



PROJECT MUSE®

Violence, Excess, and the Composite Emotional Rhetoric of  
*Richard Coeur de Lion*

Marcel Elias

Studies in Philology, Volume 114, Number 1, Winter 2017, pp. 1-38 (Article)

Published by The University of North Carolina Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/sip.2017.0000>



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/644547>

# STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

---

---

Volume 114

Winter 2017

Number 1

---

---

## Violence, Excess, and the Composite Emotional Rhetoric of *Richard Coeur de Lion*

by Marcel Elias

*This article offers a reappraisal of the Middle English romance Richard Coeur de Lion in light of its composite nature, which, I suggest, provides grounds for a more critical reading of the eponymous hero's bellicose temperament and violent actions than has hitherto been offered by scholarship. I argue that the later interpolations made to the romance produce a shift in narrative tone, most clearly manifested in the emotions of the portrayed characters, pointing toward an ambivalent evaluation of Richard's violent behavior. I in turn link this evaluation to late fourteenth-century reactions against the corruption of chivalric ideals.*

Bien sai que molt a  
El rei proesce e hardement;  
Mais il s'embat si folement!  
Quel haut prince que jo ja fusse,  
Je voldroie mielz que jo eusse  
Largesce e sens o tot mesure  
Que hardement o desmesure.<sup>1</sup>

[I know well that the king is endowed with great prowess and boldness,  
but he rushes into things with such rashness! However great prince I be I

<sup>1</sup> Ambroise, *L'estoire de la guerre sainte*, ed. Gaston Paris (Paris, 1887), lines 12146–52; the English translation is mine.

would rather exercise generosity and judgement in appropriate measure, than boldness carried to excess.]

*Saladin on Richard I in Ambroise, L'estoire  
de la guerre sainte (c. 1194–1199)*

**D**ETERMINING whether medieval portrayals of violence in chronicles and literature convey excess or not is a delicate task. Excess can be considered the criterion which marks the borderline between approved or neutrally depicted forms of violence and acts of brutality that are presented as morally unwarranted. The threshold in question is, however, culturally and historically defined, as well as being subject to varying personal opinions; the concepts of violence and cruelty overlap, the latter being more of a cultural construct based upon moral comprehension than a fixed entity involving determined norms.<sup>2</sup> The standards that designated whether violence was deemed legitimate or illegitimate constantly fluctuated, notably according to the perspective, concerns, and interests of the author of the source.<sup>3</sup> It is indeed quite often only through the tone adopted by the narrative—the manner in which events, actions, and behaviors are characterized and framed—that one can attempt to establish whether a sense of reproof is disclosed or not. Moreover, as noted by Richard Kaeuper, praise and social critique of violence often came side by side in chivalric literature, attesting to the harmonies as well as the tensions at work.<sup>4</sup> While Richard I of England was widely acclaimed throughout the Middle Ages and beyond as an archetype of chivalric valor, model crusader, and expert of warfare, there also exists evidence attesting to a mixed perception of him in late medieval culture. A number of accounts and portrayals of Richard, a man who himself took part in stressing disquieting components of his character and background,<sup>5</sup> contain interspersed elements of condemnation. As shown by Jean Flori, debauchery, greed, lust, and pride

<sup>2</sup> Daniel Baraz, "Violence or Cruelty? An Intercultural Perspective," in *A Great Effusion of Blood? Interpreting Medieval Violence*, ed. Mark D. Meyerson, Daniel Thiery, and Oren Falk (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 164–65.

<sup>3</sup> For more on the inconstant and contrasting norms of violence in the Middle Ages, see Warren C. Brown, *Violence in Medieval Europe* (Edinburgh: Pearson, 2011), 289–90.

<sup>4</sup> Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 34–35.

<sup>5</sup> On this, see Jean Flori, *Richard Coeur de Lion: le roi-chevalier* (Paris: Payot, 1999), 465–66; and J. O. Prestwich, "Richard Coeur de Lion: *Rex Bellicosus*," in *Richard Coeur de Lion in History and Myth*, ed. Janet Nelson (London: King's College Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 1992), 2–3.

counted amongst the vices imputed to him by contemporary and later authors.<sup>6</sup> In his *Summa praedicatorum*, the fourteenth-century English preacher John of Bromyard notably denounced the famed crusader-king for his lapse into vanity and pride.<sup>7</sup> Glorified but also disputed, Richard I, embodying the notion of chivalric prowess in popular imagination, represents a choice persona through which to assess the points of convergence between celebration and criticism of violence. My interest here is to consider the Middle English crusading romance *Richard Coeur de Lion* (hereafter *RCL*) in light of the subtle boundaries between depictions of meritorious violent exertion and acts of excessive brutality.

Reading *RCL* rouses mixed feelings toward the manner in which King Richard is portrayed, his belligerent disposition and violent actions at times seemingly presented as praiseworthy and yet, at others, infused with disquieting ambivalence. This ambivalence has naturally been attributed by critics to the repeated allusions to the eponymous hero's devilish traits and demonic heritage, which punctuate the narrative, and to the episodes in which he eats Saracen flesh. Critics have generally accounted for the king's ambiguous nature by providing overarching ideological explanations for his objectionable actions. Cannibalism, understandably of foremost concern to scholarly enquiry, has been viewed as an expression of Christian identity, Englishness, crusade ideology and conquest, and Western annihilation.<sup>8</sup> The king's questionable actions are overall perceived as inherent to his standing as Christian and national hero.<sup>9</sup> These interpretations, however, fail to consider *RCL*

<sup>6</sup> Flori, *Richard Coeur de Lion*, 465–70.

<sup>7</sup> John of Bromyard, *Summa praedicatorum* (Vienna, 1586), "Bellum," 99, §50, cited in Timothy Guard, *Chivalry, Kingship and Crusade: The English Experience in the Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), 178.

<sup>8</sup> Suzanne M. Yeager, *Jerusalem in Medieval Narrative* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 48–77; Suzanne Conklin Akbari, "The Hunger for National Identity in *Richard Coeur de Lion*," in *Reading Medieval Culture: Essays in Honor of Robert W. Hanning*, ed. Robert M. Stein and Sandra Pierson Prior (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 198–227; Alan S. Ambrisco, "Cannibalism and Cultural Encounters in *Richard Coeur de Lion*," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29 (1999): 499–528; Geraldine Heng, *Empire of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 63–113; and Nicola McDonald, "Eating People and the Alimentary Logic of *Richard Coeur de Lion*," in *Pulp Fictions of Medieval England: Essays in Popular Romance*, ed. McDonald (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 124–50.

<sup>9</sup> The king's ambivalence and emphatic violence are moreover quite often paradoxically read as serving rehabilitative purposes with regard to the historically documented shortcomings ascribed to Richard I, so as to endow him with the ability to more fully assume the form of the English, Christian crusader-king *par excellence*. See, especially, Lesley A. Coote, "Laughing at Monsters in *Richard Coeur de Lyon*," in *Grant Risée? The Medieval*

in terms of certain discontinuities and internal contradictions resulting from its composite nature, which, I suggest, provides significant evidence in support of a more critical reading of Richard's bellicose temperament and propensity for violence. The complex textual history of the romance (a point which I will come back to in the following paragraphs) indicates that certain interpolations were made by one, or multiple, later adaptor(s)—notably the 1200 lines that open the narrative as well as Richard's anthropophagic feast—which complicate our perception of the English crusader-king. While the composite nature of the romance is commonly taken into consideration or at the very least acknowledged by critics, the general consensus is that the previously produced base narrative, along with the additions which were subsequently made, are expressive of a single homogeneous ideology; in other words, these later interpolations are seen as complementing the core of the text in such a way as to underscore and elaborate on the ideological strands which were already present.<sup>10</sup> Yet, as recent scholarship has stressed, critical discussions of the concerns, contexts, and internal dynamics of romances must indispensably account for the fact that processes of translation and adaptation of these narratives were extremely fluid and often involved active engagement with and reworking of source materials; authors and adaptors were frequently led to redirect, interrogate, and even criticize the conventions of their sources.<sup>11</sup> The present study aims to offer a reassessment of the generally accepted idea that the later additions made to *RCL* extend congruously, albeit creatively, on the conventions of the text's base narrative. I will argue, instead, that these interpolations produce a shift in the romance, whereby violent actions are led to overstep the boundaries between the commendable

---

*Comic Presence: Essays in Memory of Brian J. Levy*, ed. Adrian P. Tudor and Alan Hindley (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 208–9; Heng, *Empire of Magic*, 91–98; and Yeager, *Jerusalem in Medieval Narrative*, 50–51.

<sup>10</sup> While Yeager, Akbari, Ambrisco, Heng, and McDonald (see note 8 above) focus primarily on the later additions made to the text, with a particular focus on the cannibalism episodes, their interpretations demonstrate how these interpolations coalesce with and accentuate the ideological stance of the base narrative, principally by providing further emphasis to the poem's preoccupation with Christian identity, English national identity, crusade ideology and conquest, and Western annihilation.

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., Christine Chism, "Romance," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1100–1500*, ed. Larry Scanlon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 57–59; Sylvia Huot, "The Manuscript Context of Medieval Romance," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 62–63; and Alison Wiggins, "The Manuscripts and Texts of the Middle English *Guy of Warwick*," in *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, ed. Alison Wiggins and Rosalind Field (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2007), 61–80.

and the excessive, thus prompting the reader/auditor to reflect upon the parameters delineating legitimate and illegitimate violence. As will be illustrated in what follows, the medium through which this evaluative discrepancy is orchestrated in these additions is that of emotional characterization: anger and fear, the emotions that most pervasively circumscribe Richard's acts of violence throughout the narrative,<sup>12</sup> as well as the emotion of sorrow, particularly during the cannibalistic feast, constitute vehicles through which the king's ambivalence and unsettling aura are brought to light.

Before expanding upon the emotional component of *RCL*, let us first consider the poem's manuscript evidence. *RCL* exists in seven fragmentary manuscripts that can be divided, according to Karl Brunner, into versions B and A.<sup>13</sup> B is shorter and is considered to be more "historical" and closer to the original version, whereas A is longer, contains more marvelous "romance" components, and is most certainly a later expansion of B.<sup>14</sup> Brunner, to whom we owe the most comprehensive critical edition of the romance, bases his work on the longer A version while also providing a detailed apparatus of the variances found in the B manuscripts.<sup>15</sup> The B-A distinction he establishes, and the classifica-

<sup>12</sup> Brown briefly considers the emotions linked to violence and identifies fear and anger as those most relevant in this respect, a comment that applies well to *RCL*. See Brown, *Violence in Medieval Europe*, 13.

<sup>13</sup> Brunner, introduction to *Der Mittlenglische Versroman über Richard Löwenherz* (Vienna: W. Braumüller, 1913), 1–24. Version B manuscripts: Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Advocates 19.2.1 (the Auchinleck MS), 326r–327v (c. 1330); London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 58, 250r–275r (c. 1400–50); London, British Library, MS Egerton 2862 (*olim* Trentham-Sutherland), 1r–44v (c. 1390); London, British Library, MS Harley 4690, 109r–115v (fifteenth century); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 228, 1r–40v (late fifteenth century). Version A manuscripts: Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 175/96, 1–98 (c. 1400); and London, British Library, MS Additional 31042 (the London Thornton MS), 125r–163r (c. 1440).

<sup>14</sup> The historically attested occurrences of *RCL* and the historicity of the B version are most fully discussed in John Finlayson, "Richard, Coer de Lyon: Romance, History or Something in Between?" *Studies in Philology* 87 (1990): 156–80. Finlayson describes the B version as "medieval 'history' heightened, simplified and sometimes rearranged to highlight its essential pattern and concentrate its meaning in the figure of a great English warrior and Crusader general" (179).

<sup>15</sup> Brunner's edition (see note 13 above for full reference) is based on the Gonville and Caius College, MS 175/96 (c. 1400), supplemented by one of the two early prints of the text by Wynkyn de Worde (1509 and 1528). These early prints are derived from a complete version of Caius 175 (see John Finlayson, "Legendary Ancestors and the Expansion of Romance in Richard, Coer de Lyon," *English Studies* 79 [1998]: 299). For a detailed table of the passages contained in each of the different manuscripts, see Brunner's introduction, 15–17. See also Peter Larkin's recent edition, *Richard Coer de Lyon* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2015), published while this article was already in press. Like Brunner's, Larkin's edition is based on Gonville and Caius College, MS 175/96, using one

tion of the former as “historical” and the latter as “romance-like,” is, however, slightly problematic because all extant manuscripts, apart from the earliest one, the fragmentary Auchinleck (c. 1330, a B-version manuscript), contain a certain amount of interpolated “romance” material. It is nevertheless possible, as shown by Philida M. T. A. Schellekens in her (regrettably) unpublished edition of the B-version manuscripts of the poem, to reconstruct a “core text” or “base narrative” within B, recognizable through its Kentish/SE rimes and more factual, historically attested structure that correlates to the events related by the chroniclers of the Third Crusade.<sup>16</sup> Due to the deficiency of the extant manuscript evidence, this is the closest one can possibly get to accessing an “original version” of RCL.<sup>17</sup>

The Auchinleck, which is presumed to be itself a translation of a lost Anglo-Norman original,<sup>18</sup> is composed of this core historical material

---

of the two early prints by Wynkyn de Worde to complete lacunae. While important not least in enhancing the romance’s accessibility (Brunner’s edition is in Austrian-inflected German), Larkin’s is not a critical edition, as noted by the editor himself, and his textual notes, though substantial, lack the level of detail provided by Brunner’s. I have therefore opted to preserve all relevant references to Brunner’s edition.

<sup>16</sup> Schellekens, *An Edition of the Middle English Romance: Richard Coeur de Lion*, 2 vols. (PhD diss., Durham University, 1989), 2:29–43, 59–66, and 73–75. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6564/>. Schellekens’s work is a parallel-text edition of Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Advocates 19.2.1 (the Auchinleck MS); London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 58; London, British Library, MS Egerton 2862 (c. 1390); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 228. The core text as established by the author is to be found in the following lines of her edition: 1–34, 733–2410, 2807–2950, 3085–3154, 3807–4146, and 4309–78. Schellekens’s unfortunately scarcely used meticulous reconstruction of this core text provides critics of RCL with the means to offer a more precise framework for the manuscript tradition of the poem, commonly divided—with mixed satisfaction in view of the complexity of the extant evidence—into a more “historical” B version and more “romance-like” A version. One episode, however, must be added to this core text list: lines 2411–68, which see King Philip of France leaving the crusade. Not only does Philip’s departure and the Duke of Burgundy’s appointment as his successor count amongst the more directly historically attested elements of the crusade campaign, but his departure must indispensably be accounted for in terms of narrative logic since he is absent in the core text of the B version thereafter. Moreover, Schellekens’s exclusion of this passage from the base narrative is far more hypothetical than the other identified interpolations given that she admits to its lack of any distinctive dialect features (see 33 and 62).

<sup>17</sup> Ultimately, the work done by Finlayson in “Richard, Coer de Lyon” to demonstrate the historicity of B, closest to the original version, is only partially satisfactory since he concedes that the B version also contains a number of non-historical elements (168) without concretely suggesting the reconstruction of a base narrative or core text within these manuscripts.

<sup>18</sup> Gaston Paris, “Le roman de Richard Coeur de Lion,” *Romania* 26 (1897): 361–62; Brunner, introduction to *Der Mittelenglische Versroman über Richard Löwenherz*, 18; and Finlayson, “Richard, Coer de Lyon,” 161.

until it breaks off. The manuscript opens with a 34-line introduction in which Richard is compared to other heroic figures of history and literature, after which the story of the king's crusade is directly launched: on his way to Jerusalem, Richard stops in Messina to meet up with Philip of France then pursues his journey on to Acre via Cyprus; in the last lines of the surviving leaves of the manuscript, the English king is presented as setting the siege on the Muslim forces at Acre into motion.<sup>19</sup> In all probability the Auchinleck originally thereafter contained the further key events of the Third Crusade that are comprised as core constituents of the other versions of the text: Richard's victory at Acre, Philip's departure from the crusade, and the English king's massacre of the Saracen prisoners; the battle of Arsuf and occupation of Jaffa; the rebuilding of Ascalon; the capture of Darum; the retaking of Jaffa; and finally the three-year truce with Saladin followed by Richard's return to England and death.<sup>20</sup>

A highly "romance-like" interpolation of approximately 1200 lines, which is incorporated after line 35 of the Auchinleck and is found in its most complete form in the A-version manuscripts, was however subsequently made to the beginning of the text, relating Richard's demonic heritage, the tournament in which he contends disguised and his preparatory crusade and imprisonment in Germany. This 1200-line addition first appears within the manuscript tradition of *RCL* in A-version manuscript Caius 175 (c. 1400).<sup>21</sup> The A-version passages in which Richard cannibalizes his Saracen victims are moreover also consensually assumed to be later additions.<sup>22</sup> There is no historical foundation

<sup>19</sup> For a full transcription and digital facsimile of the Auchinleck MS, see *The Auchinleck Manuscript Project*, ed. David Burnley and Alison Wiggins: <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/>.

<sup>20</sup> For an account of the key events of the Third Crusade, see John Gillingham, *Richard I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 123–221.

<sup>21</sup> It must however be noted that bits of this passage are missing from Caius 175, due mainly to a number of missing folios (these correspond to lines 228–448 and 679–796). Yet given that the two early fifteenth-century prints by Wynkyn de Worde (which contain the whole interpolation) are clearly derived from a complete text of the Caius manuscript, we can be quite certain that Caius 175 originally comprised the totality of the interpolated passage. The narrative context moreover indicates without a doubt that the gaps found in Caius 175 originally contained the passages found in Brunner's edition at lines 228–448 and 679–796 (as specified in note 15 above, Brunner's edition supplements the passages missing from Caius 175 with Wynkyn de Worde's two early prints).

<sup>22</sup> Although these passages that introduce Richard as a man-eater are present in the late fourteenth-century Egerton 2862 (a B-version manuscript) in addition to the two A-version manuscripts, this points toward a problem with Brunner's categorization rather than suggesting that they may have originally been part of the Auchinleck MS. Egerton 2862's opening lines are illegible (the manuscript begins at line 1857); however,

to these episodes, and their style, subject matter, and a number of linguistic features set them apart from the base narrative of the B version, which deals with historically attested events.<sup>23</sup> I will argue here that these “romance-like” passages, which appear during the late fourteenth century, infuse a distinctive tone to the text, reconfiguring the image of King Richard presented in the more historical core of the crusade campaign by stressing ambivalent features of his character.

More specifically, I will argue that in significant episodes of these later interpolations the emotions of fear, anger, and sorrow constitute narrative devices through which King Richard’s behavior is questioned and the socially destructive, excessive dimension of his violence and commitment to chivalric prowess borne out. A subtle assessment of Richard, expressed through the lens of emotions, is conveyed in these additions through the emphasis and exploitation of certain unsettling facets of the king’s character and background in such a way as to arouse the reader’s awareness of the excessive and disruptive tenor of his actions. Interestingly, these emotional depictions simultaneously contrast with but also shed new light upon the emotional texture of the base narrative of Richard’s crusade campaign—a texture that is principally consistent with the use of emotions in ecclesiastical crusade discourse.<sup>24</sup>

---

the king’s cannibalism is present. This noticeable inconsistency in Brunner’s A-B categorization—since the Egerton 2862 (part of the B version) tends to include certain “romance-like” marvelous elements characteristic of the A version—is noted by Ambrisco, “Cannibalism and Cultural Encounters,” 524, note 3. On the inconsistencies related to Brunner’s categorization, see also Norman Davis, “Another Fragment of ‘Richard Coer de Lyon,’” *Notes and Queries* 16 (1969): 447–52.

<sup>23</sup> Schellekens, *An Edition of the Middle English Romance*, 2:62 and, on the linguistic discrepancies in these passages, 33. Also on the cannibalism episodes as additions, see Ambrisco, “Cannibalism and Cultural Encounters,” 507–8; and McDonald, “Eating People,” 140. While the A-version manuscripts and Egerton 2862 see Richard healing from sickness through the consumption of Saracen flesh (which is the first of two episodes of cannibalism), Douce 228 and Arundel 58 present the king’s healing as instantly and directly caused by divine intervention (see lines 2232–33 of Schellekens’s edition). Both the Auchinleck and Harley 4690 are deficient at this stage.

<sup>24</sup> My assessment of the role of emotions in crusade discourse results principally from a survey of emotional rhetoric in the sources compiled in Christoph T. Maier, *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology: Model Sermons for the Preaching of the Cross* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality, 1095–1274* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981); Jean Flori, *Prêcher la croisade (XIe–XIIIe siècle): communication et propagande* (Paris: Perrin, 2012); Norman Housley, *Documents on the Later Crusades, 1274–1580* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996); Jessalynn Bird, Edward Peters, and James Powell, *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013). It has also been supplemented by the following articles: Susanna A. Throop, “Zeal, Anger and Vengeance: The Emotional Rhetoric of Crusading,” in *Vengeance in the Middle Ages: Emotion,*

While the emotions that circumscribe the king's actions throughout the more historical core text of the crusade expedition are predominantly presented as lending support to his violent deeds, one nevertheless senses the presence of certain latent problems embedded in the narrative. These problems, at the time, may well have been what prompted the desire of the later adaptor(s) of the A version to give further prominence to the disturbing features of Richard's temperament.

The use of emotional language as a means of calling attention to questionable, problematic Christian chivalric or royal behavior is not unique in Middle English crusading literature to *RCL*. In *The Siege of Milan*, for example, preserved in the London Thornton manuscript (London, British Library, MS Additional 31042) alongside *RCL* and roughly contemporary with the emergence of the A-version interpolations (c. 1400), King Charlemagne is cast as displaying inwardly directed, illegitimate anger, which is set in stark contrast with the expressions of zealous, justified wrath of the romance's upmost representative of ecclesiastical power, Bishop Turpin. Coextensive with divine justice, Turpin's wrath aims to impel Charlemagne to reconsider his refusal to engage in crusade. Charlemagne's anger toward the bishop, on the other hand, prompts domestic fragmentation and threatens to engulf Christendom in internal strife.<sup>25</sup> In *The Sultan of Babylon*, also estimated to have been composed sometime in the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, the author takes considerable liberties with his source material, modifying the internal dynamics of the narrative by reconfiguring its emotional rhetoric. A notable instance of this manipulation of emotional content is when Charlemagne is ascribed unbridled wrath as he rashly decides to send all of his peers as envoys to Sultan Laban, a man who is known to slay the messengers of his foes. Repeatedly opposed by his most trusted men, who warn him of the harmful ramifications of acting "from anger," the king comes to an impulsive, wrathful decision with devastating immediate consequences, given that his peers wind up cap-

---

*Religion, and Feud*, ed. Susanna A. Throop and Paul R. Hyams (Burlington: Ashgate, 2010), 177–202 (which was reprinted as the last chapter of her monograph *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 1095–1216* [Burlington: Ashgate, 2011]); Jonathan Riley-Smith, "Crusading as an Act of Love," *History* 65 (1980): 177–91; and Sophia Menache, "Love of God or Hatred of your Enemy? The Emotional Voices of the Crusades," *Mirabilia* 10 (2010): 1–20.

<sup>25</sup> See *The Siege of Milan*, in *Three Middle English Charlemagne Romances*, ed. Alan Lupack (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1990), lines 681–705, 710–12, and 746–57; and, for a discussion of these episodes in terms of legitimate and illegitimate anger, see my "The Case of Anger in *The Siege of Milan* and *The King of Tars*," *Comitatus* 43 (2012): 50–52.

tured and imprisoned by the Sultan.<sup>26</sup> The Middle English fragmentary adaptation of *The Song of Roland* also calls into question Christian decisions and motives for action through the medium of emotions: in the lead-up to the famous defeat of Roncevaux, Roland dismisses his men's plea for him to uphold his "loue" for Charlemagne by blowing his horn for help; disregarding their warnings on the dangers to royal safety entailed by his decision to engage in combat, Roland reacts with "wroth" and ultimately succeeds in convincing his army to avoid the "shame" of retreat, thereby leading it to tragic, albeit heroic, defeat and death.<sup>27</sup> The three Middle English Otuel romances were also subject to a number of indicative alterations or additions of emotional characterization in the transition they underwent from *chanson de geste* to romance form. In the passage that sees Roland, Oliver, and Ogier embark in a secret, unsanctioned expedition against the Saracen forces, for instance, the Middle English versions are unique in reproving their enterprise as motivated by pride and envy—a critique that is voiced through the eponymous Saracen convert.<sup>28</sup> As in *RCL*, emotions are called upon in these texts to

<sup>26</sup> *The Sultan of Babylon*, in *Three Middle English Charlemagne Romances*, ed. Lupack, lines 1679–1734. For this passage in the Anglo-Norman version of *Fierabras*, which, along with *La Destruction de Rome* was adapted by the author of *The Sultan of Babylon*, see "*La Destruction de Rome et Fierabras*, MS Egerton 3028, Musée britannique, Londres," ed. Louis Brandin, *Romania* 64 (1938): 18–100, lines 649–717. Earlier on in *The Sultan of Babylon*, following a wrathful dispute between Charlemagne and Roland, the narrator had moreover asserted that "every wrath moste over-gone, / Of the more myschiefe to make voydaunce" (1105–6).

<sup>27</sup> *The Sege off Melayne and The Romance of Duke Rowland and Sir Otuell of Spayne, Together with a Fragment of The Song of Roland*, ed. Sidney Herrtage, EETS, e.s., 35 (London, 1880; repr. 1931), lines 551–60: "but for dred of dethe, do thou it neuer, / but for our lordis loue, þat is god euer. / If we dye here, his baile is the mor / . . . / then was this man [Roland] wroth in-ded, / And to them said he ther: / 'ye knyghtis, for shame shon ye neuer.'"

<sup>28</sup> In *Otuel* (composed before 1330), see *The Tale of Rauf Coilyear with the Fragments of Roland and Vernagu and Otuel*, ed. Sidney J. H. Herrtage, EETS, e.s., 39 (London, 1882; repr. 1931 and 1969), lines 1020 and 1027–30; in *Otuel and Roland* (composed c. 1330), see *Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, ed. Mary Isabelle O'Sullivan, EETS, o.s., 198 (London, 1935), lines 1056–68; in *Duke Roland and Sir Otuel of Spain* (composed c. 1400), see *The Sege off Melayne and The Romance of Duke Rowland and Sir Otuell of Spayne, Together with a Fragment of The Song of Roland*, ed. Herrtage, EETS, e.s., 35 (London, 1880; repr. 1931), lines 1048–53. The passions of envy and pride are absent in the corresponding passages of the Continental version (see *Les anciens poètes de la France*, ed. François Guessard and Henri Michéant, 10 vols [Paris, 1858–1870], I) and of the Anglo-Norman text, as yet unpublished. I am grateful to Diane Speed for providing access and permission to refer to her transcription of this version, found in Cologny-Geneva, Bodmer Library MS 168, 211ra–222rb. For a study of emotional rhetoric in the Otuel romances in relation to late medieval crusading mindsets, see my "Mixed Feelings in the Middle English Charlemagne Romances: Emotional Reconfiguration and the Failures of Crusading Practices in the Otuel Texts," *New*

invite debate, to complicate patterns of unambiguous Christian heroism, and to qualify and evaluate chivalric and royal behavior. These episodes, among others available, suggest the existence of more moralistic, reformative romance features pertaining to chivalric and royal conduct than are commonly accounted for in scholarly assessments. Excluding *The Siege of Milan*, for which there is no extant source material, these examples also underscore the importance of situating our understanding of romances and romance protagonists in relation to manuscript variations and evolution. Richard in *RCL* is an ambivalent character specifically because the romance is a composite.

In what follows, I will first delineate the manner in which anger and fear characterize Richard's actions throughout the crusade campaign narrative, focusing on the passages present in the more historical base text of the B-version manuscripts. In order to more clearly isolate this material, references will be made in this section to Schellekens's edition of the B version of the romance.<sup>29</sup> I will then refer to Brunner's edition to demonstrate how these same emotions, supplemented with sorrow, reconfigure this "dominant" emotional rhetoric in the later additions and thereby channel the reader's attention toward the excessive and subversive dimension of the king's character and actions. By interrogating the mechanisms for representing violence in the poem, the later interpolations draw attention to the disruptive power of certain components of the chivalric ethos, most specifically its paramount value, prowess.<sup>30</sup> By altering an emotional texture that buttresses the legitimacy of violent exertion, these additions not only expose an acute awareness of the slipperiness of "representation" but also bear witness to the versatility and distorting potential of emotional characterization. By extension, these interpolations point toward the limitations of justifying violence through a "righteous" emotional mindset. Richard the Lionheart, as a legendary archetype of chivalry, understandably represents a choice

---

*Medieval Literatures* 16, ed. Laura Ashe, Wendy Scase, and David Lawton (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2016), 172–212.

<sup>29</sup> See note 16 above for the full reference to the edition and line numbers of this core text. Schellekens's work being a parallel-text edition, citation will be made with reference to Arundel 58 unless indicated otherwise. As previously specified, the fragmentary state of the Auchinleck makes it impossible to know precisely which parts were added in Richard's crusade campaign. Following Schellekens's reconstruction of a base narrative within the more "historical" B-version manuscripts therefore constitutes the most appropriate way of accessing an "original version" of *RCL*.

<sup>30</sup> For a discussion of the role of prowess in relation to chivalric violence, see Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 129–60.

persona through which to address the anxieties and tensions, particularly tangible in the late fourteenth-century context in which these additions emerged, felt toward the social damage of chivalric violence.<sup>31</sup>

#### WRATH AND FEAR IN THE CORE TEXT OF RICHARD'S CAMPAIGN

The base narrative of Richard's crusade expedition presents us with an emphatically fierce king who does not seem, *a priori*, to transgress the chivalric and crusading standards of violence. Richard is defined by his unconditional fearlessness and unyielding dedication to the cause of achieving Christian victory over the Saracen armies of Saladin, a mission that is repeatedly signaled as required by God. He is likewise depicted as unequivocally committed to the chivalric ideals of prowess, courage, and honor. This generates an intense preoccupation over his fame and reputation, since honor could be rapidly lost through cowardice and unavenged injury.<sup>32</sup> A large number of grisly descriptions of battle and violence permeate the base narrative, the vast majority of which fulfill the goal of asserting, and reasserting, Richard's prowess. The emotions of wrath and fear regularly emerge throughout the core text of the crusade campaign and provide further emphasis to the king's fervor and zeal for the crusade, an effect which is notably achieved through their conformity with the emotional rhetoric of ecclesiastical crusade discourse. Yet, certain questionable features prefiguring—and thus perhaps accounting for—the later interpolations nevertheless transpire.

There are a number of characterizations of King Richard as wrathful throughout these passages of the crusade narrative, many of which, directed against the Saracen enemy, have the effect of imbuing his stance as *miles Christi* with further intensity and fierceness.<sup>33</sup> As constituting

<sup>31</sup> On this, see especially Nigel Saul, "A Farewell to Arms? Criticism of Warfare in Late Fourteenth-Century England," in *Fourteenth Century England*, ed. Chris Given-Wilson, 8 vols. (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002), 2, 131–46. I will come back to this point in my concluding paragraphs.

<sup>32</sup> For a discussion of chivalry, memory, and fame, see Nigel Saul, *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500* (London: The Bodley Head, 2011), 283–304.

<sup>33</sup> An indicative example can be found at lines 2231–38: "[The Saracens] hadden almost in icome, / . . . / but God that made mone and sonne / heled kyng Richard of his sekenesse / in that nede and that destresse. / And whenne Richard that bataylle vnderstod / ffor wrath hit brent negh his blode / and dude him arme wel tho." Or again, lines 3148–54: "He [Richard] kepte hym euere with his swerd / and euer cried to Jhesu, oure Lord: / 'Nough I shal deye for thi loue, / receyue my soule to heuene aboue!' / The Sarasyns with

an act of vengeance in themselves (and therefore established as befittingly reacting to previous transgression) and defended by carefully devised doctrinal justification, the crusades represented an occasion on which wrath targeted at the heathen enemy was predominantly sanctioned because it was necessary to Christian endeavors.<sup>34</sup> Exposed to severe critical evaluation in late Antiquity<sup>35</sup> and during the Carolingian era,<sup>36</sup> the emotion indeed came to progressively occupy a legitimate place during the second half of the Middle Ages, as long as it was directed toward wrongful, sinful behavior. While anger preserved an ambivalent status due to its position amongst the Seven Deadly Sins and rooted in its potentially destructive effects, the medieval Church could not fail to recognize its capacity to operate as a beneficial instrument, expressive of reproof against harmful action. Concomitant with the Church's desire to channel knightly violence and reform secular knighthood during the eleventh and twelfth centuries,<sup>37</sup> the develop-

---

hure mase al tofrussad hym in that plase / . . . / Therefore kyng Richard wexid wrothe." See also, e.g., lines 2828–34 and 3995–98. Lines 2075–80 also present a peculiar instance in which a swarm of "anoyed and "agramed" bees are released by the English king on the Saracen troops of Acre.

<sup>34</sup> On crusading and vengeance, see Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*. On the connection between righteous anger and crusade ideology, see Throop, "Zeal, Anger and Vengeance," 177–202.

<sup>35</sup> Laurent Smagghe, "Sur paine d'encourir nostre indignation. Rhétorique du courroux princier dans les Pays-Bas bourguignons à la fin du Moyen Âge," in *Politiques des émotions au Moyen Âge*, ed. Damien Boquet and Piroška Nagy (Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2010), 76. On Seneca's negative treatment of anger, see Martin Blais, "La colère selon Sénèque et selon saint Thomas," *Laval théologique et philosophique* 20 (1964): 247–90.

<sup>36</sup> For instance, Alcuin of York: "Ira una est de octo vitiis principalibus, quae si ratione non regitur, in furorem vertitur: ita ut homo sui animi impotens erit, faciens quae non convenit. Haec enim si cordi insidit, omnem eximit ab eo providentiam facti, nec iudicium rectae directionis inquirere" (Anger is one of the eight principal vices. If it is not controlled by reason, it is turned into raging fury, such that a man has no power over his own soul and does unseemly things. For this vice so occupies the heart that it banishes from it every precaution in acting and in seeking right judgement) (*De Virtutibus et Vitiis* 31, PL 101, col. 634, cited in Geneviève Bühler-Thierry, "Just Anger' or 'Vengeful Anger'? The Punishment of Blinding in the Early Medieval West," in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998], 75).

<sup>37</sup> This is however a very delicate subject that has given rise to various divergent views. See, e.g., Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, 5; Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 50; Tomáš Mastnak, *Crusading Peace: Christendom, the Muslim World, and Western Political Order* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 43–44; and Richard Kaeuper, *Holy Warrior: The Religious Ideology of Chivalry* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), especially chapter 1.

ment of a type of righteous, zealous anger, based on the model of divine wrath, is attested to within various sources.<sup>38</sup>

Thus, the thirteenth-century crusade propagandist Gilbert of Tournai, for instance, drawing upon Ecclesiastes 36, incites his audience to anger: "Excita furorem et effunde iram . . . quantum ad eos, qui sunt cruci rebelles" (rouse your fury and pour out your rage . . . against those who are the rebels of the cross).<sup>39</sup> As implied in this assertion, however, wrathful crusade fervor is to be directed not only against the Muslim enemy, but additionally against all those who obstruct the progress of the crusade and are therefore also "rebels of the cross."<sup>40</sup> Accordingly, wrathful expression also appears in *RCL* within inter-Christian contexts and serves to reconfigure political relationships.<sup>41</sup> In fact, the core text of the romance seems to significantly allow for more extensive narrative development of the situations that generate angry reactions between Christians than those in which the emotion is directed against Saracens. Faced with a number of mutinous affronts from Christian characters, notably King Philip of France and King Isaac of Cyprus, which threaten the advancement of the crusade, Richard reacts with fury.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Richard E. Barton conducts a discussion of the social role of zealous, righteous anger during the eleventh and twelfth centuries ("'Zealous Anger' and the Renegotiation of Aristocratic Relationships in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France," in *Anger's Past*, ed. Rosenwein, 153–70). Gerd Althoff documents the progressive rehabilitation of royal anger with sources of righteous anger during the twelfth century ("*Ira Regis*: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger," in *Anger's Past*, ed. Rosenwein, 70–74). Throop also shows that it is during the twelfth century that the term "zeal," which will subsequently come to be intimately linked to the concept of righteous anger, is increasingly employed and associated with crusading ("Zeal, Anger and Vengeance," 179–84).

<sup>39</sup> Gilbert of Tournai, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 15953, 376v–378r, in Maier, *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology*, 206–7.

<sup>40</sup> Indeed, the menace of wrath, most often portrayed as expressed by God, often served the purpose in crusade propaganda of compelling those reluctant to take the cross to comply. See, for instance, Jacques de Vitry, Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 228, 148rb–149rb, in Maier, *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology*, 85; Gilbert of Tournai, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 15953, 376v–378r, in Maier, *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology*, 201 and 207–9; and "Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris," in *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, n.s., 5, ed. A. Chroust (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1928), 6–10, trans. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, 64–65.

<sup>41</sup> The connection between displays of wrath and processes of negotiation or compromise resulting in dispute resolution is made, notably, by Barton ("'Zealous Anger,'" 158–59).

<sup>42</sup> See notably lines 923–27 in which Richard displays his anger in reaction to the killing of a number of Englishmen by French soldiers; 1242–43 in which Richard responds wrathfully to the king of Cyprus, who has captured a group of shipwrecked crusaders; 1379–81 in which Richard reacts with wrath when the Cypriot king again attempts to betray the English king's trust; and 3876–931, in which Richard responds with righteous anger to the stubborn refusal of a certain duke of Austria to take part in the rebuilding

Presented as legitimate because triggered by inadmissible conduct, and thus originating from “just” intentions,<sup>43</sup> these displays of wrath, along with the threat or act of retaliation, seem to aim toward reestablishing Christian solidarity with the crusade as a unifying objective.

Yet Christian cause and personal ambition converge throughout the core of the crusade narrative. King Richard’s angry demeanor certainly bolsters the advancement of the crusade, but to what extent are the “just” intentions that account for his proclivity to wrath described as specifically founded upon Christian collective interests? While the more historical heart of the king’s campaign is largely consistent in situating his acts of violence, fierceness, and wrathful disposition within a rationale of meritorious crusade fervor, certain instances lead one to relativize his position as unimpeachable warrior of Christ and to question his motivations for action. In a telling wrathful exchange between the kings of England and France, the town and considerable treasures of Acre, which Richard considers his “purchas” and is willing to share “no partye” (2422–23),<sup>44</sup> are revealed as representing the *personal* object of contention at the origin of large-scale Christian fragmentation. Indeed, following the English king’s refusal to share the slightest portion of his winnings, this dispute over the “dygnite” (2418) of Acre becomes the source of everlasting mutual “wrope” (2450) between the two royal figures and sees the French army ultimately leaving the crusade.<sup>45</sup> Insofar as private inter-Christian wrath displayed over the control of Acre precludes the possibility of an all-encompassing, cohesive Christian body leading a harmonious offensive against the Muslim armies, it seems that the potentially self-destructive dimension of anger directed against one’s peers is here subtly brought to light. The perils to collective integrity entailed by such conflicts were, moreover, of acute relevance to crusading concerns, as attested by chroniclers and other commentators: not only was disunity amongst crusading leaders one of the most pervasive

---

of the Christian fortifications of Chaloyne (Ascalon). All of these displays are triggered by condemnable actions that obstruct the advancement of the crusade.

<sup>43</sup> Anger was indeed generally defined as righteous and legitimate when displayed in reaction to unjust offenses and founded upon morally justifiable reasons. For a summary overview of this aspect, see Elias, “The Case of Anger,” 47–48.

<sup>44</sup> The quoted words refer to the text found in Douce 228. Arundel 58 reads: “of my purchas ne getest thugh wrth a flye!”

<sup>45</sup> In the A-version manuscripts, the French king is present in subsequent episodes. His departure from the crusade, however, is prompted in a very similar fashion, following a wrathful argument between the two rulers over the “ryche cyte” (5898) of Jerusalem, which Richard considers his “wynnyng” and of which he is unwilling to share “half a ffoote” (5902).

critiques and reasons for defeat proffered throughout the history of the enterprise,<sup>46</sup> but the failure of the Third Crusade was itself almost unanimously imputed to the dissensions of Richard I and Philip-Augustus.<sup>47</sup> Christian rivalries and/or conflicting interests likewise took the blame for the fall of Acre in 1291,<sup>48</sup> as well as for the disappointing outcomes of the fourteenth-century crusades of Alexandria (1365) and Nicopolis (1396).<sup>49</sup> Anger, in this sense, comes to be conceived not so much as an instrument that, employed in a legitimate manner, can coerce the vicious into virtuous action, as a tool of political advancement and a motif drawing attention to internal fracture. The axiomatic permissibility of Richard's wrath, a liminal emotion that oscillated between condemnation and acceptance in its medieval conception,<sup>50</sup> seems thus already at this stage to be interrogated and may well have prompted the later adaptor(s) to further exploit its evaluative dimension—an aspect that we shall explore in the next section.

The emotion of fear occupies an equally central place throughout *RCL* in delineating Richard's character and acts of violence. Fear, and lack of fear, are repeatedly highlighted throughout his campaign and encompass the narrative in such a way as to emphasize the division between Christians and Saracens. Richard, "bat neuer no was couward" (6 and 1361), is recurrently presented as fearless, fear-inspiring, and de-

<sup>46</sup> See, for instance, the examples given in Giles Constable, *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 289–92; Palmer A. Throop, *Criticism of the Crusade: A Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda* (Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1940), 69–77; and Martin Aurell, *Des chrétiens contre les croisades (XIIe–XIIIe siècle)* (Paris: Fayard, 2013), 70–89.

<sup>47</sup> On this, see John Victor Tolan, *Sons of Ishmael: Muslims through European Eyes in the Middle Ages* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008), 82–85; and Throop, *Criticism of the Crusade*, 76–78. One among a number of interesting primary sources is to be found in *The Poems of the Troubadour Bertran de Born*, ed. William D. Paden, Jr., Tilde Sankovitch, and Patricia H. Stäblein (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 41:4–5.

<sup>48</sup> See, for example, Ludolph von Suchem, *Ludolphi de itinere terrae sanctae liber*, ed. Ferdinand Deycks (Stuttgart, 1851), 42–46; Pierre of Duisbourg, "Cronica terre Prussie," in *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum*, ed. M. Töppen, 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1861–1874), 1:208; and Aurell, *Des chrétiens contre les croisades*, 338–44.

<sup>49</sup> On the responsibility borne by the English crusaders at Alexandria in this regard, see Guard, *Chivalry, Kingship and Crusade*, 46–47. For the Nicopolis crusade, see especially the *Chronique du religieux de Saint-Denis*, ed. M. L. Bellaguet, 6 vols. (Paris, 1839), 2:487–523.

<sup>50</sup> Although the emotion of anger appears to have been subjected to a progressive rehabilitation during the second half of the Middle Ages, its acceptance nevertheless remained extremely ambivalent, and it was only to be expressed in certain specific contexts and according to certain precise conventions. On the codes and conventions of royal anger, see in particular Althoff, "Ira Regis," 59–74; and Laurent Smagghie, *Les émotions du prince: émotion et discours politique dans l'espace bourguignon* (Paris: Garnier, 2012), 167–222.

nouncing those who yield to the emotion, whereas the Saracens are insistently depicted as prone to fear and fleeing in battle, mostly in response to the English king's terrifying ferocity.<sup>51</sup> In fact, Saladin's men are described as dreading Richard with such intensity that during the first altercation to take place, a group of them chooses to jump into the sea and drown rather than having to face him in battle.<sup>52</sup> This fear is certainly on a conspicuous level linked to Richard's chivalric identity—his strength, bravery, and belligerence. Fear was of course a direct reaction to his violent disposition and deeds, and the king's total immunity to the emotion very much contributes to bolstering his heroic stance as "werryour beste" over "Rowelond," "Charlemayn," "Gawayn," "Ector," "Achylles," etc. (7–31). Yet, reading into the use of the emotion in further depth shows that absence of fear seems to be a specifically Christian prerogative throughout the crusade part of the text, not only because the mindset is an indispensable component of worthy chivalric identity but because it is inherent to the righteousness of the Christian cause—an idea that permeates crusade propaganda. Crusade preachers repeatedly promoted the idea that fear becomes irrelevant for those who take the cross since in doing so, they commit to fighting for God and are thus absolved of their sins and guaranteed a place in heaven. Consider, for instance, the following passage from a recruiting song for the Second Crusade: "Ki ore irat ad Loovis / Ja mar d'enfern avrat pour, / Char s'alme en iert en pareis / Od les angles nostre segnor" (Whoever goes with Louis now, / Need never fear the devil's horde. / His soul will go to Paradise / With the angels of the Lord).<sup>53</sup> Or, as articulated by Bernard of Clairvaux: "Impavidus profecto miles, et omni ex parte securus, qui ut corpus ferri, sic animum fidei lorica induitur. Utrisque nimirum munitus armis, nec daemonem timet, nec hominem" (The knight who puts the breastplate of faith on his soul in the same way as he puts a breastplate of iron on his body is truly intrepid and safe from everything. Un-

<sup>51</sup> Passages in the core text in which Saracens express fear, and/or flee in battle in reaction to Richard's fierce demeanor and actions include lines 1757–60, 2083–84, 2261–65, 2915–19, 4072–74, and 4346. Other instances in which Saracens are represented as fearful, and/or fleeing from the Christian forces can be found at lines 1890, 1954–60, 2105–34, 2279–80, and 4045–50. Richard also regularly employs the qualifiers "coward" or "ffeynt" to characterize Saracen enemies and fellow Christian men who do not act according to his expectations. See e.g., lines 1080, 1709, 3902, 3945, and 4330.

<sup>52</sup> Lines 1757–60: "The Saracenus, as I yow telle, / went hit were a fende of helle / and ouere borde lopyn he / and dreynte hemsself in the see."

<sup>53</sup> Colin Morris, "Propaganda for War: The Dissemination of the Crusading Ideal in the Twelfth Century," in *The Church and War*, ed. W. J. Sheils (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 95.

doubtedly defended by both kinds of armour he fears neither demon nor man).<sup>54</sup>

Richard stresses the virtuous character of fearlessness by indicating that those lacking in courage, spirit, and vigor in face of the enemy are sentencing their souls to damnation: "whoso by feynt, / in helle-water he be dreyn!" (1709–10).<sup>55</sup> In the narrative framework of the core of Richard's crusade campaign, in which the king's actions are insistently introduced as endorsed by divine authority, it would seem that the fear he inspires in the Saracen enemy has as much to do with his fierce demeanor as with his identity as epitome of Christian faith and agent of Christian subjugation.<sup>56</sup> The fear repeatedly attributed to the Saracens of *RCL*, almost as though it were a predisposed condition, may accordingly be conceived as a sinful fear of Christendom, a perennial state of dismay symptomatic of religious inadequacy and rooted in the imminent fate of damnation that awaits them.<sup>57</sup> Indeed, given the longstand-

<sup>54</sup> Bernard of Clairvaux, "De laude novae militiae," in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, ed. Jean Leclercq and Henri Rochais, 9 vols. (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1963), 3:214 (trans. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, 102). For more examples on the irrelevance of fear in crusade propaganda for those who take the cross (a subject which has surprisingly given rise to very little critical attention) see, e.g., in Maier's *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology*: Gilbert of Tournai (183, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 15953, 375r–376r); and Bertrand de la Tour (231–35, Barcelona, Archivo de la Corona de Aragon, MS Ripoll 187, 82ra–va), who dedicates his whole sermon to the importance of not yielding to fear. A second use of the emotion in crusade propaganda has to do with the fear inspired by God, which aims to incite men to take the cross (for example, in Maier, *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology*: Jacques de Vitry, 93, Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 228, 148rb–149rb; and Gilbert of Tournai, 201, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 15953, 376v–378r).

<sup>55</sup> Here quoted from Egerton 2862. "Helle" is replaced by "evil" in Douce 228 and by "vuelle" in Arundel 58. The meaning however remains essentially the same, the threat of damnation being implicit rather than explicit. This same threat toward his men is reiterated at lines 1811–12.

<sup>56</sup> Indeed, these passages of martial exertion and violence, which generate reactions of dread from Saladin's men, are often preceded and/or followed by pronouncements of divine assistance (often under the form of a plea or expressed gratitude). See, e.g., lines 1757–60 and 1783–84; 2053–56 and 2083–84; 2232–33 and 2261–65; 2843–48 and 2915–19; 4065 and 4072–74.

<sup>57</sup> Gilbert of Tournai also provides an example of this significant notion of "fear of Christendom" in crusade propaganda. Elaborating on the concept of sign/cross, he writes, "Quando homo fert baculum elevatum et erectum, tunc timet canis . . . Sic crucis signum non est abscondendum sed aperte portandum, quo gravissime verberati sunt et veri fideles consolati" (When a man carries a stick and holds it up, then a dog is frightened . . . In the same way, the sign of the cross must not be hidden but carried openly and must be taken up against the dogs of hell, who are very frightened of the stick, with which they are beaten most severely but with which the true believers are comforted) (Gilbert of Tournai, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 15953, 375r–376r, in Maier, *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology*, 184–85).

ing affiliation between fear and sin in Western medieval mentalities,<sup>58</sup> it does not seem surprising that in a context of crusade, perceived and promoted as penitential warfare in remission of one's sins, the emotion should be mainly ascribed to the necessarily sinful Saracen other.<sup>59</sup> In this sense, the dread the king inspires throughout the crusade campaign not only underscores his chivalric valor but also draws attention to the commendable character of his violent disposition, as ingrained in a dialectic of meritorious crusade identity.

Yet, although the use of fear seems to conform to the standards of crusade ideology, the emotion nevertheless contains an evaluative dimension that cannot be disregarded.<sup>60</sup> Indeed, since the expression of fear involves the assessment of an object or person deemed particularly menacing, the emotion also has the effect of *accentuating* the violent actions that prompted the fearful reaction in the first place—an aspect that is further highlighted by references to Richard's devilish nature, also present in the base narrative of the B version.<sup>61</sup> More importantly, fear is already set forth on a couple of occasions as constituting a natural response to the English king's fierce and menacing temperament within inter-Christian contexts<sup>62</sup>—a feature that is developed in the additions

<sup>58</sup> On this, see notably Jean Delumeau, *Le péché et la peur: la culpabilisation en occident, XIIIe–XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Fayard, 1983), which is the second of three volumes written by Delumeau on the subject of fear in the Middle Ages and early modern period. This connection between fear and sin and fear and the divine is moreover semantically ingrained in some of the principal Middle English words employed to signify aspects of the emotion. The adjective "feint," as listed in the *MED*, signifies lacking in spirit or courage, cowardly but also faithless (for a person or a relationship) or false (if referring to a belief). The headwords "dreden" and "douten" both contain the definition of "to fear (God)." "Febleness," weakness of will or courage, can also signify moral or spiritual weakness. "Arghnes(se)," meaning cowardice, timidity, is also a branch of the deadly sin of sloth: timidity in doing good.

<sup>59</sup> Moreover, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which saw the emergence of the manuscripts we have of *RCL*, are often considered as representing periods in which the climate of fear in Western Christendom was particularly pervasive—a feature that lends further force to the idea of projecting this ubiquitous fear upon the "sinful" Saracen other, who, unlike the Western targets of this unjust predicament, truly "deserves" to feel terror. For a brief overview of this climate of fear, see Steven Fanning, "Mitigations of the Fear of Hell and Purgatory in the Later Middle Ages: Julian of Norwich and Catherine of Genoa," in *Fear and Its Representations in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Anne Scott and Cynthia Kosso (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 295–97.

<sup>60</sup> The evaluative dimension of the emotion is highlighted by Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Les émotions de la vengeance," in *La vengeance, 400–1200*, ed. Dominique Barthélemy, François Bougard, and Régine Le Jan (Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 2006), 240.

<sup>61</sup> See, e.g., lines 1758 and 2262.

<sup>62</sup> Philip's fear of Richard is most clearly expressed after the English king vehemently rebuffs his plea to accept Saladin's offer to crown Conrad of Montferrat as king of Surry:

that we shall now consider. Because of the very evocative and versatile character of fear, in terms of the diverse responses its representation could induce, it may well be that the poem's use of the emotion was perceived, in a similar way as anger, as potentially problematic by a later redactor, and thus inspired the interpolation of more explicitly unsettling characterizations, which further exploit the king's demonic heritage and problematize his acts of violence.

#### EMOTIONAL AMBIVALENCE IN THE INTERPOLATIONS

The 1200 lines that open the A version of the poem as well as Richard's anthropophagic feast, later additions made to the core of the text, tend to reconfigure the emotional rhetoric briefly exposed above so as to provide further prominence to the excessive and unsettling aspects of the king's violent disposition and commitment to chivalric prowess. A close observation of the manner in which the emotions of fear, anger, and sorrow delineate Richard's actions provides insight into the reasons why he comes across as ambivalent and disturbing. An altered assessment of the king is thus induced at the very beginning of the revised romance in such a way as to redirect the reader's perception toward the immoderate and socially destructive dimension of his conduct.

Inasmuch as the emotion of fear appears to primarily outline King Richard's identity as model Christian leader throughout the crusade campaign—immune to but productive of the emotion due to his engagement in a cause that exonerates him of sin and guarantees his salvation—these later additions seem to prompt a reevaluation of the poem's dominant modes of affective representation. The evaluative character of fear is employed at the outset to introduce Richard into the poem, via his demonic mother Cassodorien. The first two appearances of fear/distress in this interpolation complicate the perception the reader has of the English king at the inception of the romance by establishing the focal point of emotional response as rooted in his devilish background. Stemming from folklore, the legend of the Angevin kings' devilish lineage was disseminated notably by Ranulf Higden's immensely popular *Polychronicon*, in which it is invoked to buttress accusations of royal tyranny and cruelty.<sup>63</sup> The poem's insistence on this affiliation more-

"but he [Philip] ne durste speke no more, / for euer he dradde of dundes hard / to vnderfonge of kyng Richard" (2346–48). King Isaac of Cyprus also displays fear by fleeing from Richard and his men when they seek violent retribution for his betrayal (1471–76).

<sup>63</sup> I quote here from John Trevisa's translation of the *Polychronicon*: "Also of þis Henry

over comes across as especially ambiguous here in a context of crusading romance in view of the widespread tendency of such narratives to portray Saracens and not Christians as devils.<sup>64</sup> In search for “þe ffeyrest wymman þat wore on liff” (51) for Richard’s father, Henry, to marry, the messengers who are sent out fall upon Cassodorien’s father’s pure white ship with its fabulous, yet distressing powers; the initial reaction of these good Christian knights is, significantly, one of intense emotional anguish (58). The sentiment of uneasiness the narrative pins on the demonic queen is reinforced when, shortly after, on the morning succeeding her wedding with Henry, she reveals that she is physically incapable of witnessing the Eucharist and faints. This scene, again, generates great fear and dismay on the part of the people present: “þe qwene fel in swowne adoun; / þe folk wondryd and were adrad” (190–91). This reaction could be disregarded as triggered out of worry for Cassodorien’s well-being, yet, in view of the disturbing strangeness and nature of the incident, the onlookers’ dread indubitably contains further implications. The queen’s highly unorthodox response to the holy sacrament—involving a disposition that could be perceived as aligning her with other slanderers of the Eucharist such as, notably, witches<sup>65</sup>—is moreover reiterated in an even more disconcerting manner when, fifteen years later (but a few lines later in the narrative), she is prevented from withdrawing and forced to stay for mass. Again, however, she succeeds in escaping the imposed outcome, this time by flying out of a window in the roof of the church and never coming back (227–34), thus

---

[Henry II, Richard’s father] while he was a child y-norsched in þe kynges court of Fraunce, seynt Bernard þe abbot propheciede and saide in presence of þe kyng ‘Of þe devel he come, and to þe devel he schal’; and menede þerby boþe þe tyrauidise of his fader Gefray þat geldede the bisshop of Sagye, and his owne cruelnesse þat slou3 seynt Thomas of Caunterbury” (*Polychronicon Ranulphi Hidgen monachi Cestrensis*, vol. 8, ed. Joseph Rawson Lumby [London, 1871], 35). This connection with the devil was also called upon by Scottish detractors of the English to support accusations of treachery. See Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, gen. ed. D. E. R. Watt, 9 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987–1998), 5 and 16–19; *Short Scottish Prose Chronicles*, ed. Dan Embree, Edward Donald Kennedy, and Kathleen Daly (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2012), 40–41, 56, 131, 270, and 285; and Katherine H. Terrell, “‘Lynealy discendit of þe devill’: Genealogy, Textuality, and Anglophobia in Medieval Scottish Chronicles,” *Studies in Philology* 108 (2011): 320–44.

<sup>64</sup> This tendency is also noted by Marianne Ailes and Phillipa Hardman, “Crusading, Chivalry and the Saracen World in Insular Romance,” in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. Rosalind Field, Hardman, and Michelle Sweeney (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2010), 60.

<sup>65</sup> Jeffrey Burton Russel asserts that, in fourteenth-century popular mentalities, acts of profanation involving the Eucharist were predominantly ascribed to witches and Jews (*Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984], 167).

providing the narrative with a strikingly conclusive touch to the disquieting aura she emits. By designating and eliciting unease/fear as the natural response to the supernatural and unsettling occurrences surrounding the protagonist's devilish mother, the author draws upon a vast field of semantic and imaginative associations connected to anxieties felt toward Satan's agents, which were diffused by the political and ecclesiastical elite throughout all segments of the population in late medieval society.<sup>66</sup> The emotion of fear/distress is in this way directly correlated with Richard's devilish heritage—which will subsequently come to be linked to his disturbing brutality—even before the king makes his first appearance in the text, thereby complicating the reader's grasp of the emotional texture of the romance and of its eponymous hero's makeup from the start.

The tournament episode of the poem, which immediately follows the incidents related to Cassodorien, straightforwardly highlights the troubling dimension of Richard's proneness to violence upon his ascension to the throne of England. Richard fights in three different disguises that are qualified as "full stronge" (268): first dressed in black with a raven upon his crest whose beak is wide open "as he were wode" (276) and has a bell around his neck, then on a blood-red steed with the emblem of a red hound (333 and 337), and finally in white with a bright red cross embroidered on his shoulder and a dove upon his helmet (387–93). The evolution of these attires—with devices drawing upon a range of undertones, progressing from ominous to ambiguous (since it is often Saracens who are identified with hounds in romance<sup>67</sup>) to emphatically well-defined—draws further attention to the king's hybrid nature.<sup>68</sup> Although the death-boding raven with the bell around its neck adorning

<sup>66</sup> Jean Delumeau, *La Peur en occident, XIVe–XVIIIe siècles: une cité assiégée* (Paris: Fayard, 1978), 232–383.

<sup>67</sup> On this, see, e.g., Jesus Montano, "Sir Gowther: Imagining Race in Late Medieval England," in *Meeting the Foreign in the Middle Ages*, ed. Albrecht Classen (New York: Routledge, 2002), 124–26.

<sup>68</sup> As noted by Jeffrey Burton Russel, the devil was also associated with a number of animals throughout the Middle Ages, including dogs and ravens, sometimes following Judeo-Christian tradition and at others because of the sacredness of animals to pagan gods, which Christians affiliated with demons (*Lucifer: The Devil in the Middle Ages* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986], 67). Other passages in which Richard is presented as disguising himself: line 595, as a palmer for his preparatory crusade; then, line 915, as a squire to illicitly visit the bedchamber of Margery, King Mordred's daughter. Although disguises are a common motif of romance, it seems that in the case of *RCL*, these attires take on a particular significance, reinforcing the slippery and ambivalent component of Richard's character.

the crest of the king's first costume is presented as foreshadowing the Church's destruction of those who do not share Christian belief (278–84),<sup>69</sup> Richard's ferocity is significantly not, at this point in the narrative, directed against Saracens but against Christians. Dressed in black and charging "full egerly" (290), the king leaves the first knight who challenges him "nye deed" (294)—which generates, according to Sir Thomas of Moulton's later account of the events, a reaction of dread on the part of the onlookers (482). Richard's second contender is however less fortunate. The king, described as "stout and sauage" (485), wielding his shaft "wiþ gret rage" (486) and striking the knight "wiþ yre" (497), kills both man and horse: "His necke he brake there a two: / His horse and he fell to grounde, / And dyed bothe in that stounde" (298–300). In response to this, a third knight, who will thereafter rise to the challenge, decries the damage inflicted on the knightly fellowship by Richard's unchecked violence: "þis is a deuyl, and no man, / þat oure folk felles and sleth!" (500–501). Finally, when King Richard rapidly unhorses this third contestant, a "hardy and good" knight (305), all others remain paralyzed, in fear for their lives: "Off hym þey were adred ful sore / þat non durste jouste wiþ hym efft: / Lest he hadde hem here lyf berefft" (514–16). Here, the fear Richard provokes and the wrath he expresses characterize his actions in such a way as to foreground the tensions inherent in the unbridled nature of his emphatically violent disposition. Although his deeds of arms underscore his chivalric aptitudes, the manner in which they are presented—notably by means of the emotions that frame them—points toward their destructive character and the socially problematic dimension of prowess, which is here utterly devoid of restraint or measure.<sup>70</sup> By explicitly conflating Richard's wrathful violence with his devilish nature, moreover, the narrative draws a direct parallel with what Kate McGrath has shown to be a well-documented authorial practice consisting of ascribing excessive, objec-

<sup>69</sup> In fact, all three costumes are presented as prefiguring Richard's subsequent violent deeds on crusade (see lines 278–84, 339–42, and 395–96), in such a way as to conspicuously mark the connection between his temperament and actions preceding the crusade expedition and those that will characterize him during the campaign. The overlap between ambiguously portrayed violence and divinely ordained fervor thus further brands him as disturbingly equivocal.

<sup>70</sup> On the importance of chivalric measure, balance, and restraint in historical and literary sources, as testifying to, and countering, the threat of unbridled violence, see Saul, *For Honour and Fame*, 190–93; Richard Kaeuper, "The Societal Role of Chivalry in Romance: Northwestern Europe," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. Krueger, 97–114; and Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 145.

tionable knightly anger and bloodshed to Satan's influence. The purpose of such analogies was to reinforce understandings of the depicted anger in terms of the emotion's status as a Deadly Sin.<sup>71</sup> Such narrative strategies were likewise deployed in crusading accounts, especially to condemn wrathful or hateful dissensions and violence amongst Christians. *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, an eyewitness report of the Siege of Lisbon at the inception of the Second Crusade, for instance, imputes the outbreaks of anger and violence that threaten to destroy the Christian army from the inside to the poison of the devil's malice (*malitie virus*).<sup>72</sup> The infighting that permeates chronicles of the Third Crusade was also perceived as caused by the devil.<sup>73</sup> A more contemporary example is to be found in Ludolph of Suchem's mid-fourteenth-century account of the loss of Acre in 1291: the author attributes the city's fall and ruin to the citizens' "odiosam discordiam" (hateful quarrels), which, instigated by Satan, result in considerable Christian bloodshed.<sup>74</sup> Despite the fact that Richard's displays of wrathful violence against fellow Christians precede his crusading expedition, associating them with the devil produces a similar effect as in the above scenarios: that of highlighting the prejudicial impact of inwardly directed violence on Christian collective integrity.

As is the case with fear, anger thus also constitutes a narrative device through which the "romance-like" additions to *RCL* interrogate and convey an evaluation of the king's acts of violence. Because the emotion relied on a number of conventions that defined its legitimate or illegitimate character—the foremost being its relation to reason, moderate or unrestrained expression, and conformity with a just cause<sup>75</sup>—the

<sup>71</sup> McGrath, "The Politics of Chivalry: The Function of Anger and Shame in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Anglo-Norman Historical Narratives," in *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White*, ed. Belle S. Tuten and Tracey L. Billado (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 65–66. On the sinfulness of excessive wrath, see also Richard Lavynham, *A Litol Tretys on the Seven Deadly Sins*, ed. Johannes Petrus Wilhelmus Maria van Zutphen (Rome: Institutum Carmelitanum, 1956), 12. Lavynham's treatise was one of the most popular Middle English examples of the genre during the later Middle Ages.

<sup>72</sup> *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi: The Conquest of Lisbon*, ed. and trans. Charles Wendell David (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), 166–67.

<sup>73</sup> On this, see Tolan, *Sons of Ishmael*, 82 and 85.

<sup>74</sup> Ludolph von Suchem, *Ludolphi de itinere terrae sanctae liber*, 42.

<sup>75</sup> This was stressed by influential theorists such as Thomas Aquinas and Giles of Rome. See, for instance, *Summa theologiae*, IIa 2ae 158, 1–8 and, in particular, 1 and 2 on unreasoned, immoderate anger in relation to sin; and, in John Trevisa's Middle English translation of Giles of Rome's *De regimine principum*, see *The Governance of Kings and Princes: John Trevisa's Middle English Translation of the De regimine principum of Aegidius Ro-*

way an author framed the wrathful actions or words of the protagonist he portrayed could serve as a rhetorical tool to assert his endorsement or denunciation of the person or action in question.<sup>76</sup> Imputing unrighteous or unchecked wrath was one way of expressing reproof; an equally effective formula, however, was to present a person's unwarranted behavior as provoking the legitimate, justified anger of others. Correspondingly, from the perspective of the individuals described in the narratives, Stephen D. White notes that "more than an emotional response to a past political act, a display of anger also involves a quasi-judicial appraisal of the act and of the person or persons deemed responsible for it."<sup>77</sup> During the episode directly following the tournament, in which Richard goes on a reconnaissance crusade disguised as a palmer and accompanied by only Sir Thomas and Sir Folk, Richard both expresses immoderate anger and finds himself targeted by a number of wrathful displays, which are significantly presented as entirely legitimate and ensue from uncourteous and perfidious actions. Returning from his scouting expedition to the Holy Land, Richard is denounced by a minstrel and finds himself wrongfully accused of spying on King Mordred's land and thrown into prison.<sup>78</sup> Although the scale of moral rightfulness is largely tipped in favor of Richard due to this unfair arrest, the English king's subsequent actions will clearly inverse this tendency.

The morning after he is incarcerated, Richard is challenged by Mordred's son, Ardour, to exchange a single barehanded blow in order to see who is the stronger man. Upon receiving "an eere cloute" (760) delivered in strict conformity with their agreement, Richard nevertheless deems that Ardour "dyde hym wronge" (762) and wrathfully swears vengeance (763–64).<sup>79</sup> At this point, however, the narrative ascribes

---

*manus*, ed. David C. Fowler, Charles F. Briggs, and Paul G. Remley (New York: Garland, 1997), 128–29.

<sup>76</sup> See, for instance, the examples given by Althoff, "*Ira Regis*," 67–70.

<sup>77</sup> White, "The Politics of Anger," in *Anger's Past*, ed. Rosenwein, 140.

<sup>78</sup> It seems relevant that Richard is denounced by a minstrel, whom the king had previously ungraciously rebuffed, in view of the popular legend of Blondel, which appears in its earliest form in a thirteenth-century French prose chronicle. The legend tells of a minstrel who is said to have shown his dedication to Richard I by finding the unknown location of the prison in which the king was incarcerated in Germany, traveling and singing songs from castle to castle until finally hearing the captive monarch's voice in reply. On this, see John Gillingham, "Some Legends of Richard the Lionheart: Their Development and Their Influence," in *Richard Coeur de Lion in History and Myth*, ed. Nelson, 55. Although the legend benefited from a certain amount of popularity, it is of course entirely uncertain whether the author who created this episode in *RCL* was familiar with it.

<sup>79</sup> The most elemental definition given for the emotion of anger by medieval authors

particular prominence to Ardour's good will, courtesy, and desire for a fair fight:

The kynges sone with good wyll  
 Badde they sholde haue theyr fyll,  
 Bothe of drynke, and eke of mete,  
 Of the best that they wolde ete,  
 That he myght not awyte  
 For feblenes his dente to smyte;  
 And into bedde be brought to reste,  
 To quyte his that he be preste.  
 The kynges sone was curtese,  
 That nyghte he made hym well at ease.  
 (756–74)

Despite this honorable treatment, Richard, concealed in the privacy of his cell, diligently applies a layer "thycke and more" (781) of hard beeswax over his fist in order to inflict as much harm as possible to his adversary. Ardour, specifically described as "a trewe man" (786), faces the king with "ire and mode" (788) and receives his blow without flinching but is struck "ded as ony ston" (798). Richard's urge to consummate his vengeance toward Ardour's stroke, repeatedly underlined by the author (763–64 and 783–84), as well as the lethal consequence of such spite clearly come through as disproportionate. More importantly, the inequitable nature of Richard's blow exposes the king as both prone to excess and tricky in a most pernicious way.<sup>80</sup> Thus, the vindictive, wrathful drive to Richard's violence, measured against Ardour's "curtese" and "good wyll," is cast in a critical light and set forth as disturbing—a feeling which the reader retains throughout the rest of the romance. Although directed against the Saracens, and therefore by nature legitimate, Richard's later acts of violence preserve the taint of excess and cruelty imputed to them by these earlier incidents.

King Mordred's first reaction, upon learning of his son's death, is one of intense grief (802–5). The distress caused by Richard's injurious act

---

was "the desire for vengeance." See, for instance, *Summa theologiae*, IIa 2ae 158, 1; *The Governance of Kings and Princes*, 127; and Lavynham, *A Littel Tretys*, 10.

<sup>80</sup> Although fighting fairly is in large part a modern misconception of chivalry, there were also an ever-expanding number of late medieval sources drawing specific attention to the importance of regulating chivalric violence under the heading of certain laws of arms. See for instance Brown, *Violence in Medieval Europe*, 280, on Froissart's conception of chivalry, according to which "good knights fought fairly."

then reaches a full poetic climax when Mordred informs his wife of their loss:

‘Dame,’ he sayde, ‘wost þou nouȝt,  
 þy ffayre sone to deþe is brouȝt!  
 Siþþen þat j was born to man,  
 Swylke sorwe hadd j neuere nan!  
 Alle my ioye is turnyd to woo,  
 For sorwe j wole myseluen sloo!  
 Whenne þe qwene vndyrstood,  
 Ffor sorwe, sertys, sche wax nygh wood.  
 Her kerchefs she drewe, her heer also,  
 ‘Alas,’ she sayd, ‘what shall j do!’  
 Sche cratched hereselff in þe vysage,  
 As a wymman þat was in rage,  
 þe face fomyd al on blood,  
 Sche rente þe robe þat sche was born.

(819–34)

Mordred then verbalizes his wrath, which not only finds support in the discursive force ascribed to the grief he and his wife feel at losing their only son but is, moreover, explicitly presented as legitimate and fully justified in view of Richard’s wicked/immoral (“vnwrest”) conduct:

The kynge sayde wiþ egre wylle:  
 ‘In prisoun þey schal leue styllle:  
 And feteres on hem loke feste!  
 Ffor þe dedes þat aren vnwrest,  
 þat he has my sone jslawe,  
 He schal dye be ryȝt of lawe.’

(871–76)

Richard however does not stop at killing Mordred’s son but, furthermore, seduces his daughter and, disguised as a squire, visits her bed-chamber for seven consecutive nights. When the two are caught by one of the German king’s men, Mordred’s anger mingles with grief (933). Here, considerable emphasis is attributed to the fact that King Mordred gives Richard’s fate a great deal of thought. In addition to being triggered by a serious injury, his decision is the very opposite of impulsive and is fundamentally founded upon reason—defining criteria, as we have seen, distinguishing righteous from condemnable wrath in late medieval theoretical conceptions. Mordred calls upon his most wise and learned advisors (936–37)—figures of utmost importance to the

effective and virtuous governance of medieval kings, a detail which is far from inconsequential<sup>81</sup>—and, together, they spend long hours pondering upon the most adequate “iugement” to administer for this “gret tresoun” (950–51). After three days of deliberation, one of these men, Sir Eldrys, argues that “3e shal doo, be my resoun” (1001) and choose a fierce lion, abstain from feeding it—and from feeding Richard—for three days, and release it into the English king’s cell. Ultimately, however, in a scene that supplies the king with his famous epithet, Richard manages to tear the lion’s heart out, carries it into the hall, seasons it with salt, and eats it in front of the stunned and horrified King Mor-dred. At yet another key moment, Richard’s wrathful violence is attributed to his devilish disposition: “Twis, as j vnyrstonde can, / þis is a deuyl and no man” (1111–12), utters the German king in disbelief.

Finally, the unsettling dimension of Richard’s violent behavior is thrown into sharpest relief in the climactic scene in which he serves the human heads of the captive Saracens to Saladin’s ambassadors—a scene that compellingly confirms his tendency toward excess. Through the way in which the narrative frames the particularly shocking motif of cannibalism—a taboo act and literary technique of “othering” most commonly associated with Saracens in Western medieval culture<sup>82</sup>—Richard’s ruthless ferocity is patently rendered, thus providing a dramatic conclusion to the “contamination” of the king’s status of exemplary *miles Christi* operated through these later additions. Here, as Siobhain Bly Calkin has convincingly argued is the case in a surprising number of Middle English romances, the critique of Christian conduct and ac-

<sup>81</sup> On the essential role of friends and advisors to the good governance of medieval kings, see Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004; 1st ed. 1990); and his “Friendship and Political Order,” in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Julian Haseldine (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 91–105.

<sup>82</sup> Heather Blurton, *Cannibalism in High Medieval English Literature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 107–14. See also Jill Tattersall, “Anthropophagi and Eaters of Raw Flesh in French Literature of the Crusade Period: Myth, Tradition, and Reality,” *Medium Ævum* 57 (1988): 245–48. Cannibalism was most commonly relegated to the “monstrous races” that appear across various medieval genres, influenced by the Marvels of the East tradition, of primary importance to medieval representations of cannibalism. Processes of “othering” linked to cannibalism are also notably found in accounts of the Tafurs, a marginalized group of soldiers under Norman or Flemish control, said to have fed off the bodies of dead Turks during the First Crusade (see Lewis A. M. Sumberg, “The ‘Tafurs’ and the First Crusade,” *Medieval Studies* 21 [1959]: 224–46) and the Tartars, who invaded and conquered parts of Eastern Europe during the thirteenth century (on Matthew Paris’s treatment of the Tartars’ cannibalism, see Blurton, *Cannibalism in High Medieval English Literature*, 81–103).

tions is effected through the medium of Saracen antagonists.<sup>83</sup> Saladin's emissaries, at first deceptively welcomed as "frendes" (3444),<sup>84</sup> are then contemptuously seated at "a syde-table" (3446) (an insult in itself<sup>85</sup>) containing salt but neither bread, water, nor wine (3447–48) and presented with the cooked decapitated heads of members of their nearest kin. Richard had previously ordered these heads to be carefully shaven, displayed on golden platters, each face identified by a name tag, slanted upward, and molded into a grotesque grin (3427–33). The ambassadors' reaction to this shocking sight is, understandably, a mix of wrath, sorrow, and fear:

þeroff they had all grame!  
 What þey were whenne þey seyen,  
 þe teres ran out off heren eyen;  
 And whenne þey þe lettre redde,  
 To be slayn fful sore þey dredde.  
 Kyng R. hys eyen on hem þrewe,  
 Hou þey begunne to chaunge here hewe.  
 For here ffrendes þey sy3yd sore,  
 þat þey hadde lost for euermore.  
 Off here kynde blood þey were.

(3464–73)

Observed by the complacent monarch, who provocatively proceeds to eating "wiþ herte good" (3481) the mutilated head which he has been served, Saladin's men can only conclude that Richard is "þe deuelys broþir" (3484). Richard's acts, charged with the emotional distress in-

<sup>83</sup> Calkin, "Saracens," in *Heroes and Anti-Heroes*, ed. Neil Cartlidge (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2012), 185–200. Calkin also comments on how the episode of cannibalism signals potentially troubling aspects of Richard's behavior, in particular linked to the fraught issue of familial ties and dynastic succession (198–99). On Saracens serving as a mouthpiece for the critique of Christian protagonists in the German romance tradition, see also Aurell, *Des chrétiens contre les croisades*, 340–43; and Mary Fisher, "Criticism of Church and Crusade in Ottokar's *Österreichische Reimchronick*," *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 22 (1986): 157–71.

<sup>84</sup> The fact that Richard addresses these emissaries as his "frendes" (3444 and 3501) further emphasizes the dishonorable nature of his treatment, given that the manipulation of the language of friendship in order to deceive was considered self-discrediting and was very much frowned upon by medieval commentators. On this, see notably C. Stephen Jaeger, *Ennobling Love: In Search of a Lost Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 19.

<sup>85</sup> As noted by Heng, *Empire of Magic*, 73. An interesting parallel is to be found in the Austrian poet Walther von der Vogelweide's *Novellino*, in which Saladin is described as denouncing the Christian kings' custom of eating on elevated tables, dominating their subjects. See Walther von der Vogelweide, *The Single-Stanza Lyrics*, ed. and trans. Frederick Goldin (New York: Routledge, 2003), xxv.

duced by a taboo behavioral extreme, are both expressive and generative of horror. The ambassadors are justifiably characterized by unequivocally legitimate wrath, dread, and sorrow in reaction to the king's malicious scheme and diabolical self-composure. Yet again, Richard is portrayed as disturbingly infringing upon the values of chivalry expected of him.

The king's troubling demeanor is moreover reinforced by the incongruous emotions he thereafter exhibits and verbalizes. He morbidly assumes a wrathful stance in reaction to the Saracens' anguish and makes an astounding request for his guests to cheer up, be at ease, and eat their fill of their friends' and families' boiled heads:

Abouten hym gan loke ful ʒerne,  
 Wiþ wraþ semblaunt, and eyen sterne.  
 þe messangers þoo he bad:  
 'Ffor my loue bes alle glad,  
 And lokes ʒe be weel at eese!  
 Why kerue ʒe nouʒt off ʒoure mese,  
 And eetes ffaste as j doo?'

(3487–93)

Richard's wrathful response to the distress and terror manifested by Saladin's emissaries comes across as disquietingly inapposite in this situation, thus prompting the reader to further associate his violence with cruelty and his position of king with that of tyrant.<sup>86</sup> Saladin's envoys are taunted, treated with derision, and contemptuously insulted—they are therefore entitled to feel angry—whereas Richard conveys his wrath and disdain with utterly no heed to his trembling and dismayed victims.<sup>87</sup> By combining humiliation with brutal physical abuse in a context of ambassadorial exchange, the king's unrestrained actions clearly violate the boundaries of acceptable royal prerogative.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>86</sup> As noted by Baraz, the difference between violence and cruelty was of crucial political significance: "violence was, to a certain degree, the prerogative of the legitimate ruler. Cruelty, on the other hand, was the sign of an illegitimate tyrant" ("Violence or Cruelty?," 165).

<sup>87</sup> According to Giles of Rome's *Super rhetoricum*, this is specifically what differentiates a good king's pronouncement of wrath from a tyrant's: a tyrant's does not diminish in front of a trembling and frightened victim. This aspect is noted by Bénédicte Sère, "Dés-honneur, outrages et infamie aux sources de la violence d'après le *Super rhetoricorum* de Gilles de Rome," in *Violences souveraines au Moyen Âge: travaux d'une école historique*, ed. François Foronda, Christine Barralis, and Sère (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2010), 109.

<sup>88</sup> As also noted by Coote: "he is breaking, even mocking, the chivalric code of hospitality, especially when applied to the sanctity of communal meals, whilst also perverting the rules of war concerning the protection and conduct of ambassadorial exchanges"

Eventually, after the ambassadors are again described as crippled by fear (3495–99), Richard orders that the heads be brought away and that proper food and drinks be served—a dinner that the Saracens are however unable to partake of, utterly overwhelmed with dread and grief (3634–38). In a curious attempt to apologize, Richard asserts that they need not be “squouymous,” that “þis is þe manner off myn hous” to be served “Wiþ Sarezynys hedes all hoot” (3509–12). He follows this up by justifying his alleged ignorance of the Saracens’ culinary customs by resorting to his identity as “kyng, Cristen, and trewe” (3514). He then expresses worry that his good name be stained by a pejorative reputation on account of him being “so euyl off maneres” (3519). Richard in this manner significantly closes this scene with an interestingly hybrid dialectic in which he presents his actions as endorsed by God and pertaining to his Christian identity, yet it is not for any moral reason that he preoccupies himself over the outcome of his behavior but because of his reputation. Indeed, this suddenly profuse exploitation of his Christian status comes through as extremely ambiguous now that he considers it possible that a blemish to his name could result from his offensive treatment of the ambassadors.

This use of emotional language and rhetoric to define and evaluate Richard’s conduct is finally insistently reiterated in the account of these events the Saracen envoys deliver to Saladin. Considerable further narrative weight is given to the intensely distressing reactions of suffering caused by the “sterne” King Richard, presented as merciless in countenance and action as the ambassadors kneel in front of him to communicate Saladin’s message (3568–70). Exclamations of sorrow—“Ffor sorwe we wende ffor to deye!” and “Ffor sorwe þoo we gan to syke” (3596 and 3604)—punctuate the narrative as one of the emissaries lists the names of the relatives and friends whose heads they were served for consumption (3591–3604). Pronouncements of grief and dread are juxtaposed with alarming characterizations of Richard:

Vs þouzte oure herte barst ryzt insunder,  
 Lord, 3it þou myzt here a wundyr!  
 Before Kyng Rycharde a knyzt in haste  
 Karff off þe hed, and he eet ffaste.  
 Wiþ teep he grond þe flessch ful harde,  
 As a wood lyoun he ffarde,  
 Wiþ hys eyen stepe and grym;

---

(“Laughing at monsters” 205). On the severe reprehensibility of conflating anger with humiliating actions and physical harm in some medieval sources, see Paul R. Hyams, *Rancor and Reconciliation in Medieval England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 52.

And spak, and we behelde hym,  
 Ffor drede we wende ffor to sterue;  
 He bad vs þat we scholde kerue  
 Oure mes, and eeten as he dede.

(3605–15)

Eyes cruel and glistening, vigorously gnawing the flesh of the human head in front of his terrified guests, the eponymous king's immoderate behavior is compounded by the speaker's repeated recourse to emotions designed to generate the compassion of his audience.<sup>89</sup> The tone of the narrative, imbued with emotional stimulation, is one that collapses the disparities between Christians and Saracens, inviting the reader to relate to and even sympathize with the envoys' perspective.<sup>90</sup> The reprehensible dimension of Richard's conduct is even further amplified at the closing of this episode when, in contrast with the English king's preceding expression of unjustified wrath (as though to provide a counterexample), Saladin—a figure whose virtuousness was largely acclaimed in late medieval Western culture<sup>91</sup>—is described as displaying emphatically legitimate royal anger upon hearing of his men's fate (3657). This response, as the narrative makes clear, is fully justified by the monstrosity of the English king's injurious acts. These emotional pronouncements again culminate in an assertion of Richard's devilish nature: "It is a deuyl wiþout ffayle" (3664).

<sup>89</sup> See also lines 3613 ("Ffor drede we wende ffor to sterue"), 3619 ("Ffor drede hou we begunne to quake"), 3634 ("Ffor drede and dool we wende to deye"), and 3638 ("So sory were we þenne for drede").

<sup>90</sup> Sorrowful utterances in particular are a common motif of both crusade propaganda and crusading romances but are for the most part ascribed to Christians: designed to lay stress on the injuries that prompted the emotional reaction in the first place, the rhetoric of sorrow is generally called upon to arouse sympathy and stimulate communal empathetic response, substantiated by retributive violence. See, for instance, Jacques of Vitry, "Sermones vulgares," in *Analecta novissima*, ed. J. B. Pitra, 2 vols. (Paris, 1887), 2:421–22; *The Siege of Milan*, lines 159, 528, 559, and 575–76. For a discussion of the infectious, compassion-arousing function of sorrow and tears in some late medieval political settings, see Smagghe, *Les émotions du prince*, 388–92. Similar conclusions regarding the ambivalent and at times sympathetic portrayal of the Jews of *Siege of Jerusalem*, victims of the cruel, inhumane treatment of Christian protagonists, have been proffered in recent reassessments of the poem. For a convincing exegetical reading of the text in which the Jews are interpreted as representing a typological Christian people, see Suzanne M. Yeager, "The Siege of Jerusalem and Biblical Exegesis: Writing about Romans in Fourteenth-Century England," *The Chaucer Review* 39 (2004): 70–102.

<sup>91</sup> See, for an overview, Margaret Jubb, "The Crusader's Perceptions of their Opponents," in *Palgrave Advances in the Crusades*, ed. Helen J. Nicholson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 235–40.

CANNIBALISM, EVALUATIVE EMOTIONS, AND THE  
BOUNDARIES OF CHIVALRIC VIOLENCE

This last disconcerting scene of cannibalism brings our examination of the “transgressive” emotional voices of the poem to a conclusion. That this episode in particular was perceived at the time as disturbing, eliciting responses of disapproval and, most likely, disgust, may well have been the reason why it disappeared during the fifteenth century in the B-version manuscripts, reemerging only thereafter in the two early prints made by Wynkyn de Worde (1509 and 1528). Of the seven extant manuscripts of the poem, only three contain Richard’s anthropophagic feast,<sup>92</sup> which suggests that the passage may have suffered from limited popularity. Along with Caius 175, the most “contaminated,” “romance-like” manuscript containing the episodes of cannibalism is the London Thornton (London, British Library, MS Additional 31042), in which *RCL* appears notably alongside *Siege of Jerusalem*, the second of three Middle English romances compiled by Robert Thornton in which anthropophagic representations are pitched as symptomatic of profound discomfort—the third being the *Alliterative Morte Arthure* preserved in Lincoln Cathedral Library, MS 91. In the *Alliterative Morte Arthure* and *Siege of Jerusalem*, both believed to have been composed sometime in the late fourteenth century (i.e. around the time in which the additions to *RCL* emerged), the trope of cannibalism likewise serves as an outlet for social angst and critique. First and foremost cast as a tyrant, then as a giant and man-eater, the Genoese monster of the *Morte* typifies the manner in which excess—immense bodily limbs, mass ingestion of human beings, as well as prodigious material wealth—acts as a narrative locus for anxiety and threats felt toward social integrity.<sup>93</sup> In *Siege of Jerusalem*, as noted by Bonnie Millar, the very extreme character of the act of infanticide/cannibalism is expressive of certain doubts and tensions concerning the validity of warfare, its potential for chaos and loss of control.<sup>94</sup> In a similar way, Richard’s cannibalism was *meant* to dis-

<sup>92</sup> London, British Library, MS Egerton 2862 (c. 1390); Cambridge, Gonville, and Caius College, MS 175/96 (c. 1400); and London, British Library, MS Additional 31042 (c. 1440).

<sup>93</sup> For a discussion of the various areas of feudal chivalric masculinity upon which the Genoese giants’ threatening monstrosity bears, see Heng, *Empire of Magic*, 115–79. The *Morte* has moreover frequently been read as adopting a critical stance toward war and as upholding irenic convictions, an argument that was first articulated by Russell A. Peck, “Willfulness and Wonders: Boethian Tragedy in the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*,” in *The Alliterative Tradition in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Bernard S. Levy and Paul Szarmach (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1981), 153–82.

<sup>94</sup> Millar, *The Siege of Jerusalem in its Physical, Literary and Historical Contexts* (Dublin:

turb, to serve as a climactic motif both corroborating and crystallizing the sense of ambivalence felt toward the king's acts of violence introduced in the later interpolations through the rhetorical effect inherent in the representation of, and appeal to, human emotion.

The overview I have offered testifies to the evaluative dimension of emotions, which serve as functional devices and ideologically infused rhetorical tools, expressive of the values, problems, and insecurities embedded within this collectively produced romance. Since emotions could so easily define and qualify a person or the nature of a protagonist's relationship to others, they were commonly employed by medieval authors to express positive or negative assessments. In a now famous (or infamous) passage of Froissart's *Chroniques*, written a few years before the emergence of the A-version additions to *RCL*, the Black Prince, in a decision said to have been taken out of mad rage, is presented as ordering the general slaughter of the inhabitants of the town of Limoges in 1370:

Là eut grant pitié; car hommes, femmes et enfans se jetoient en genoulz devant le prince et crioient: 'Merci, gentilz sires, merci!' Mais il estoit si enflammés d'aïr que point n'i entendoit, ne nuls ne nulle n'estoit oïs, mès tout mis à l'espée, quanques on trouvoit et encontroit, cil et celles qui point coupable n'i estoient . . . Il n'est si durs coers, se il fust adonc à Limoges et il li souvenir de Dieu, qui ne plorast tenrement dou grant meschief qui y estoit.

[What took place was pitiful; for men, women and children flung themselves on their knees before the prince, wailing: 'Have mercy, gentle lord, have mercy!' But he was so inflamed with rage that he refused to listen, neither man nor woman was taken heed of, but all who were to be found were put to sword, including those who were in no way guilty . . . There is no hard-hearted man that, if he had been in Limoges at that moment with God in mind, would not have wept intensely at the great calamity which took place.]<sup>95</sup>

The representation and elicitation of emotions—illegitimate rage and empathetic distress—understandably represents the medium that Froissart considers most effective to convey the tragedy of Edward's decision, which clearly comes across as unwarranted, cruel, and exces-

---

Four Courts Press, 2000), 92–93. Michael Livingston, moreover, goes as far as arguing that the poem takes a peacemaking position, that "the gore . . . is perhaps best read as a grim awareness of the terrible realities of war, not as a bloodthirsty and berserk cry for further bloodshed." See his introduction to *Siege of Jerusalem*, ed. Livingston (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2004), 28–29.

<sup>95</sup> *Chroniques de J. Froissart*, ed. Siméon Luce, 15 vols. (Paris: Société de l'Histoire de France, 1869–1975), 7:250; the English translation is mine.

sive.<sup>96</sup> Similar narrative strategies had been used to denounce Richard I's temperament a century earlier in the *Récits d'un ménestrel de Reims*, a largely fictional account that includes some of the events of the Third Crusade and aims to praise the Capetians. The anonymous author repeatedly imputes rash and excessive wrath, supplemented with hate, pride, and envy, to Richard, while Philip-Augustus, on the other hand, is presented as responding to the English king's "offensive" behavior with unambiguously legitimate anger.<sup>97</sup> While these authorial practices are exploited in a more nuanced way and with varying degrees of intensity in *RCL*, the reconfiguration of emotional rhetoric staged in the later additions must be understood in terms of how it calls upon the receptiveness of a medieval audience versed in the literary traditions of praise and blame:<sup>98</sup> these episodes draw attention to Richard's disturbing temperament and invite the reader/auditor to appraise his questionable acts and propensity for violence. Due to the complex textual history of the romance, it is of course impossible to know with certainty whether these interpolations were made by one or multiple authors. Nonetheless, in view of the manner in which Richard is interrogated and problematized throughout these passages, it seems probable that they were the work of a single redactor,<sup>99</sup> invested with reworking the tone of the narrative in such a way as to highlight the unsettling and tension-prone characteristics of the king's acts of violence.

*RCL*, under its most "contaminated," "romance-like" form, should be considered in relation to what Janet Coleman has identified as a larger development in the English literature written between 1350 and 1400, in which "few works were meant merely to entertain, but were intended

<sup>96</sup> This description in particular has led historians to assert that at this stage in his *Chroniques*, Froissart was becoming increasingly biased in favor of the French. See, e.g., John Barnie, *War in Medieval Society: Social Values and the Hundred Years War, 1337–99* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974), 77; and Jim Bradbury, *The Medieval Siege* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1992), 318.

<sup>97</sup> *A Thirteenth-Century Minstrel's Chronicle: Récits d'un ménestrel de Reims*, ed. and trans. Robert Levine (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1990), 23 and 30–37.

<sup>98</sup> On the habits of reading and writing during the Middle Ages and the nature of representation in literary and historical narratives linked to a variety of rhetorical assumptions, see Ruth Morse, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), especially chapter 1 on the importance of rhetoric and emotional stimulation.

<sup>99</sup> In this respect, I therefore agree with and extend (by incorporating a larger number of episodes to this conclusion) the viewpoint expressed by McDonald ("Eating People," 140), i.e., that the sections involving Cassodorien, Richard's eating of the lion's heart, and the episodes of cannibalism were the product of a *single* later adaptor.

rather to criticize and eventually to reform social practices."<sup>100</sup> Indeed, the interpolations' subtle indictment of Richard's excessively violent temperament and obsession with feats of arms and chivalric fame resonates with an increasingly pervasive critique, expressed most clearly during the last quarter of the fourteenth century, of the damaging and self-interested character of chivalry. As illustrated notably by Nigel Saul, there took place between the 1330s (estimated date of the first fragmentary version of *RCL*, the Auchinleck MS) and the end of the fourteenth century (when the additions emerged) an important escalation of denunciative attitudes toward the failures of knights to behave according to the standards expected of them. During the 1370s and 1380s, English campaigns on the Continent were not as successful as they had previously been, and the detrimental effects of the Hundred Years War came to be more markedly felt, one of the consequences being that knightly conduct was exposed to severe scrutiny. Among those criticizing the corruption of chivalric values, most specifically the destructive character of violence and the inadequate centrality of fame and prowess, were figures such as Chaucer and Gower.<sup>101</sup> Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* explicitly broach the fraught issue of violence conditioned by "ire," "excesse," and "outrage," while Gower's *Confessio Amantis* deplores the killing of both Christians and Saracens.<sup>102</sup> As recently argued by Celia M. Lewis, the writings of the fourteenth-century English crusaders Henry of Grosmont and John Clanvowe bear witness to a significant degree of moral compunction and critical introspection entailed by the violence of their martial careers.<sup>103</sup> Grosmont, in *Le livre de seyntz medicines*, remorsefully ascribes the appetite for bloodshed which defined his chivalric existence to the sin of anger.<sup>104</sup> In all evidence, the un-

<sup>100</sup> Coleman, *Medieval Readers and Writers, 1350–1400* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), 16.

<sup>101</sup> Saul, "A Farewell to Arms?" 131–45, and *For Honour and Fame*, 193–96. As noted by Saul, "the writers who articulated the literature of complaint were no extremists" and "stood in the social and political mainstream" ("A Farewell to Arms?," 145). See also Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, 117–38. On Chaucer, Gower, and peace, see R. F. Yeager, "Pax Poetica: On the Pacifism of Chaucer and Gower," *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 9 (1987): 97–121.

<sup>102</sup> Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*: The Tale of Melibee, 5.1528–34 (on "excesse" and "outrage") and *The Parson's Tale*, X.532–78, especially 542–45 (on violence and "ire"); Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, 2, ed. Russell A. Peck and trans. Andrew Galloway (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2013), 4, lines 1659–80.

<sup>103</sup> Lewis, "History, Mission, and Crusade in the *Canterbury Tales*," *The Chaucer Review* 42 (2008): 353–60.

<sup>104</sup> *Le livre de seyntz medicines: The Unpublished Devotional Treatise of Henry of Lancaster*, ed. E. J. Arnould (Oxford: Blackwell, 1940), 17.

ease felt toward unchecked violence and the chivalric values of prowess and fame had seeped into contemporary perceptions of the crusades. Norman Housley observes that "there can be little doubt that crusading, despite its strong scriptural credentials and the unflagging support that it received from both clerical and lay authorities, suffered from the growing revulsion toward unbridled war that developed during the late middle ages."<sup>105</sup> The most well-informed account to have reached us of the disastrous crusade of Nicopolis in 1396, while clearly in favor of the expedition as such, elaborates at great length on the reprehensibility of chivalric actions motivated by anger, pride, and vainglory.<sup>106</sup> When the immoderate expression of such passions leads to the brutal killing of Turkish prisoners (executions which are similar in scope to those performed by Richard to stage his cannibalistic feast), the author condemns the act as antithetical to the tenets of Christianity and decries the lamentable human costs involved:

Dies erat dominica ultima mensis septembris, cum rumor adventus hostium innotuit. Quo territi qui Nycopolim obsidebant, redierunt, soluta obsidione, subsannantibus civibus cum ignominiosis verbis. Unde nostri ad iracundiam provocati, ut fidelium relacione notum fuit, ex concepto dolore iniquitatem inauditam pepererunt, quam scribere siccis oculis non valemus. Tunc illis excidit fidelitatis tenor, hucusque eciam infidelibus inviolabiliter observatus; nam quotquot ex adversariis se fidelitati eorum submiserant, spretis condicionibus cum juramento firmatis, o Deus ulcionum et humanorum actuum censor equisime, occidi crudeliter peceperunt.

[It was the last Sunday of the month of September that it became known that the Turks were approaching. Our soldiers, frightened, lifted the siege on Nicopolis and broke camp amidst the taunts of the citizens. According to trustworthy reports, our men were so roused by anger that they committed an act of unthinkable cruelty which I cannot tell of without shedding tears. Forgetting

<sup>105</sup> Housley, *Documents on the Later Crusades*, 13; for sources testifying to various forms and degrees of critique, disillusion, and skepticism in relation to the crusades in late medieval society, see especially documents 12, 17, 30, 35, 36, 47, 48, 51, and 56. See also, notably, Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, 2, 3, lines 2485–94; and his *Miroir de l'Omme*, in *The Complete Works of John Gower*, ed. G. C. Macaulay, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1899), 1, lines 23893–3988; "The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards," ed. H. S. Cronin, *English Historical Review* 22 (1907): 302; John Wycliff, *Select English Works*, ed. Thomas Arnold, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1871), 3, 139; and, on the inefficiency of violence in "dealing" with Islam, Juan de Segovia y el problema islámico, ed. D. Cabanelas Rodriguez (Madrid: Universidad de Madrid, 1952), 303–7. See also Lewis, "History, Mission, and Crusade," 353–82; and Guard, *Chivalry, Kingship and Crusade*, 177–81. For a recent reassessment of the scope of Christian reservations toward the crusades in earlier centuries, see Aurell, *Des chrétiens contre les croisades*, and, in particular, his last chapter for a discussion of some post-1291 sources.

<sup>106</sup> *Chronique du religieux de Saint-Denys*, 487–496 and 508–511.

the responsibilities of their faith, which had until then been scrupulously observed when dealing with the infidels, and disregarding the agreements they had made—Oh God, fair judge of the vengeance and actions of men!—they cruelly executed all of the prisoners that had surrendered to them.]<sup>107</sup>

Again, this infringement on the bounds of acceptable violence is denounced by juxtaposing the unwarranted anger of the perpetrators with the reaction of distress and sorrow that such acts of cruelty necessarily induce. The later additions to *RCL* fit well within this context of concern with, and questioning of, the boundaries of chivalric violence and, more generally, of proper and improper knightly conduct; they interrogate the validity of Richard's violent behavior by bringing the reader/auditor to reflect upon the manner in which it is framed, its reception within the romance, and prejudicial implications. Emotions, due to their evaluative character, serve a fundamental role in this process.

*St Catharine's College, Cambridge*

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 500; the English translation is mine.