



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Kilpatrick, Hannah Elizabeth

Title:

Writing with Feeling: Practising Angers in Late-Medieval English Chronicles

Date:

2019

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/235596>

Terms and Conditions:

Terms and Conditions: Copyright in works deposited in Minerva Access is retained by the copyright owner. The work may not be altered without permission from the copyright owner. Readers may only download, print and save electronic copies of whole works for their own personal non-commercial use. Any use that exceeds these limits requires permission from the copyright owner. Attribution is essential when quoting or paraphrasing from these works.

Writing with Feeling: Practising Angers in Late-Medieval English Chronicles

Hannah Elizabeth Kilpatrick

Student number: 319627

ORCID: 0000-0003-1520-8501

Submitted in fulfilment of 101AA Ph.D. – Arts

October 2019

Faculty of Arts: School of Culture and Communication

Principal supervisor: Professor Stephanie Trigg

Co-supervisor: Professor Stephen Knight

This dissertation explores depictions of anger in fourteenth-century English chronicles. I bring chronicles in Latin, French, and English into conversation with adjacent narrative genres to reveal the vocabulary of emotional behaviours in these texts. This approach illuminates the tropes and conventions that chroniclers use to shape meaning, and reveals underlying anxieties about socially dysfunctional emotional styles. Treating chronicles both as witnesses to and participants in emotional practices, I consider the role of historical writing in recording, teaching, and altering emotional norms.

Declaration

I, Hannah Elizabeth Kilpatrick, declare that:

This thesis comprises only my own original work toward the degree Ph.D., Arts (101AA);

Due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used; and,

This thesis is fewer than the maximum word limit in length, exclusive of bibliographies and appendices.

This thesis was funded by the Commonwealth Government (Australian Postgraduate Award, 2013–16) and the ARC Centre of Excellence for the History of Emotions (RHD Studentship, 2013–16).

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	4
<i>Abbreviations</i>	5
<i>Preface</i>	6
 Introduction	 8
 Section A: Narrating angers	 30
Chapter 1: Finding angers	38
Chapter 2: Shamed anger	57
Chapter 3: Honour or sin?	77
 Section B: Feudal anger	 89
Chapter 4: The script of feudal anger	92
Chapter 5: Anger's opposite	104
Chapter 6: A proportionate response	112
Chapter 7: Uneasy angers	124
 Section C: Writing the feeling body	 135
Chapter 8: The act of feeling	140
Chapter 9: The complete body	152
Chapter 10: Angry dole	164
Chapter 11: Difference and deviation	174
 Coda	 186
 <i>Appendix</i>	 189
<i>Works cited</i>	245

Abstract

This dissertation explores depictions of anger in fourteenth-century English chronicles. In doing so, it asks questions about methodology in the history of emotions: how we interrogate our texts, and what we bring to our understanding of the emotionalities of a distant culture. Few chroniclers were immediate witnesses to the emotions of the people they depict, nor do many chronicles allow an unequivocal view into the chronicler's own emotional life. How, then, do we approach the relationship between literary representation and historical reality?

I study chronicles in three languages and a variety of styles, including the chronicles of Jean Froissart and Geoffrey le Baker, the *Vita Edwardi II*, the *Anonimale*, the *Annales Paulini*, *Les Voeux du Hérón*, and the Middle English prose *Brut*. I bring these into conversation with works in adjacent narrative genres such as *chanson de geste*, particularly the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, *Raoul de Cambrai*, and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Comparing the chronicle texts to their more overtly emotional cousins illuminates the patterns of emotional behaviours in medieval narrative culture. When we think in terms of emotion scripts—structured and repeated sequences of emotional behaviour—we begin to recognise vocabularies of reference and meaning across texts and genres. This is particularly appropriate for medieval texts, due to a cultural habit of thinking in terms of figures and *auctoritas*: recognising tropes and allusion is an essential part of accessing meaning in a text. This approach illuminates the traditions and conventions that chroniclers use to shape meaning, and reveals underlying anxieties about socially dysfunctional emotional styles.

Anger is not a single emotion but a complex cluster of feelings and practices. It intersects with many different social institutions, from religious ethics to the negotiation of personal honour and feudal relationships. In all its forms, however, it is associated with moments of social dysfunction, where pressure is put on existing relationships and emotional norms. Studying angers can therefore elucidate the ways in which normative medieval emotionality is imagined and performed, but can also expose the “cracks” where dominant emotional styles are under pressure or in the process of renegotiation.

I employ a form of practice theory that centres on narrative culture: examining the emotional norms and styles of texts as if the chronicles were themselves emotional actors in history, as well as witnesses to emotional acts. Expression categorises emotions, but it also shapes them. I find that *expression* includes not only words and emotional behaviours but scripts and stories: semi-predictable series of actions with an accumulated weight of cultural meaning, performed (or narrated) over a period of time. With that in mind, I suggest that we should reconsider the role of narrative (and especially genres with authoritative cultural cache such as historiography) in recording, sorting, teaching, shaping, regulating, and ultimately changing emotional norms.

Abbreviations

AND: Anglo-Norman Dictionary

AP: Annales Paulini

DMF: Dictionnaire du Moyen Français

EETS: Early English Text Society

EMC: Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle

GB: Chronicle of Geoffrey le Baker

GCF: Grandes Chroniques de France interpolations into the SHF edition of Froissart's
Chroniques

MED: Middle English Dictionary

SGGK: Sir Gawain and the Green Knight

SHF: Froissart's Chroniques, collated according to the chapters of the Société de l'Histoire de
France edition (see Appendix)

VEII: Vita Edwardi II

Preface

Some years ago, I was struck by the similarity between two scenes in apparently very different texts: Edward III's famous confrontation with the burghers of Calais in Book I of Jean Froissart's *Chroniques*, and Arthur's response to the Roman emissaries at the beginning of the alliterative *Morte Arthure*.¹ Each scene follows the same pattern: the speechlessness in those first few moments of fury; those flashing eyes, communicating royal wrath; the terror they strike into their targets, who prostrate themselves and plead for mercy; the united emotional response of the king's followers, to pity in one case and shared anger in the other; an appeal to the king that invokes his nobility and courtesy/*gentillesse*; and finally, once the performance of anger has had its effect, the acts of counsel that temper it into a more considered response. Both expressions of anger are truly performances, and are felt as such: displays of glory and triumph before a full court, and on the stage (in a slightly broader sense) of war and international power. But are they *performances* of emotion in another sense—conventional rather than sincere, rehearsed rather than spontaneous? And what are we to make of the fact that one is fiction in all senses, while the other is, at least ostensibly, history?

Froissart² recounts in detail the speeches and actions of people who were still living at the time of writing, and his *Chroniques* became increasingly popular in English and French society over the last few decades of the fourteenth century. They were circulated to an audience that included eye witnesses to the events in question, and which would have been familiar with the alliterative *Morte* or similar texts written in the cultural climate of Edward III's new Camelot.

But this scene is not restricted to these two texts: displays of royal anger following the same pattern appear in fictional and historical literature in England over the previous two centuries. Would Froissart have used that trope to display Edward III's anger in the flattering pattern of powerful, positive monarchs of literature, no matter what he said or did at Calais?

¹ SHF 1–312; *Morte Arthure* 116–38. For notes on editions and translations of my most commonly used primary texts, see the entry for that text in question in the appendix, which contains the original and a translation of several anger events from each text. In the body of the thesis, an underlined citation denotes that the passage in question is among those included in Appendix B.

² For these early years of his *Chroniques* Froissart is copying and editing the writings of Jean le Bel. I will discuss the little differences of wording he makes to le Bel's version in more detail in Section B, but for now, I am speaking of Froissart's text as we have it today, and in the context of its popularity in the English and French courts through the later fourteenth century.

Or did Edward III make that connection himself, deliberately acting out a familiar scene of royal anger precisely because it carried all that inherited power of meaning-making? Does art imitate life, or life art? Or is there a more subtle interplay of cause and effect at work? In other words, what role does historical writing (or writing history) have on the cultural memory of emotion and on how it is learned?

These questions provided the seeds for this dissertation, and they multiplied as it grew. Medieval historical writing has received relatively little attention so far in the field of emotions history, and it presents its own unique challenges. How can we study emotion in historiographical texts, where the relationship between experience and representation is so deliberately entwined, and where meaning is often embedded within stories by conventions and references that are not necessarily obvious to the foreign (modern) eye? We rarely have direct access to the emotion of the subjects of the stories, but nor can we divorce a chronicle entirely from the events it narrates to study it entirely as creative fiction. Whose feelings, then, do we ask it to witness: Edward III's or Froissart's? or those of an entire emotional community?

Historiography has one particularly enticing trait: it is a deliberate and conscious attempt to impose order on a chaotic world, to string events into a known and comprehensible shape. In short, historiography tries to make meaning out of human experience by means of story. The impulse is fundamentally human, very innate, but the process is highly acculturated; and *that* is a paradox with which the history of emotions is very familiar. Storytelling is shared across all human cultures, as a means of shaping and sorting experiences, and of transmitting and recording them. The models and shapes that it uses, however, are learned: learned from very early in life, and steeped in cultural and individual experience. The relationship between medieval chronicles and the emotions they represent is almost always opaque, but the techniques by which chroniclers shape their narratives can be traced; and these can teach us a great deal about how they share, explore, and participate in the emotional norms of the world around them.

Introduction

Defining anger

Are emotions primarily biological or cultural phenomena? The “nature vs nurture” question has been central to the field of the history of emotions,³ not least because the push-pull between them is necessary for the process of *historicising* in the first place. If a thing is either absolutely biological (and therefore transhistorical) or absolutely culturally determined (ahistorical), how can it be truly said to have a history? For any conversation to be meaningful we must position ourselves somewhere between extremes: between the inherent and the acquired, between anthropology and literature, between the general and the exceptional. In doing so, we are not declaring a final answer, only choosing the best position from which to hold that particular conversation—and, more importantly, acknowledging that a choice has been made.

In any study of a single emotion, one of the first of these choices is about definition and scope. What do I mean, for example, by the word *anger*? Where do we start when it comes to studying an emotion across such a cultural gap? Consider, firstly, the word itself. The noun *anger* entered the English language from Old Norse, but the earliest attested uses in the *Middle English Dictionary* are from the 1320s—well after the composition of many of the texts that I am using. Even once the word was established it was not the most commonly used word in medieval England for what we now mean by the same word. *Wratthe* (from Old English) is more common; and then Middle English shares some words with either or both Latin and French, such *rage* and *ire/ira*.⁴ There are plenty of other common words in all three languages: Latin *furor* and *iracundia* and the verb *commovere*; Middle English *tene*, *furour*, *greme*, *indignacioun* and *greven*, *grouchen*; French *ferté*, *irur*, and *ennoier*, *corucer*.

Usage and connotations are perpetually shifting in conversation with other linguistic and cultural currents, across and between all three languages. For example, the *Middle English Dictionary* lists “distress, suffering, anguish, agony” as the primary meaning of *anger*: its

³ For the fullest treatment to date of the two sides of this debate, see Chapters 2 and 3 of Jan Plamper’s *History of Emotions*.

⁴ Spellings used here are the headword forms given in the *Middle English Dictionary* and *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* as of June 2019. I keep to this practice throughout except when referencing a specific text that uses variant spelling. Where appropriate I follow the *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français* instead of using the Anglo-Norman form. Latin is standardised except in direct quotations.

associations with wrath, hostility, rage—in short, our “anger”—come second. In contrast, Latin *commovere* almost always means “to become angry”, though semantically it could just as well mean “to be moved” by any other powerful emotion. Latin and English *dol/dolor* usually refer only to physical pain or sorrow, while the French equivalent (*duel*) is much closer to the English *grief*—a surge of passionate hurt (and usually anger) in response to a physical or emotional “wound”.⁵ Some (but not all) words carry the same range of connotations as their cognates in the other two languages; some exist as nouns, adjectives, and verbs, while others are rare or non-existent in certain parts of speech: *angren*, for example, was more common than *anger*, and begins to appear in Middle English texts a little earlier.⁶ Stephen White half acknowledges this flexibility when he says that, despite the number of anger-related words in French and Latin “these different terms do not necessarily mark more than one clearly identifiable form of anger” (“Politics of Anger” 134–35). While I find that there are, in fact, several clearly differentiated types of anger in these texts—of which more later—none of them has a stable relationship with any one of these words. Nor is there any single contemporary term that could stand in as a blanket term to cover the concept of anger as a “basic emotion”. *Wratthe* and *ira* come the closest, perhaps; but their associations with the deadly sin are too powerful to let them stand in as neutral terms in their cultural context.

Instead I use *anger* in its modern sense: a relatively neutral “meta-concept” within which “I will not shy away from the necessary labours of historicization”—as Jan Plamper says when he privileges the word *emotion* over *affect*, *passion*, or *feeling* (*History of Emotions* 12). *Anger* is rare enough in the writing of medieval England to be relatively unencumbered with cultural baggage, and is on the other hand common enough in modern English to be all-encompassing. Beneath this broad umbrella of a word, I can hunt out the finer nuances of meaning, genre, language, style, and context in the lexicon appropriate to the period, letting the word choices in individual texts come into conversation (or argument) with each other.

The complexity of the lexical field is mirrored in the cultural discourses around the various types of angers and the other ideas that they intersect. From the iconography of vices and virtues to Edward III’s Arthurian rage, different angers do different kinds of work in

⁵ *Duel* and *gref* are discussed in Chapter 10.

⁶ 1300, rather than 1325—although there is one isolated example from the last quarter of the twelfth century. Unlike the modern English verb “to anger”, *angren* is usually intransitive: reflexive in sense, and sometimes in syntax (that is, it means “to become angry”, not “to provoke anger in”; and appears in the construction “I anger [myself] [at her]”, with the reflexive pronoun and indirect object being optional). This is characteristic of many Middle English emotion words: an active verb is used more often than a passive or adjectival construction.

different contexts: theological, political, interpersonal, cultural, literary, or historical. Where do we begin, when comparing any two instances of anger? Do they interact conceptually at all? If late-medieval concepts of anger were not neatly ordered along different lexical lines (*wratthe* always meaning one kind of anger, *gref* and *rage* two more), how then were they structured, and how do we access those conceptual patterns?

One way would be to use contemporary tools: that is, to build a working definition or theory of various types of anger from medieval theoretical apparatus (such as Thomas Aquinas' discussions of anger in the *Summa Theologiae*, schematic representations in visual culture, or the "flow-chart" analyses of sin in confessional manuals), then use that theory to analyse one's chosen texts. Curiously enough, however, I have found medieval theories of emotion, sin, and the body, have little relevance to the kinds of anger conceptualised in these texts. So, for example, confessional manuals like Lorens d'Orleans' highly popular *Somme le Roi* (and its fourteenth-century translation into *The Book of Vices and Virtues*) anatomise anger, almost literally, with detailed reference to everyday behaviour and actions, simplifying and making practical a good deal of more complex and abstract canon theory. We might expect such manuals to have some influence on how people feel about their feelings—and in other situations they almost certainly did⁷—but their model of private self-analysis constructs a very different emotional self to that found in any of my texts, and I found that *The Book of Vices and Virtues* rarely provided me with any meaningful comparison.

Galenic humoral theory is another medieval theoretical tool that one might expect to find useful here, but the only traces of it are an association of anger with heat and the colour red. There is in this context no mention of choler, no suggestion of anger being located in any particular organ or section of the body, nor any idea of it affecting the body in any way consistent with medical (or astrological) theory. Nor do most chroniclers explicitly respond to or engage with ongoing scholastic debates about the status and permissibility of anger under certain circumstances or when expressed in certain ways. I have found these types of medieval theoretical apparatus almost entirely irrelevant when it comes to classifying and interpreting the angers of these texts. No particular branch of medieval theory seems to touch the way people tell stories about anger: the kinds of anger conceptualised, the mechanisms by which they are produced in the body, the words and behaviours used to describe them, their effects on the narrative or on how chroniclers interpret historical events. Consequently, I have

⁷ For example, Jennifer Bryan emphasises the popularity of these confessional manuals and their role in constructing an idea of the heart as a site of silent meditation (*Looking Inward* 121 and elsewhere).

used medieval theory very sparingly. It must be acknowledged here, but it would have been a weak analytical tool for most of my texts.

What of modern approaches to medieval anger? Rob Boddice, in his 2018 summary of the field, has a footnote that begins, “Anger has produced a disproportionate number of works” (65 n. 17). He may be right, objectively, but I find that we have not yet really come to terms with how to approach anger as a subject of a historical study. Those works that consider a period after the Middle Ages—most notably the Stearns’ book on anger in twentieth-century America—foreground control and restraint. This idea of anger as an explosive, destructive social force is present (though not so ubiquitous) in a good deal of work on medieval anger as well. I will consider the existing literature on medieval anger in more depth in Chapter 1; but, broadly speaking, most critics either study anger as sin, or royal anger.⁸ Less common, but still prominent, are studies of anger in other groups of people,⁹ or studies focussed on one particular author or text.¹⁰ The subtitle of Silvana Vecchio’s article may be taken as a summary of the whole: “Storia di un vizio che qualche volta è una virtù” (“History of a vice which is sometimes a virtue”). In other words, critical focus has usually been on asking whether and when anger is to be permitted: under what circumstances, in which persons, to what extent. This narrowness of focus limits the kinds of questions we can ask. True, it is impossible to disentangle medieval anger entirely from its status as one of the principal vices; and true, it has the potential to be a very destructive social force; but we can ask a good deal more about emotional production and practices if our questions are not filtered through considerations of whether anger is positively or negatively coded in any given instance.

⁸ For the first approach, apart from studies already mentioned, see works such as Paul Megna on “Righteous Anger Management”; Maureen Flynn, “Taming Anger’s Daughters”; Michael Rota, “The Moral Status of Anger”; Liliana Sikorska, “Dealing with Anger”; Silvana Vecchio, “Ira mala / ira bona: Storia di un vizio che qualche volta è una virtù”; Marc B. Cels, “God’s Wrath Against the Wrathful”; and Albrecht Classen, “Anger and Anger Management in the Middle Ages”. Works on royal anger include Chris Given-Wilson on “The Earl of Arundel, the War with France, and the Anger of King Richard II”, and Hans Jacob Orning on “Royal Anger between Christian Doctrine and Practical Exigencies”. Even here, however—as the second title implies—questions of sin and vice are usually in play, as royal anger is usually discussed with reference to its acceptable limits and applications.

⁹ As, for example, three papers in *Anger’s Past*: Lester Little on monastic anger, Wendy Davies on anger in tales of Celtic saints, and Paul Freedman on depictions of peasant anger.

¹⁰ Such as Ron Newbold, “The Nature of Anger in Gregory of Tours’ *Libri Historiarum*”.

The predominance of this somewhat limited approach is the more remarkable because *Anger's Past*, edited by Barbara Rosenwein in 1998, put us in a very good position to begin the work of looking beyond that. For example, as we see in Stephen White and Gerd Althoff's papers in that volume, "royal anger" is not exclusive to kings. The same semi-ritualised behaviours appear in other men in positions of feudal power. *Ira regis* is a medieval term, and anger in kings specifically is an important subject of medieval rhetorical discourse, but that is clearly not the whole story when it comes to these behaviours as emotional practice. Moreover, both White and Althoff acknowledge a place for "royal" anger as a productive social tool.

Since the publication of *Anger's Past* the field of emotions histories has blossomed, and we have developed many more nuanced ways of thinking about emotion than were available up to 1998. Medieval love, for example, has been the subject of many subtle and interesting studies on questions of social function, expression, embodiment, acculturation, sincerity, and learning. Beyond studies of single emotions we have similar questions being asked of, for example, affective piety; of emotions in general as they engage with objects, with spaces, with the environment, and so forth; emotions as they are felt and expressed and spoken of in relation to the physical body; and the kinds of emotional engagement that texts can require of their readers. "Anger" as a subject seems to have vanished in the last few years, subsumed perhaps by "violence", "conflict", "pain"—arguably more nuanced key words which have the potential to bring the same promising inquiries to specific instances of medieval anger—and yet, I do not think we have ever quite come to terms with anger in its own right. Nor, perhaps, have we quite moved away from the assumption that it is such a fundamental (primitive?) emotion that its destructive power is transhistorical, and it is only the expression (or suppression) of it that changes.

As we will see, taking medieval anger on its own terms leads to unexpected revelations—I was quite unprepared, for example, by what anger taught me about love in a feudal context (see Chapter 5). Meaning is always negotiated by reference and comparison. This is no less true of emotion: none of these concepts of anger exists in isolation (*only* of kings, *only* a sin or not a sin, the *only* way to behave while angry). A project of this scope lets me bring different types of anger and different narrative styles into conversation with each other, to study the relationships between them as well as the angers themselves. As I explain in my first chapter, I identify five types of anger in these texts, of which two—feudal anger and shamed anger—account for the vast majority of anger events in medieval historiography. Each seems to be considered as a distinct emotion: they have different patterns of language

and narrative structure, they arise from distinct causes, they are contrasted to a different opposing concept (from love to cowardice), they have different scripts of emotional behaviour. Like C. Stephen Jaeger and Ute Frevert's "lost emotions"—ennobling love in Jaeger's case, honour in Frevert's—these angers are "bound up intimately and intrinsically with dynamics of power and social practice" (Boddice 90).¹¹ They are deeply embedded in social roles and the negotiations of an acculturated emotional self, and so they too are to a certain extent "lost": they must be reconstructed before they can be understood.

What does late-medieval anger look like? It includes Ira battling against Patientia in the popular iconography of vices and virtues, as well as the just (but vengeful) wrath of God. It includes formal displays of the disfavour of princes, and statements of war. These may all be played out in highly personal terms in the court and on the battlefield. It includes impulses, sensations, behaviours, and continuous states, as well as various cultural, religious, legal, and interpersonal meanings. Anger can be a vice or a weakness, or evidence of virtue and strength. It may unite a community, or disrupt it. It can be discussed in terms of many different social codes: religious ethics (e.g., as a spiritual vice, or the vengeance of a righteous God/monarch), the honour code (as a response to shame or a means of disproving affront), feudal and political interactions (signal and tool of conflict and its resolution), and so forth. It may be portrayed positively or negatively—it is rarely neutral. Finally, it intersects with many different kinds of stories and social institutions. Anger is not one single emotion but a complex cluster of feelings and practices. All are, however, associated with moments and times of social dysfunction, where pressure is put on existing social institutions and emotional norms, exposing the cracks already there. Anger, therefore, does not only teach us about anger: it teaches it about feelings and dominant emotional styles, and it draws attention to their failures.

Defining chronicles

It is over twenty years now since Gabrielle Spiegel called for the vernacular historiography of thirteenth-century France to be read "within the context of Old French literature and not solely—as has been customary—in relation to the Latin sources that served as the bases of

¹¹ Jaeger, *Ennobling Love: In Search of a Lost Sensibility*; Frevert, *Emotions in History: Lost and Found*. For a comparative discussion of these and other works on lost emotions see Boddice 88–92.

the first works" (*Romancing the Past* 7); but it is still relatively rare for medieval chronicles to be considered in the context of a broader literary canon, or indeed in comparison to any texts but each other. This distinction is anachronistic and unhelpful: it results from our modern disciplinary divisions, not from anything intrinsic to the texts. Historiography did not belong to a separate category in the Middle Ages. This situation is changing, but there is still a good deal of catch-up work to be done to bring chronicles properly into conversation with other contemporary narrative texts. If anything, Latin chronicles are now more isolated than the vernacular texts, due to the recent interest in French and English chronicles of the Brut tradition. Some of this work has begun to consider chronicles in literary terms—that is, as being capable of creativity and imagination, rather than (crudely speaking) as sources for diplomatic or cultural history—but only a few scholars study them in relation to other popular narrative genres like romance and *chanson de geste*. This is rather odd, since chronicles themselves are remarkably diverse in form and style. The longer the chronicle, after all, the more "stories" it contains, often from many different time periods and places; and often, too, drawing on the storytelling techniques of many different genres. This does leave us with a problem of definition—what counts as a "chronicle" (and, by implication, what a chronicle is for)—as well as of interpretation.

Most scholarly definitions of "chronicle" focus on the distinctions between *chronicle* and *historia* or *Annales*. *Chronicle* is most often used to refer to medieval historiographical works in general, but if a distinction is made then *annals* typically means a work with short point-form entries organised by year, with little discussion or paratactic connection; *histories* are fully realised discursive, analytical prose with a reasonably high degree of literary decision and organisation; and *chronicles* lie somewhere in between, with the exact boundaries varying. David Dumville initiated an ongoing debate in the Medieval Chronicle Society when, at their second conference in 1999, he delivered a keynote responding directly to trends he had observed at the inaugural conference three years earlier. He decried the "looseness... which allows almost any narrative text dealing with supposedly historical persons and events to be called a chronicle", and called for a very clear and narrow definition ("What is a chronicle?" 1). Dumville builds up his definitions of *chronicle* and *annal* from the classical terms, refuting Bernard Guenée, whose definition is grounded in medieval usage and is

deliberately vague. Guenée admits that, in practice, there is much sliding between the forms.¹² Dumville is not satisfied with this. To summarise: Dumville argues that *chronicle*, from *chronos*, is conceptually a cognate with Latin's *annales libri*, so they ought to be treated as essentially synonymous (1–4). If there is a distinction it is that an *annal* is a single entry based on a year, whereas the *chronicle* is a collection of those annals (6). By implication, a *history* is anything with more narrative structure and content. The problem with this is that he insists on this very narrow usage despite the fact that it is grounded in classical inheritance, rather than medieval usage, and the tools he uses to build the definition would not have been available to writers in the ninth to thirteenth centuries, of which he mainly speaks. It also deliberately excludes a good deal of medieval historical writing that complicates this narrow definition, and thereby creates an artificial distinction and avoids the conversations that chronicles, by his definition, were having with every other form of historiography at the time.

Burgess and Kulikowski take a different angle: they attempt to break down “the fundamental dichotomy between annals and chronicles that is observed by modern medievalists” (165). Like Dumville, they dedicate their first several pages to antecedents in classical antiquity, including (in this case) Mesopotamia and Ancient Greece. “Antecedents” in this case are both stylistic and etymological: that is, Burgess and Kulikowski are interested in both the history of the word *chronicle* and the sort of text that it describes. They seek a cross-cultural definition for a period spanning more than a millennium, and argue that no real consistent distinction held true across that time between the brief year-entries that we have come to call annals and full-scale analytic narratives. Their conclusion is that the word *annals* should be dropped completely—“its baggage is simply too heavy for it to bear”—that *chronicle* should be used in such a way as to match its use in classical studies (prose works, but short and paratactic); and that *historia* should be used to include any long, narrative work such as those of Froissart (181–82). They also suggest several other less common terms like *chronograph* to cover various “sub-genres” (182), but the details are not important here: the key point is that their definitions, like those of Dumville and Guenée, centre on the difference between terse year-entry tables and narrative prose. Other criteria such as, for example, content selection, language, narrative style and structure, length, temporal distance from narrated events, or institutional affiliation, are rarely discussed in much detail.

¹² Guenée also summarises this debate of terminology as it proceeded over the twentieth century to date. His work was instrumental in embedding these three terms and their approximate meaning in academic usage—as well as the idea that this particular aspect of form and structure was the one by which medieval historical writing should be classified (997–1016).

Nevertheless, these and similar works do contain a pervasive assumption about what the contents of a “true” chronicle will look like, twinned with an implicit value judgement on what a work of history ought to do. In her foundational overview of medieval English historical writing, Antonia Gransden noted the ambiguity around the word *chronicle* and sidestepped it, declining to enter the debate but restricting her own study to “general, *serious* historical writings” (*Historical Writing* 129, emphasis mine). Dumville does not specify his criteria for content even so much as that: he simply decries the “loose... attitude” that, for example, allows Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae* to be called a chronicle (1). In his closing remarks, too, he jokingly promises fellow presenters at the conference that he will not send around the “chronicle-police” to each session—“except perhaps that on Geoffrey of Monmouth!” (24).

Dumville is hardly alone in nominating this one particular figure to represent all stylistic interlopers. Geoffrey’s incorporation of Arthuriana and a Trojan origin myth into his version of British history—and his popularity—have made him a favourite target of those who feel that words like *chronicle* and *historia* are applied too generously. His entry in the *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* undercuts him quite firmly—“Although Geoffrey claimed to be a historian, the *Historia* is not based upon fact”—and mentions Echard’s suggestion of “a new category [for him], *historia fantastica*”.¹³ More intriguingly, as an unexplained comment in introducing the text, Joanna Bellis remarks that the Trojan elements “conferred prestige and glory [but] strained at the limits of a credible historical genre” (“Mapping the national narrative” 321). The past tense implicitly positions Bellis’ criticism in the context of the *Historia*’s immediate contemporary reception—but it does so without specifying just what those limits may be, or how far that ideal of a “credible historical genre” may transcend century and culture.¹⁴

¹³ Beal and Kennedy, “Geoffrey of Monmouth”. The internal reference is to Siân Echard, *Arthurian Narrative in the Latin Tradition*.

¹⁴ Criticism of the *Historia* and questioning of its status as a work of history are not limited to the present day—its Arthurian elements, in particular, were targeted within a few decades of its composition—but these criticisms should surely be taken in the context of the cultural and literary changes taking place in England at the time, not least with regard to this question of what “history” should be. My point here is not that the status of the *Historia* was unproblematic in its own time but that we do not always stop to examine exactly what made it so. It would be a worthwhile and curious project to compare the terms of those criticisms with those levelled at Geoffrey in this past century, to ask exactly what views they imply: of historical writing, of fact and storytelling, and of the historian’s responsibility to the past and future.

This impulse to separate fact from fantasy, or the serious from the sensational, is even more evident when we consider modern reception of the various Brut chronicles, which rework Geoffrey's version of the history of Britain into vernacular verse and prose (and eventually Latin again). These form a strong majority of surviving historiography in England from the mid-thirteenth century to the rise of the printing press—indeed, one Middle English prose version was among the first books that William Caxton chose to print—and their exclusion would seriously misrepresent the kinds of stories that fourteenth-century England wanted to hear and tell about her past.¹⁵ As I mentioned earlier, these texts are receiving increased attention lately, and rather different treatment in academic circles than other chronicles. So, for example, Brut chronicles are more likely to be allowed as vernacular literature, and therefore to be drawn into cultural and linguistic studies.¹⁶ This change in focus depends on protesting that the Bruts are exceptional, for better or for worse—that they are either more interesting (or better written, or more culturally relevant) than mere chronicles, or that they hardly count as true chronicles at all.

The Brut tradition, in fact, provides an example of many of the issues with definition and genre, and our academic desire for clear definitions. Its status is complicated by the question of what it actually is: whether a single text with variations (translations, additions, errors, emendations) for which an Ur-text might reasonably be sought, or a “tradition” comprising several main translations/adaptations and variants on those. However, the same change in focus is perhaps leading to an exaggerated perception of the actual differences

¹⁵ Prominent among the Bruts are Wace (French, rhyming couplets, 12C); Laȝamon (English, alliterative verse, late 12C or early 13C); Pierre de Langtoft (French, verse, early 14C); Robert Mannyng of Brunne (English, rhyming couplets, completed 1338); “the” French prose Brut and its Middle English translation and continuations (diverging primarily after 1333, but also including the *Anonimalle* which diverges from 1307). There is also a Latin Brut tradition. In general, I refer to most Brut chronicles by individual names (Mannyng, *Anonimalle*, etc) and use the word Brut (unitalicised) to refer to them collectively. Italicised, I use the *Brut* to refer specifically to Brie's edition of the Middle English version. For convenience, I usually cite the Middle English prose version as witness to the whole tradition, the *Anonimalle* as an independent chronicle for the years 1307–34, and Mannyng for linguistic comparison.

¹⁶ See, for example, *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain*, edited by Wogan-Browne et al., in which Brut chronicles have a strong presence; *Reading Laȝamon's Brut*, edited by Allen et al.; and Julia Marvin's work on the Brut tradition over the past decade. A more common approach to bringing chronicles and literary texts into conversation with each other is to use chronicles to contextualise literature; so, for example, Gerald Morgan's edited volume *Chaucer in Context* includes one paper considering the power politics in the Middle English *Brut* and the court culture in which Chaucer was writing (William Marx).

between Brut chronicles and others. One could assemble a similar cluster of texts based on descent from Bede, or from Henry of Huntingdon. Alternatively, rather than foregrounding textual “ancestry”, one could group together those monastic works born from a need to establish their own house’s legendary or hagiographical origins and establish rights to certain lands or traditions, in response to various royal land grabs from the eleventh century onward. Here, too, is mutual influence—in style, motivation, and content—including frequent copying. And what of the Latin cousins of the Brut, descended from grandfather Geoffrey but never turned into the vernacular?

Erik Kooper’s recent suggestion is an intriguing response to the situation: he calls for Brut chronicles to be considered as an entire genre of their own, classed as a group of distinct texts “whose ultimate textual basis should be, or can be traced to, the Oldest Version of the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut*” (93). This suggestion seems to combine the impulse to separate them from “true” chronicles with the desire to acknowledge their interest and importance by giving them another equal category of their own. Kooper’s argument incidentally reveals an underlying haziness of definition that has dogged this whole debate: not only of the word *history*, but of *genre*.

All this is not intended as a preamble to some new definition of either word. I use *chronicle* simply and inclusively as a shorthand for “medieval historical writing”. This is still the most common and casual usage—as, for example, in the name of the *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, and that of the Medieval Chronicle Society itself. *Annals* and *historia* I have demoted almost to the status of adjective, using them to characterise the ends of a spectrum between sparse year entries and fully developed literary narratives: I find that most chronicles fall somewhere along this spectrum rather than being entirely one or the other, and most move freely back and forth along it. I have dwelt on this question of definition to show up, firstly, some of the underlying assumptions in the way we approach medieval historical writing, and secondly, the pervasiveness of this urge to define and segregate. Chronicles vary wildly in almost every characteristic, and we want, naturally, to compare like with like. But this debate is in itself a symptom of the porosity of genre boundaries in the late Middle Ages, and of our reluctance to work across them.

The afterlife of the *Historia Regum Britanniae* is among the greatest examples of generic boundary-crossing in the later Middle Ages, with the stories of Arthur and Camelot branching out across romance, lay, fabliaux, and something that looks very like hagiography—even without considering all the various branches of the Brut chronicles themselves. Many of these non-chronicle texts employ a framing device wherein the authorial voice asserts the

interest and *auctoritas* of the tale by claiming to have found it in an old book of history—and this is all the more credible because chronicles will themselves frequently change register to tell one story or another as romance or hagiography. In most versions of the *Brut*, the story of King Leir and Cordelia is sandwiched between genealogical lists—or to put it another way, the series of almost literal “begat’s provide a structure and a unity to all the anecdotes that make up Geoffrey of Monmouth’s view of old Britain. Universal chronicles—that is, chronicles that tell (or purport to tell) the entire history of the world, from Creation onwards—were of necessity a miscellany of different stories arranged chronologically. Consequently, a single text might include episodes of hagiography (say, the reign of Edward the Confessor), chanson or romance (Arthuriana), collections of prophecy (Merlin) or sayings (Alfred), digressions on geography (descriptions of the lands and rivers of the British isles), cultural or anthropological anecdotes, stories from the Bible (particularly the Creation), Virgilian-style epic (Brutus), and moralising authorial commentary—besides charters, petitions, letters, and similar documents (sometimes forged), inserted to illustrate the stories told, or to verify the privileges and possessions of the religious house to whom the manuscript belonged.

It is now increasingly recognised—at least, when it comes to the study of medieval literature generally—that the concept of genres is fluid in the Middle Ages.¹⁷ This does not mean that the idea of genre is meaningless in studying medieval literature, or that medieval people themselves never thought in terms of genre divisions. Keith Busby lists many different medieval terms for different genres, and points out that their sheer number indicates “an awareness on the part of medieval authors and audiences of both the similarity and difference between types of narrative”, but finds that modern efforts to define genres “have obscured or even sacrificed the qualities of individual texts by attempting to impose conformity on a motley corpus” (139). Busby rejects attempts to define by a few influential prototypes, suggesting that, in a work such as Bérout’s *Tristan*, “[o]ne looks in vain for many of the qualities prized in a Chrétien romance (say, quest structure or psychological character development), and the text can remain a puzzle until it is seen as a confluence of many kinds of narratives: romance, epic, and fabliau foremost among them... the lexis of Bérout’s poem

¹⁷ Aside from Alfred Hiatt and Keith Busby, discussed below, others who have drawn on this sort of genre flexibility in their work include Emily Leverett (“An Affective Romance?”), Marianne J. Ailes (“The Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* as a chanson de geste”), and Robert Turcan and Yin Liu (“Middle English Romance as Prototype Genre”). In addition, Christine Elswiler’s study of the lexical fields of certain words in *Lazamon’s Brut* provides hard data on the comparative frequency of those words in the *Brut*, the Old English heroic tradition, and Middle English romance, with an emphasis on the generic ambivalence of the *Brut*.

shifts from the courtly to the popular in conformity with the various intertexts it evokes” (141). He concludes that “[t]he real lesson in the end is surely not to be obsessive about genre definitions, to admit their elasticity, and to appreciate the interplay between the many varieties of Old French narrative” (151).

Alfred Hiatt goes further, arguing that the lack of generic codification in Middle English literature “indicates neither an inability to think metacritically on the part of medieval authors and their publics, nor a state of ‘disintegration’, nor any kind of ‘immaturity’ of literary production, but rather an active resistance to classificatory schemas... [Authors] revelled in the flexibility, open-endedness, and vagueness of generic expectations” (279–80). In this context, medieval authors (and presumably audiences or readers) could be more flexible in shaping the meanings of a text, reaching for a wider range of contextual referents, moving in tone or style from *chanson de geste* to hagiography from one passage to the next, or glancing aside for just a moment to the fabliau in the midst of courtly romance. Strictly defined genre divisions must, under these circumstances, be rather limiting than helpful. Any medieval text exists in relation to shared cultural expectations formed by other texts that bear varying degrees of kinship with it.

However, this awareness has been slow to reach chronicle studies, not least because chronicles are generally considered to lie outside the fold of literature. Neither Busby nor Hiatt includes historiography in their otherwise excellent discussions of medieval French and English literature respectively. Busby considers the boundaries of several other genres—anthology manuscripts, saints’ lives, the Breton lay—but does not mention chronicles, implying by exclusion that they are not “literature” but something else, even though they overlap just as thoroughly with all these genres mentioned. Hiatt’s paper introduces part III of Paul Strohm’s edited volume *Middle English*, titled “Textual kinds and categories”: eight papers (not counting Hiatt’s) on various genres of Middle English literature. None of them is dedicated to historiography, although Matthew Giancarlo does discuss the fascination with family lineage that appears in both romance and chronicle (352–68). This is not a reflection of the relative popularity of chronicles compared to genres such as autobiography or vernacular theology—both of which *do* have a chapter to themselves in *Middle English*—but of our own priorities. Chronicles have traditionally belonged to history, not to literature: we have perpetuated an artificial division along our own disciplinary lines, between historical writing and other forms of contemporary narrative. There is still a tendency to read chronicles as the forerunners of modern historical writing, rather than as part of a larger network of medieval narrative writing. That is, they are still too often read to discover “facts” (about events, about

years, about the lives of major figures), evaluated for their accuracy according to post-Enlightenment tastes and standards that do not predate the nineteenth century, and found wanting. The distinction between historiographical writing and “literature”, in short, is irrelevant and unhelpful when it comes to medieval textuality.

With this in mind, it would be disingenuous to think that only chronicles can illuminate other chronicle texts: that chroniclers draw only on other chronicles and “serious” texts such as the Bible in shaping their narrative, or that other texts are never influenced by chronicles. Some scholars have begun to consider these intertextual links. Anne Baden-Daintree, for example, considers the imagery of violence in the alliterative *Morte Arthure* with comparative reference to Geoffrey of Monmouth and two vernacular Brut chronicles (Wace’s in French and Lazamon’s in English) (“Visualising war”). Joanna Bellis includes chronicles in her “literature” of the Hundred Years War, though she treats it separately to poetry (*Hundred Years War in Literature*). Giancarlo, as mentioned, compares the treatment of one theme (genealogy) across romance and chronicle, justifying that choice on the grounds that they are both “obsessively concerned with the stories of kings and knights, the rise and fall of reigns and rules, the ‘subjects of history’ ... the sheer improbability of events and the strange potentialities of temporal unfolding” (357—58). Engagingly, he turns that familial obsession back on the genres themselves, calling the two kinds of story “demonstrably close kin”: “like storied twins, ‘romance’ and ‘chronicle’ have the same point of birth and their wanderings intersect” (355). Chronicles are not isolated from other genres. They share narrative techniques, tropes, structures, allusions—and a similar repertoire of emotional styles. In fact, they are not a distinct genre at all: they are simply texts that purport to recount real events, with some intention of “writing history”.

Serious, factual, credible, “historical”: these terms are not in themselves transhistorical, nor is the assumption that they should characterise a work of “history” for it to deserve the name. One of the issues at stake here is the question of the purpose of historical writing. As Nancy Partner pointed out in 1977, histories were until approximately the late eighteenth century recently read for pleasure as much as for “solemn” education and reference—as witness the many surviving manuscripts of the Brut chronicles and continuations.¹⁸ Besides, as her title reminds us, entertainment and serious purpose are not sworn enemies; and a certain flexibility with narrative style and weight might serve both these ends. Narrating the

¹⁸ Julia Marvin’s entry in the EMC on the “Prose Brut, Anglo-Norman” begins: “In its different versions in Anglo-Norman, Latin, and English, the Prose *Brut* chronicle became the most popular secular, vernacular work of the late Middle Ages in England. Over fifty Anglo-Norman manuscripts survive”.

downfall of the Earl of Lancaster in a form deliberately reminiscent of a saint's martyrdom is very good storytelling, and very persuasive "education" (see Chapter 3 below). Having Edward III act out the same pattern of rage as King Arthur is deliciously dramatic even only on its own terms, but even more so when it resonates with every time one has read a similar tale before. There are other kinds of edification, too, that are served better by rhetoric and effective storytelling than by strict historical accuracy. Raluca Radulescu has argued, for example, that chronicles often functioned as mirrors for princes, "seeing history in terms of models of good and bad kings" and "creating coherence out of the chaos of earlier periods, including the recent past" (*Romance and its Contexts* 24).

This was my original reason for bringing my main chronicle texts into conversation with romances and *chansons de geste*. Medieval narrative texts make meaning in conversation with each other, but this intertextual meaning-making is difficult to access after so many years. Genre is not irrelevant to medieval narrative but it is flexible, to the point of being an authorial tool in its own right. The results have been illuminating. I am looking for emotion, and the fact that many chronicles are rather dry or distant makes many emotion events difficult to characterise without comparison to more emotionally descriptive texts.¹⁹

Perhaps it is for this reason that chronicles have been relatively neglected in the study of the history of emotions so far, just as they have in the study of medieval literature. Two chapters in *Emotions and War* consider medieval historiography—those by Lindsay Diggelmann and Andrew Lynch—and Joanna Bellis' studies of representations of the Hundred Years War in chronicles and other literature often foreground emotional responses (*Hundred Years War* and "Reader might lament"). Chronicles make some appearances, too, in the volume which she co-edited with Laura Slater (*Representing War and Violence*). Stephen Justice's volume on the fifteenth-century chronicler Adam Usk comes close: although he does not explicitly engage with emotions history, his sensitivity to the effect of Usk's emotions on history-making gives Justice's analysis richness and depth. Similarly, Barry Windeatt's paper on body language in Laȝamon's *Brut* covers ground which is familiar to the history of emotions, but without taking notice of much existing work in that area. One silence is particularly worth noting: Rob Boddice's 2018 survey of the field of emotions history. His chapter on "historians and emotions" (that is, the history of the history of emotions) goes straight from Thucydides to the nineteenth century (14). This implies that, despite the

¹⁹ Carolynne Larrington employs a similar technique in texts which are more directly related, comparing emotion scripts in Old Norse sagas to those in the texts that they translate, to explore the language of feeling in the emotionally reticent Norse texts.

number of medieval scholars working on emotions over the last two decades, medieval thoughts about emotions in a historical trajectory have barely been considered. And yet, chronicles have the potential to be very rewarding for emotions history: they sit at the intersection of many genres, and at the point where fact and interpretation of history meet. They represent in themselves that interplay between experience and expression that we see in emotions. They have the potential to reveal a good deal about how we (as humans, or as historians) interpret and shape stories, histories, and feeling. Why have they received so little attention?

One reason may, ironically, be the influence of Barbara Rosenwein. Having a fellow medievalist as such a pioneer of the field has given us a strong position from which to take an equal part in the ongoing conversation. But the power and popularity of the idea of “emotional communities” has, it seems to me, influenced the type of sources that we want to consider: more specifically, it has circumscribed the sort of emotional worlds that we want texts to be able to witness in order to be considered “emotional”. Rosenwein’s model is not essentially textual: the text is a window onto the object(s) of study, and the characteristics of the text, like distorted or coloured glass, may obscure that object as much as reveal it. Certainly, from a classically historical point of view, chronicles are not clear windows onto the emotional lives of the people in their pages. Even if we were to limit our study to single-author chronicles which tell of recent events we would still find difficulties in their relationship to historical fact. Most chroniclers are not immediate witnesses to the emotions of the people (the characters) they depict, nor do many allow an unequivocal view of the emotional world of the chronicler. How, then, do we approach the relationship between representation and fact?

Nor, on the other hand, can chronicles be treated entirely as fiction. When it comes to text-based emotions studies of the period, we have focussed in large part on religious communities and texts and on that sort of text which already belonged by tradition to “literary studies”. Burger and Crocker have noticed this problem too, suggesting recently that our focus on affective piety in scholarship on medieval emotions, “while understandable... and immensely productive... has tended to narrow what we expect the focus of medieval studies of affect and emotion to be. As a result, we have only begun to tap the rich offerings of medieval representations” (12). Few chronicles overtly participate in the construction of affective piety, or other types of emotionality that have received focussed critical attention. Moreover, their professed status as documenting real events means that they rarely invite the kinds of questions that historians of emotions would ask of *Troilus and Criseyde*, or *Le Roman*

de la Rose. Many have little overt artifice or authorial intervention, and organise their material hypotactically rather than causally, which limits their appeal as objects of study for their own sake. Too literary for some inquiries, not literary enough for others, too close to “reality” and too far from it, chronicles do not seem able to answer the kinds of question that we have been trying to pose.

Approaching the texts

If the questions we have been asking so far are not well suited to medieval historiography, what exactly am I asking of my texts? What ideas about emotion am I seeking in them, and how?

As I have already implied, I come to these texts initially from the perspective of a literary scholar. I do not ask, for example, Geoffrey le Baker to give me a “true” account of the feelings of Edward II on this or that specific occasion. I want the text to tell me about the emotional norms of the world in which it was written—not merely “England in the early fourteenth century”, but the world as refracted through individual and cultural imagination. In general terms, I am interested in the role of narrative and convention in shaping historical persons and events into something comprehensible and meaningful. More specifically, I regard the text both as witness to emotional practices, and as emotional practice in itself. That is, I see it as both revealing and participating in emotional norms.

The rapid expansion of the field of the history of emotions has given us a plethora of terms for studying how emotions work within a society: emotional norms, styles, scripts, communities, regimes, and so on. Many of these terms overlap, either in their initial definition or in how they have been adopted and adapted since. For example, William Reddy’s “emotional regimes” and Barbara Rosenwein’s “emotional communities” have enough similarities—and each, being a very flexible conceptual tool, has been used in a wide enough variety of ways—that comparing or contrasting them to each other is almost as popular a sport as applying them. Emphasising their differences usually leads to—or relies on—a narrowness of definition: the centrally enforced political structure of the modern nation state (“regimes”), against intimate de-centralised cross-sections of medieval daily life (“communities”). As both have acknowledged, however, the essential difference in the object of study is not so great: “anything that looks like an emotional community in Rosenwein’s

terms is probably also an emotional regime in Reddy's", as Boddice points out (80).²⁰ For my purposes, however, both terms are somewhat limited: they define the object—the social group—rather than opening up the emotions and emotional processes of the people within that group. My focus is reversed. If I have a "community", it is all those who participated in the transmission and creation of a certain kind of storytelling over several centuries—far too large and nebulous to use Rosenwein's methods in any meaningful way. Nor do I engage deeply with Reddy's approach: his "regime", however broadly defined, centres still on questions of enforcement and conformation, whether the means of enforcement be police officers or disapproving glances. I am interested not in how emotions are imposed but in how they are learned and developed and made to work; and, more fundamentally when it comes to method, I give the text itself a more central role as a medium of emotional experience and expression than does either Reddy or Rosenwein.

To this end, I employ a form of practice theory that centres on narrative culture: examining the emotional norms and style of texts (singly and collectively) as if the texts were themselves emotional actors in history, as well as witnesses to emotional acts. This reflects a growing tendency in the field of emotions history as a whole: the collapse of the distinction between emotional experience and expression, between the innate and the cultural. Monique Scheer's introduction of emotional practices into the field has been particularly influential in combating these dualisms, but she is not alone. Nor am I the first to apply similar ideas to textual culture: Nicky Hallett, for example, finds that the textuality of her nuns is itself instrumental in the dynamic construction of emotional norms. Scheer provides a "how" based on practice theory; Hallett applies the "how" to textual practices. Sarah McNamer goes further by explicitly discussing the medieval English text as a site for teaching and debating lived emotional practices ("Feeling" and *Affective Meditation*). I find that, unavoidably, all my texts participate in a similar conversation. Explicitly or implicitly, willingly or unwillingly, by expression of feeling they participate in developing the idea of what that feeling is, does, and means. "Expression", for these purposes, can include not only words and emotional behaviours but actions and stories, including those about the emotions of others. On a very fundamental level emotions *are* stories—or at least, we sort and file them as stories within our memories, and retrieve them in those terms. Expression, therefore, does more than categorise emotions: it shapes them.

²⁰ For Rosenwein's and Reddy's responses, see Rosenwein's review of *Navigation of Feeling* (2002), and the series of interviews conducted and edited by Jan Plamper in *History and Theory* (2010).

There is another cluster of semi-synonymous theoretical terms to disentangle here: “emotional norms”, “emotional styles”, “emotionology”, and, to a lesser extent, “emotion(al) scripts”. I will come back to the idea of scripts, but I must clarify a few points about my usage of the others. Peter and Carol Stearns initially used “emotional styles” as more or less synonymous with their “emotional norms” or “emotionology”. I use it less broadly, following Scheer: patterns of emotional behaviours and practices that are appropriate to given social contexts. A person would have many emotional styles in their repertoire and, more or less consciously, choose the appropriate one for a given context (Scheer 216–17, adapting Gammerl). That is, I take emotional norms to mean those which apply to society as a whole, and emotional styles to mean subsets within that—not different people but different behaviours by the same people in different situations.

However, I aim to treat my texts both as witnesses and as actors. Consequently, I apply “emotional norms” and “emotional styles” not only to the practices they witness, but to the world of written narrative in which they participate. “Emotional norms” in this sense would encompass the structures and expectations governing emotion in medieval narrative as a whole, while “styles” allows for variation such as one might see between different genres: different emotions prioritised, different emphases, different forms of description. For example, it remains consistent across late-medieval narrative in general that only those people most noble in birth and in soul can feel the most highly valorised emotions, but the ways in which emotions are portrayed and discussed and the kinds of emotions prioritised in the text will differ according to genre—according, that is, to the “emotional style” of the narrative.

“Emotional norms” and “emotional styles”, therefore, are conceptual tools that I take up and adapt slightly in order to demonstrate a certain continuity in the ways we can think about emotional practices between narrative and lived experience. My definition of “emotion(al) script”, however, has very little to do with its previous usage in the field. That term has so far been relatively undeveloped: a promising combination of words, but with little theoretical traction. Its usual meaning, so far as I have been able to trace, seems to be a subset of emotional norms or emotional regimes: essentially, *prescriptions*. McNamer defines “emotion scripts” using that very word: “the loosely affiliated cultural prescripts that aid in establishing and maintaining what cultural historians have termed ‘emotional regimes’ or ‘emotional communities’” (*Affective Meditation* 12): that is, a knowledge of the appropriate emotional behaviour in any given context, as governed or enforced by whatever broader social norms apply.

McNamer goes on to develop a more rigorous concept of “intimate scripts”, in which the text provides a set of instructions for the performance and production of feeling. I use the term “script” differently, to mean a repeated and recognisable sequence of emotion signs within a narrative: to express (or produce) a given emotion, a person does *this*, then *this*, then *this*. As I explain in more detail in my opening chapter, an “emotion event” is any moment in the text where emotion is in play; an “emotion sign” (within an emotion event) is the means by which the author depicts the character’s emotion; and an “emotion script” is any sequence of these signs that is repeated often enough, in different texts and contexts, to become recognisable and eventually take on a set of cultural meanings of its own. So, an emotion event might be an entire elaborate scene rich in description of emotional behaviours and internal sensations; or it may be a political action such as a declaration of war considered in terms of its effects on the relationships between the parties; or it may be a brief narratorial mention of somebody’s feelings; or it may be a remarkable *absence* of emotion where we might expect it. An “emotion sign” might be a character’s actions, gestures, and speech acts, a comment from the narrator, or juxtaposition with some symbolic representation of a particular emotional state. An emotion script is—for example—the sequence performed by Edward III and Arthur that I described at the beginning of this introduction, which is the script of feudal anger that I analyse in Section B.

I establish a list of common signs in Chapter 1, and even in such a relatively simple act of collation it is immediately clear that certain emotion signs tend to occur in specific sequences under similar circumstances: that is, one begins very quickly to see established emotion scripts. These then become objects of analysis themselves: we can think in terms of emotion scripts to recognise patterns of reference and meaning across texts and genres. From a methodological point of view this is particularly appropriate for medieval texts, due to a cultural habit of thinking in terms of patterns, figures, and *auctoritas*. We are accustomed already to reading referentially for certain aspects of medieval story-telling: recognising tropes and allusions is an essential part of accessing meaning in a text. The relationship of script and sign to “real” emotional norms is not something that can be absolutely determined; but whether it be descriptive, prescriptive, or discursive, it is a relationship—they do interact. Narrating emotions in terms of predictable, repetitive patterns of behaviour is in itself a powerful emotional practice.

In its simplest terms, this is a concordance technique: instead of matching words across and between texts, I am matching emotion scripts, and studying the structural patterns underlying when and how they are used. Why does Walter of Guisborough’s Edward I call his

heir “you low-born son of a whore”? Would Edward III, as imagined by Jean le Bel and Froissart, really have executed the burghers of Calais if Queen Philippa had not intervened? And why do these characters follow, point for point, exactly the same emotion scripts as certain characters in *Raoul de Cambrai*, *Les Voeux du Hérón*, and the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, even when the context and meaning of their behaviour seem to be entirely different? Emotion scripts, visible and colourful and memorable, are the building blocks of stories; but they are also a sort of infrastructure, a network between them. Foregrounding these narrative patterns suggested that there are several different “angers” imagined in these texts, each associated with distinct scripts and governed by different social relationships and situations. From here I began to decipher the relationships between them, and to discover unexpected insights into the cultural institutions with which they interact.

Throughout Section A (Chapters 1–3) I lay out the tools for this approach and begin to put it into practice. Chapter 2 examines one of the two most common types of anger to be found in these texts—shamed anger—with a particular emphasis on the role of provocative speech to stimulate shamed anger and provide an emotional (and narrative) drive toward the restoration of honour. Chapter 3 considers the relationship between genre and emotional style, comparing the image of the deadly sin *Ira* (and her adversary *Patientia*) to the idea of shamed anger already established, and studying how several chroniclers engage specific types of anger to effect genre shifts within their narrative.

Section B (Chapters 4–6) focusses in more depth on the single most common type of anger in late-medieval chronicles: feudal anger. After describing and analysing the typical script for a display of feudal anger (Chapter 4), I move on to consider its social implications, focussing particularly on the episode of the burghers of Calais in Jean le Bel and Jean Froissart’s chronicles. The fact that this kind of anger is conceived as the opposite of love (Chapter 5) and the dynamics of counsel and intercession in dramatising the choice of a proportionate response (Chapter 6) have far-reaching implications for our understanding of feudal relationships and the role of emotion in medieval society. However, the most recognisable and self-justifying script of feudal anger is only available to men in a position of social power, leaving chroniclers—and perhaps their subjects—without a positive model for anger in any other situation. In Chapter 7 I consider a few cases where writers seem to struggle with finding an appropriate script for their characters’ feelings or behaviour, and discuss what these absences might mean for lived and written emotional practice.

In Section C I take a step back from anger to consider it in a broader context. Emotion scripts and signs of anger are still foregrounded, but my focus in this section is on language

and perceptions of the body as it relates to emotion. I attempt to develop a model for the late-medieval feeling body and its relationship to the world around it, of the kind that McNamer called for in 2007 (“Feeling”). Section C considers how far we can reconstruct, not the precise relationship of script to experience, but of how it feels to feel that way: what sort of emotionology these texts presume more broadly, and how the individual body interacts with the social one. Chapter 8 returns to my lists of emotional signs in Chapter 1, to ask what we can understand from these descriptions of boiling blood, trembling hearts, heat and movement within the body. The language used of them is essentially unifying: all parts of the body seem to work together not only to reveal and experience emotion but to create it. This unity extends to the exterior of the body: to expression and to social behaviour (Chapter 9). Facial expressions are hardly ever used, and where they do they are almost universally negative, signalling an unnatural disjuncture between the personal and social. The cluster of words around “grief” and “dole” in all three key languages illustrates this fundamental merging of the physical body with a social or metaphysical one (Chapter 10). In this sense, the non-physical body can be one’s social reputation, a community as a whole, or an institution (such as a family or state) which a particular person represents. *Deuil/gref* is not sorrow: it is a fierce emotional and physical response to the wounding of the body, and remains the same no matter what kind of “body” is in question. Upon examination, cases which deviate from these emotional norms confirm these findings: criticism of historical events and characters, especially of princes, is often couched in terms of emotional practices that create some disconnect between the interior and exterior (Chapter 11).

Emotions are complex. They do not occur in a single, isolated moment in a single, isolated mind: they have a sequence and a narrative structure, and that narrative is shaped by the personal and social body, as well as by personal and social memory. Stories structure and record experience; and chronicles collect stories. Chronicles are popular literature in the later Middle Ages. They are also instructional literature, curating the past into exemplars and debating, implicitly or explicitly, their relationship with the present and future. They have therefore a potentially powerful role in shaping that memory, in shaping words and stories of emotion. Just how and to what degree they do that will, perhaps, never be entirely clear; but if we consider textuality as a form of emotional practice, the debate itself can be rich and productive. I have said already that emotional expression, which includes stories as well as words and actions, not only categorises emotions but shapes them. In the form of written narrative, this experience-expression gains the weight of precedent and authority, and a powerful foothold in cultural memory.

Section A. Narrating angers:

Identifying and characterising angers

Introduction

How do we recognise anger in a text? Do we rely on moments when the narrator or a character explicitly identifies an emotion as “anger” (or any one of a cluster of similar words)? Do we rely on our own understanding of anger and trust ourselves to recognise angry behaviour in medieval texts? Various scholars have used one or both of these approaches. There are obvious advantages and disadvantages to both, and to a certain extent they complement each other. Where no “anger” word is given, we might still recognise a raised voice and violent action as anger, especially if it comes in response to something that we recognise, in turn, as provocation. If no description of behaviour or physiological changes is given, or if it is ambiguous, a word like *indignatio*, *grucchande*, or *coroucée* may help us; and gradually our ability to recognise medieval anger will improve. But neither description nor labels are unambiguous, and there are times when neither is present. Instead, the reader is expected to be able to categorise and interpret the feelings in question by context, and by reference to a shared system of cultural references. This is not so mysterious as it sounds: we understand nowadays perfectly well what is meant by “their eyes met across a crowded room”—or the cinematic equivalent when the pace suddenly slows and the world seems to fall away as the camera cuts back and forth between the two faces—without any need of words like *love* and *romance*. To recognise these less explicit moments of emotion reliably, we must build a reference system to access the established narrative tropes that the authors employ.

Medieval culture has, moreover, a fondness for symbolism and conventional figuring that allows convention and deliberate allusion to play a far greater role in meaning-making. Ruth Morse opens her monograph on *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages* with this sentence: “When... John Capgrave wrote that the corpse of Henry I (who had died in 1135) stank horribly, he expected his readers to understand a moral criticism” (1). Morse argues that whether he “really” stank or not is irrelevant: this anecdote relies on the understanding common to reader and writer that sanctified corpses in story are beautifully preserved and often smell delightful, and that Henry I may therefore be understood to have lived a very different kind of life. Similarly, as we will see in Chapter 3, fourteenth-century chronicles often figure the people and events they narrate in the shape of established tropes: Edward II as a

pinning lover, or Thomas of Lancaster's capture as a repetition of the murder of Thomas Beckett and his execution as Christ's passion. What might we find if we looked for similar patterns in emotional styles and behaviours?

That is the work that this section tries to do: firstly, to establish a series of signs and scripts to identify instances of anger in medieval narrative and analyse them on their own terms rather than those of our preconceptions; and secondly, to explore how writers deliberately activate narrative tropes to evaluate historical events and figures, sometimes shifting the genre of their stories to provide subtler frames of reference. Before that, however, I must look in more detail at the work that other scholars have done on medieval anger in the past, and how their work has helped to shape my own.

Anger's Past, though now over twenty years old, is still the most relevant and thoughtful study of medieval anger(s). In her introduction, Barbara Rosenwein raises the question of identification and definition quite explicitly: "we don't know what anger is" (2). Within that volume, contributors vary as to where and how they locate past anger, to what extent they consider it "good" or "bad", and how far they feel that we today can relate to that past emotion on the grounds of common humanity. The most fundamental division between contributors was one which was already becoming a point of contention in the history of emotions as a field: whether to consider anger as a basic human passion which may be more or less contained under a veneer of "civilisation", or as a social construct which can be deliberately deployed through various demonstrative or performative (or indeed literary) means to achieve a specific end. The term "civilisation" here is a deliberate reaction against Norbert Elias' *The Civilizing Process* (1939), and, to a lesser extent, Marc Bloch's *La Société Féodale* (1939–40). In both works medieval people are characterised as emotionally immature, unable to control or even understand their own emotions because they have not yet undergone modernity's civilising process. Both Bloch and Elias see medieval culture as marked by violent emotional instability. Rosenwein challenges Elias almost immediately in her introductory essay, and Stephen White similarly begins his essay by dissecting this reductionist approach to medieval emotionality (*Anger's Past* 2–3, 127–30).

Lester Little and Paul Hyams²¹ would perhaps agree with Elias: both treat anger as a primitive human passion which must be contained or sublimated by civilising influences. Both focus on instructional texts and images, which depict Ira in opposition to some more virtuous quality. Little examines the formal monastic tradition of cursing in the light of the allegorical

²¹ Little, "Anger in Monastic Curses", 9–35; Hyams, "What did Henry III of England think in bed and in French about kingship and anger?", 92–124.

figures Ira and Patientia, which encouraged monks to repress their anger until (ideally) they never felt it at all. In a more secular setting, Hyams demonstrates how the courtly culture of Henry III's time opposed Ira instead to the figure of Debonerté to exercise a more supple control over outbursts of royal anger. In both cases, this critical approach is informed in large part by the "texts" in question and the communities that created them. Little's monks, for example, living as they did in close communities where personalities would presumably chafe day after day, must have had good and frequent reason to remind themselves of Patientia's virtues and to paint Ira as a mindless creature whose rage will ultimately lead her to self-destruction. The anger that they present, therefore, is already coded as negative and violent, something that one must learn to control. Debonerté is (at least to us) a less immediately comprehensible figure, and to understand her we must think about what it means to consider her as the opposite of Ira. Hyams locates her meaning in the virtues that unite a court into a productive and positive social unit, including courtesy, generosity, and clemency. He also includes justice in her portfolio; and as justice is the most laudable aspect of royal anger in contemporary sources, the Ira-who-is-not-Debonerté is constructed as entirely negative.

Visual arts and instructional literature, by their nature, tend to encourage a simplification of their intended readers' or viewers' understanding of their emotions, and therefore of modern critical response to that emotion. Narrative texts, however, can in many cases encourage a more subtle approach. Gerd Althoff, Stephen White, and Richard Barton, examining historical and romance narratives, all consider anger as a nuanced social tool, often deployed to a specific purpose, rather than being automatically negative in the eyes of the author.²² Althoff discusses demonstrative anger as a formalised tool of the crown (or, by implication, of anybody else in a position of power), to be wielded strategically by a canny lord as one of many possible tactics. Barton takes this argument further into a perceptive analysis of how anger can function as a tool for repairing a dysfunctional feudal relationship, which is the starting point for my discussion of feudal anger in Section B.

If the question of "primitive passion versus social construct" is more or less explicit throughout *Anger's Past*, there is another methodological debate running through the volume which is not quite so close to the surface: how do we identify anger in our sources? To what extent we can decide, given our cultural distance and biases, what anger "looks like" in a medieval text? Wendy Davies' Celtic saints (like Little's monks) may curse, and curse often—

²² Althoff, "*Ira Regis*: Prolegomena to a history of royal anger", 59–74; White, "The Politics of Anger", 127–52; Barton, "'Zealous anger' and the renegotiation of aristocratic relationships in eleventh- and twelfth-century France", 153–70.

an action which we nowadays associate with anger—but their cursing is explicitly free from anger. It must be: angry speech cannot reach God, and a curse that is not heard by God cannot achieve its purpose.²³ Davies herself makes the point that “we need to be wary of our assumptions and careful about their application. There is no need to assume that behaviour which is both surprising and unpalatable to modern tastes—that of selfish, self-regarding, demanding, willful saints... necessarily arose from anger” (195). So far as this goes, it is true; however, in the process Davies runs the risk of following Marc Bloch, and dismissing as irrational pointless passion anything that we simply fail to understand.

Hyams treads close to a similar “common to humanity” assumption when he tackles this problem. Even as he argues on the one hand that anger could be employed as a political tool, he dismisses the possibility that *ira regis* is either “genuine anger” or worthy of study:

The existence of genuine anger among actual kings, to the point where it is sometimes scarcely controllable, seems to me a necessary precondition for any wide acceptance of formal *ira regis*, in much the way that forged coins will not pass unless they bear some close resemblance to the genuine coin of the realm... Adept kings vested themselves in political anger as required, much as politicians have always assumed diplomatic illness, for public effect. The reader is compelled to consider, accept, or reject anecdotes presented by the sources on the unsatisfactory basis of their look and feel. (102)

The ability to evaluate anecdotes in a search for “genuine anger” to study rests here on the assumption that the reader, being human, knows how anger looks and feels regardless of temporal and cultural distance, and could on this basis distinguish between true and feigned anger if reliable information were available.

Let us consider, then, the concordance method of identifying anger: selecting a few key words and keeping to instances in which the author uses those.²⁴ Although simple, this approach can be flexible in its application. Raluca Radulescu, for example, uses it to study not a single emotion but the damaging social effects of excessive emotion in Malory’s *Morte Darthur* by focussing on the expressions *oute of mesure* and *without mesure* (“Oute of Measure”). The clearest example of this technique in relation to anger is Ron Newbold’s paper on anger in Gregory of Tours’ *Libri Historiarum*. Newbold uses key words to collect a “manageable and representative body of data” from his source text (23). Although he acknowledges that this method is of its nature “not comprehensive” (22), it does bring to light

²³ “Anger and the Celtic saint”, 191–202.

²⁴ For my own concordance list of anger words in Latin, French, and English, see appendix A.

certain aspects of Gregory's attitude towards anger, such as a frequent commixture of anger with shame, and Gregory's tendency to elide *ultio dei* ("divine vengeance") with *ira dei*. As I have already suggested, however, this method is limited. Its most obvious drawback is that anger may appear without being tagged as *ira* or *furor*. More seriously, relying on terminology alone limits interpretation and nuance.

This opens up the possibility of searching for symbols and contexts to provide some kind of identifying method that comes with a built-in analytical structure. One possible method is identification by contrast. Lester Little, Paul Hyams, Gerd Althoff, and Stephen White all identify in their sources a model of anger that is defined and characterised, in part or whole, by its opposite. Little and Hyams, as I have mentioned above, find moral lessons in Ira's opposition to Patientia (in a monastic context) and to Debonerté (in a courtly one). Both of these oppositions emphasise defeating anger and rising above it as a primitive destructive force. For Althoff, anger is part of the "symbolic repertoire of the king", the inverse of royal favour or reward (74). Studying royal diplomas and grants, he identifies the *threat* of royal wrath as having a material weight comparable with fines. This equivalence forms the basis of Althoff's case for anger as a nuanced aspect of communication and diplomacy—perhaps even a currency, though he stops short of that suggestion. White too finds anger to be a tool for negotiating social relations. Working with chivalric rather than political or overtly historiographical texts, he sets anger and sorrow up together as the opposite of joy, with the shift from one emotional sphere to the other mediated by the decrease or increase of personal honour.

Different as these cases are, all four scholars identify an explicit symbolic opposite to anger and use it to analyse a different kind of anger as presented within the source texts. In some cases I would quibble over the name or description of the opposite identified, but in all cases the focus on an opposite opens up promising avenues of analysis. These oppositions must be approached on their own terms. They are not all equal. Allegorical personifications may face off against each other; legal punishment and reward may be specified; the opposition may be rhetorical or merely implied within the text. If we are careful, however, we can use these binaries to access context-sensitive medieval systems and approaches to the emotion in question. Identifying figures such as Ire and Debonerté as opposites immediately opens up a productive line of inquiry as to the contemporary understanding of each abstraction. Moral oppositions, such as those in the instructional texts and images studied by Little and Hyams, form part of the interpretative toolkit of medieval culture.

These need not always be explicit, especially where the allegorical figures are well known. A chronicler might, for example, allude to the Patientia/Ira opposition by describing the behaviour of one of his characters as “patient” and having a second character attack or abuse them repeatedly until the aggressor is exhausted (see my discussion of Ira and Patientia in Chapter 3). Since this second character would be recognisable as Ira to anybody familiar with the trope, the chronicler would not need to use adjectives like *iratus* or *furiosus* to describe them—nor would it be necessary to explicitly condemn their behaviour, since placing them within that trope would carry its own moral charge. For textual sources, however, this system is more valuable for interpretation than for identification. Deliberate symbolic oppositions are far more common and obvious in visual iconography than in narrative texts. Like White and Althoff’s anger/joy and anger/favour dyads, opposites are often implicit in the text, becoming clear only later once one has already begun to analyse a particular passage or story.

I have found that the surest (and most flexible) method of identifying angers within a narrative text is to build up a repertoire of their usual manifestations: how authors describe angers, in what situations they arise, and how people are said to behave when angry. As we will see when I begin to list emotion signs, many of these are heavily coded, especially when they appear in a particular sequence. Even (perhaps especially) those signs of anger that appear most natural and universal cannot be read as uninflected by cultural meaning and authorial interpretation. Newbold falls into this trap when he notes that “Gregory occasionally relates, apart from shouting and abuse, such manifestations of anger as gnashing teeth, lashing out with fists and feet, hitting with a weapon or object... but not autonomic nervous system responses such as red face, glaring eyes and trembling hands” (24). Newbold attributes this discrepancy to the fact that “[Gregory] was not present,” though he feels that “[m]entioning shouting and abuse was entirely plausible even if Gregory had no certainty about this” (24, body and footnote 11). These are indeed all anger signs that do appear in medieval texts, but the selection and arrangement of them is governed by a rich and complex language of meaning, not by the chronicler’s personal information in the case.

Ruth Morse is not the only historian who has recognised the use of conventional representation in medieval historiography to provide an implicit value judgement on the actions and sequences narrated. A medieval chronicler depicting (for example) a baron angry at his son could draw on a known repertoire of demonstrative emotional actions to suggest an interpretation of the event. If the chronicler could rely on his readers recognising these actions and their connotations, it would not be necessary to name the emotion explicitly every

time it occurred in the text. In addition, he could deliberately employ this language of action to characterise the historical actors in his story: a man given to righteous anger, or a man who flares up too rashly and violently with no good reason.

Stephen White and Richard Barton both recognise the interpretative possibilities in these conventions. White mentions chroniclers using a discussion of anger and recognisable patterns of behaviour “to evaluate the person who displays anger. Representing another person’s anger is never a neutrally descriptive or politically neutral act” (150). Both White and Barton note, in addition, that if such a language exists, it is not only the authors who have access to it, but the “actors” themselves—that is, the historical persons they depict. White discusses and distinguishes between “the display of anger [and] its representation”, considering both figures as participating in a discourse of how anger is understood (137). Barton goes on to write of anger as a set of symbols that may be consciously employed to signal the need to restructure a social relationship. We begin already to see that there are at least two levels of conscious interpretation or construction present in any given historiographical depiction of royal anger: that of the historical “character”, and that of the author. Any lord or king (such as Edward I and Edward III) who was sufficiently historically aware to take an interest in his own self-representation could try to shape his own actions according to those of an idealised king.

Of all the contributors to *Anger’s Past*, Gerd Althoff comes the closest towards proposing some symbolic language of performative emotional events. Demonstrative signals – feasting with friends to show goodwill, “cursing and throwing filth” to show hostility – become, he suggests, a crucial part of public interaction. Signals such as floods of tears and violent rages are thus “mannerisms of medieval communication” “which may appear to us overemotionalized” (74). As emotions are to some extent demonstrative, so is anger (and so are other emotions) associated with specific events and actions. Stephen White makes similar observations regarding public signals of emotion employed to deliberate political effect (138). A chronicler’s use of these signals to describe the behaviour of an actor in their history can thus provide a more nuanced and more flexible set of references for study than a reliance solely on key terms such as *ira* and *furor*.

In Chapter 1 I construct a reference “vocabulary” of signs for emotion events that contain anger. These fall into five categories: internal signs, affect and action, speech and voice, reactions to anger, and symbols and analogies. Many of these combine into emotion scripts—clear, recognisable sequences of signs that amount to a performance of a certain emotion. My examples are drawn from a range of narrative texts from England and France of

the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. These include verse and prose, all three major languages of England, and hagiographical and chivalric tales in addition to chronicles. I then describe the five main anger types that became apparent in the process. I call these feudal anger, shamed anger, battle fury, othering anger, and holy wrath.

To demonstrate how these different types of anger may employ different scripts, signs, and cultural expectations, I devote Chapter 2 to the second-most common of these, shamed anger. This is anger that arises in response to a perceived or threatened loss of honour, and consequently serves as a motivator to effect change. Given the importance of provocative speech in the emotional scripts for shamed anger, I also spend some time examining the distinction between two deceptively similar kinds of provocative words: appeals to honour and jeering taunts.

In Chapter 3 I put the findings of the first two chapters into effect by considering how emotional styles relate to genre. I compare shamed anger to *Ira*, the figure of the deadly sin, and demonstrate how these two different ideas of anger each carry with them the cultural associations of a certain genre (chivalric and hagiographic, respectively). Using them as examples I examine how the author can follow (or subvert) different scripts of anger (that is, different combinations of signs of anger) to shift from the narrative style of one genre to another. This is used to frame an event or a character in the expectations of a given genre, guiding the reader's reception of the text.

Chapter 1. Finding angers

Events, signs, and scripts of emotion

Emotion events

Few chronicles are overtly emotional texts. We rarely see such detailed emotional behaviour as in hero-centred narratives such as Chrétien's romances: scenes rich in narratorial descriptions of inner turmoil, gestural expression, and direct speech. Emotions in chronicles are often political events, rather than an occasion for rhetorical expansion and exploration. Regardless of the level of detail, however, chroniclers do use the same three basic types of what may be called narrative expression to convey characters' emotions: narratorial statement, emotional action or gesture, and emotional speech.

We find all three of these in a single sentence in this emotion event from the *Vita Edwardi II*:

At this the king, angered beyond measure [*ultra modum commotus*] that he was not allowed to keep even one member of his household at his own wish, but that, as is provided in the case of an idiot, the ordering of his whole house should depend upon the decision of another, recalled Piers out of hatred for the earls [*in odio comitum*], swearing, as he was wont, on God's soul that he would freely use his own judgement. (38–39)²⁵

This level of detail is typical of most chroniclers: the chronicler names the emotion, mentions an act of (usually indirect) speech, which may have formal effect, and tells us what action results from this emotion event. Here, the narrator tells us that the king feels anger, Edward takes impulsive action as a result of his anger and hatred, and he expresses his feelings in a vehement speech act.

Some chroniclers will on occasion give us something more expansive and dramatic. In Froissart's account of the death of the son of the Count of Foix, for example, he uses a more detailed and embodied form of each of these three expressive types to create as affective and

²⁵ Remember that underlined citations from primary sources can be found in the original text and translation in the appendix, often in expanded form.

powerful a scene as possible (SHF 3–21). We are told not only that the Count is angry (“*courrouciez*”) at finding the purse of poison around his son’s neck, but that his blood boiled (“*le sanc li mua*”). Rather than receiving an indirect report of speech, we hear the Count’s furious reproaches and threats verbatim, and we witness his lapse from the refined French that Froissart had admired earlier to his native Gascon. We also see the pleas of his courtiers in response. We see him rise from the table, draw his knife, attempt to throw it at his son, struggle against the friends restraining him, leap over the table with his knife in hand, and so on. His son’s feelings, inaction, and speechlessness present a pathetic contrast: “The child, all startled and confused, made no sound, but went completely white with fear and quite distraught, and he began to tremble hard, because he was sure that he was lost”. While the Count’s words and actions dominate the scene, and his body moves so wildly that it must be restrained, this is all we hear of the son. The boy’s speech fails him, he is surprised and does not know how to react, and his “action” is restricted to the involuntary actions of a stationary body: changing colour and trembling.

When later the count hears that his son has died in prison, his reaction is briefer. Even so, it too is conveyed through narratorial statement, emotional speech, and emotional action.

At that the Count of Foix became *courrouciez* [*angry? or distressed?*] beyond measure, and *regreta* his son very/too deeply. And he said: “Ah, Gaston! what a terrible business this is. Alas, it was an unhappy day for both of us that ever we went into Navarre to see your mother. I shall never know any perfect happiness again such as I have known before.” He summoned his barber and had his head completely shaved, and he humbled himself and dressed all in black, and did the same to all of his household. And the child’s body was carried with tears and cries to the Franciscans at Orthez, and buried there. (SHF 3–21)

We are invited to know his feelings, to witness his speech, and to judge his penitence and grief from his deeds. This time his actions are ritualised and socially inclusive, creating a space for his household to mourn with him instead of struggling against them to throw a knife across the table where they had been dining together.

These two types of narration—the report in the *Vita Edwardi II* and the description in Froissart—correspond in general terms to the categories *chronicle* and *historia*, although at the level of a single scene or event rather than of the entire text. At times, the most lavish chronicler will use an even terser form for an emotion event: an annalistic report such as “when he heard that, the king went to war”. Going to war is an emotion sign in this context, albeit one narrated from a more removed perspective than the Count of Foix’s boiling blood,

or Edward II's angry words. In a society where the political structure was essentially a set of interpersonal relationships, many other public or political actions are also emotion signs: holding a loveday, dismissing a former favourite from court, revelling all night to the sound of music and trumpets, or making a donation to a religious institution. From a perspective internal to the story, these actions express and enact these emotions to the broader community, and often make them communal; from an external perspective, they serve as a shorthand for the chronicler to inform his readers what his characters are feeling: love/reconciliation, anger/betrayal, joy/honour/merriment, piety/penitence.

In most cases these forms of emotion expression are interchangeable. If a lord says "I am filled with rage," or glares at a supplicant, this tells us no more than if the narrator were to state that "his heart was stirred by anger". Nor does it tell us any *less*: that is, emotional speech and emotional action have the same truth value as direct authorial statement. However, as there are established emotional styles for most social interaction and emotion events, a person's deviation from or observance of these styles and practices can be used to provide a more finely nuanced picture of their feelings: their intensity, for example, their commingling with other feelings, or the necessity of restraining them. Gaveston's return from one of his exiles in the *Vita Edwardi II* prompts competing emotions in Edward and his barons. Edward's emotions are given full treatment, with all three methods of narrative expression: the narrator informs us that Edward is very happy ("letus", "gratanter", "ualde gauisus"); he addresses Gaveston as "brother" and has many conversations with him; and he goes to meet him, receives him honourably and keeps him very close for some time (14). The warmth of the king's feelings is evident in his eagerness to overleap the expected bounds of formal behaviour: rushing forward to meet Gaveston rather than waiting to be approached, spending an unusual amount of time in conversation with him, and so on. Meanwhile, the barons' emotions at Gaveston's illegal return are not named, but their nature is conveyed by the *absence* of expected speech and action: "not one dared further to raise a hand to Gaveston or make a complaint about his return" (14).

The more familiar the words or actions of an emotion event, the more likely it is that the chronicler will not bother to specify or describe the emotion at all. Kissing the hand of one's lord, or performing a ritual of penitence and submission (such as the Count of Foix dressing in black and shaving his head), requires no interpretative gloss from the author, although he may choose to elaborate in order to dwell on the emotional moment. Simpler bodily gestures may have a broader range of possible meanings—rather than a one-for-one equivalence with a single emotion or situation—but they are usually unambiguous in context.

For example, Burrow suggests that “lowering the head is not only a sign of grief or shame; it can also, by virtue of cutting off eye contact, signify anger... Angry or scornful feelings are more commonly expressed, however, by the shaking of the head” (42–43). A lowered or shaken head, then, might not be enough to allow a medieval reader to put a name to the emotion on its own: context, and a foreknowledge of the feelings available in response to that context, would narrow the field. If the situation is one in which anger is likely or possible, then the difference between a bowed head and a shaken will add nuance and a bowed head may suggest, for example, that the anger is blended with grief or shame. Burrow cites a few instances in which the meaning of a sign is *not* clear, being misinterpreted even by other characters within the text; but for the most part these moments are exceptional, used for dramatic effect, and are even rarer in the world of historiography than that of romance.

Authorial statement, character’s action, character’s speech: as a general rule, any one of them may stand in for either or both of the other two, and each may be taken as a reliable guide to the character’s emotional state. The person who is sad speaks sadly and acts sadly. An angry gesture or an angry speech is as unambiguous as an authorial statement of anger; in fact, briefer accounts often sketch an emotion event with only one or two. The narrator may tell us that somebody was moved to rage by an insult; or that, upon receiving this news, he summoned his troops; or that he made a vow of vengeance. When the author of the *Anonimalle* chronicle looks for an immediate cause for the civil war of 1321–22 he uses only the first type—narratorial statement—writing that “the king’s heart was bursting with desire for vengeance” against his opponents (102–03). Lancaster’s pious fear in the face of unjust execution is shown to us in his catching hold of his confessor’s robes in a gesture of supplication, pleading, “fair fader, abide wiþ vs til þat y be dede; for my flesshe quakeþ for drede of deþ” (*Brut* 223); and so on. Except in rare cases of insincere word or behaviour (invariably flagged and fretted over by the narrator), it is assumed that we as readers may rely on any of these signs. The more of these scenes we encounter the harder it is to escape the idea that in fact feeling, word, and deed may stand for each other because they are interchangeable, and indivisible. The angry word, the drawn sword, the declaration of war *is* the feeling.

Underlying all of this is the assumption that voice and action are, under ordinary circumstances, contiguous with the emotion itself: we doubt the sincerity of the Count of Foix’s vocal lament and his shorn head no more than we doubt the narrator’s statement that he was “courrouciéz” and regretted his son’s death. While there are exceptions they are, as I will show in Section C, exceptions that prove the rule. Action and words stand equally as

witness to one's internal state: there is rarely any idea of the possibility of a disjuncture between outward performance and emotional truth. Where a disjuncture does appear, it seems aberrant and unnatural. I will return in later chapters to discuss the implications of this elision in more depth, considering how far it may reveal the emotional norms of the period. In this chapter, however, I discuss the signs primarily as literary devices. In a narrative context, they are interchangeable and have the same truth value unless the author specifies otherwise.

Emotion signs

John Burrow, in his 2002 monograph on non-verbal communication in medieval narrative, divides emotion signs into two main categories: involuntary physiological signs and deliberate gestures. He bases this categorisation on Augustine's distinction between *natural* and *given* signs, in which deliberate signs such as nods and hand gestures are characterised as *verba visibilia*, laid out in a passage that "was commonly referred to by medieval writers" (Burrow 3; *De Doctrina Christiana* II 5). Burrow's focus is on communication, not emotion, so he restricts his study to these deliberate gestures. His two-fold criteria for a physical sign to qualify are that it must be *voluntary* (that is, the character could have avoided making it, disqualifying signs such as involuntary blushes and even weeping) and intended as *communicative* (2–4). Burrow argues that the criterion of intentionality is even more applicable when studying texts than real-life situations, as "[u]nlike real people, persons in texts have no accessible insides, nor can they harbour intentions beyond what their author states or implies" (3). This argument cuts both ways, however: the accessibility of a character's internal state relies entirely on the *author's* intentions, on what they intend to communicate to the readers. Moreover, classifying signs by intentionality involves a culturally subjective judgement on where "natural/genuine" ends and "voluntary" begins.

Burrow uses this distinction primarily to delimit the scope of his study, so it will not do for me as an organising principle: I am considering a much broader array of emotion signs. The passage from *De Doctrina* may well be referred to by medieval writers, but this fundamental conceptual division between intentional and unintentional physical gestures seems to me to be entirely absent from the narrative texts that I have read. In the novels of the eighteenth century and onward, the distinction between interior emotion and that which may be displayed to society is of central importance; but in medieval narrative, as I have said, the involvement of the body with emotion and with the community is readily assumed. Since

“genuine” emotion may be conveyed through narration by naming the character’s observable actions and its social effects, intentionality is not a governing principle here. A blush has equal communicative power—both to the reader and to other characters within the narrative—with a spoken declaration of emotion or a movement of the body.

In these texts, the key difference is the social function of the emotion or thought conveyed. Consequently, my main distinction is between that which is felt only internally, and that which is externalised (and which therefore conveys an emotion to others, prompting them to share or reject it). I have divided up my list of signs accordingly: internal signs are known only to the author, the character, and the reader; the others function within the social world depicted in the text, with varying degrees of ritual and formality. For example, trembling and blushing, which Burrow would call involuntary, are in my figuring grouped with gesture and action under “behaviour and affect”, as they are all visible to other characters present. Rushing blood and pounding hearts, on the other hand, are internal signs, known only to the character, the author, and the reader.

Based on this principle, there are five main divisions within my list. The first three correspond approximately to the three types of narrative expression of emotion: **internal signs, affect and action**, and **speech and voice**. Two more categories deserve attention, however: **reactions to anger**, and **symbols and analogies** associated with anger. Social responses to anger are of crucial importance in interpreting an emotion event, especially where politics or honour are at stake; and symbols and signs may also be employed as an interpretive gloss, although they are not so common in chronicles as in some adjacent narratives such as hagiography or romance, or in visual iconography.

One or more of these emotion signs can allow us to identify an emotion event as containing anger, and give us a starting point for understanding it. It is, however, not a simple task: many of the signs listed below have multiple possible meanings. *Blushing* may signal a variety of different emotional responses. *Drawing a weapon* may demonstrate a loss of self-control or honourable strength. *Jeering speech* and *appeals to honour* are almost impossible to distinguish from each other without the context of the surrounding narrative. *Fainting* usually indicates emotional excess, of any kind. A *lion* as a symbol may represent a range of qualities (fierce, proud, strong, royal, divine, vicious, bestial). One author may code a lord’s feudal anger positively, while another may consider it a show of tyranny. Interpreting these signs still takes a good deal of subjectivity: this *feels like* that. This is not a decoding ring: it is a set of references, or the recognition of tropes and precedents and exemplars to keep in the back of one’s mind for comparison with the text under consideration. The point of these lists is to let

us cultivate a starting point for interpretation, one that would be recognisable to the world in which the text was conceived. For this reason, I have included with this dissertation an appendix containing examples of anger events from several of my texts, including three that are not chronicles, annotated with references to this list of signs. These examples, or others very like them, would be the referents that any medieval person would bring to their own reading: they are what the authors expect us to recognise, and the means by which they write.

1. *Internal signs*

- a) Authorial naming of emotions (“she felt angry”, “he was indignant”)
- b) Blood: moves, surges/swells, or heats
- c) Heart: moves, surges/swells, or heats; is heavy; or itself feels the emotion (“his heart was angered”)
- d) A feeling of near or complete madness (loss of *sens*)

These signs are felt only by the character experiencing anger: that is, they are not communicated to any other character within the text. Apart from 1a, therefore, they only appear in texts (or episodes) that have some kind of interior perspective. It is worth noting that characters will often articulate their feelings aloud. So, for example, in Jordan Fantosme’s chronicle, King Henry “was both saddened and angry [*greins*²⁶... *e irez*] and he swore his oath... and he said to his knights: ‘My lords, now give heed to what I say! I was never so grieved [*adulez*] in all my life. I am so filled with rage that I am nearly crazy” (125–29). Authorial statement is immediately followed by the character’s own articulation of the same feelings, but that speech act has a social and legal effect that the author’s words do not have: it functions as a formal declaration of anger and initiating a shift toward war. I have classed these moments as speech acts, but the kinds of internal signs they express are the same types of sign that are given by the author.

2. *Affect and action*

- a) The face:

²⁶ *greins*: See *DMF*, *AND*, and *MED*. This may be cognate with either Latin-derived *grevus* or Norse-derived *greime*, both of which could have *grein[s]* as an acceptable variant adjective in this period, especially once one factors in minim errors. In any case, it is clear that the cluster of meanings intersect here between the Roman and Germanic, so that the *gref/anger/dol* senses merge without any stable distinction in usage.

- i) Distortion or grimacing, including baring or grinding the teeth or opening the mouth
 - ii) Changing colour (to white or red)
 - iii) Glaring/flashing eyes
 - iv) Wild hair (especially in visual media)
 - v) Tears
- b) Sweating, trembling, swelling (these are often conflated or semantically identical)
- c) Hasty movement:
 - i) Wild or uncontrolled motion (in visual media, this appears as distorted attitudes of the limbs)
 - ii) Leaping to one's feet
 - iii) Rushing from one place to another without stopping
 - iv) Throwing objects (other than at a person)
- d) Loss of *sens*:
 - i) Madness
 - ii) Fainting
- e) Violence against self:
 - i) Tearing at one's hair or face
 - ii) Rending one's clothes
 - iii) Suicide or other self-harm
- f) Violence against others (actual or threatened):
 - i) Destruction of enemy's possessions or lands, especially by fire
 - ii) Displacement of aggression onto an object
 - iii) Throwing objects at somebody
 - iv) Damaging their clothes or armour (including their horse, if in battle)
 - v) Drawing or gripping a weapon
 - vi) Striking somebody
 - vii) Killing or seriously wounding somebody
 - viii) Capturing somebody
- g) Withdrawal of love
 - i) Banishment
 - ii) War
 - iii) Legal proceedings, etc.

These behavioural signs are the most immediate and varied indicators of emotion in narrative. Many of them are common (with some necessary translation) across both textual and visual media. Some are specific to certain social ranks or functions—for example, flashing eyes are usually seen in a king or a lord who has been affronted in the midst of his court. Others, especially in visual sources, have a strong iconographical association with the vice Ira and other negative figures, as I will discuss in Chapter 3. In textual sources the association is often still present but is more negotiable: so, wild hair and tearing at one's own face and clothes will suggest emotional excess, or warn of its possibility, without necessarily condemning the character altogether.

Emotional excess or strong agitation is a striking component of many of these behavioural signs, and the emotion in question is not always anger. That same action of tearing at one's hair and clothes is also associated with grief and with penitence—especially if the hair or clothes or face are also marked with dust, ash, or dirt—and sometimes simply with madness. Fear and illness may induce pallor as well as anger and shame, though they are less likely to cause the face to redden. Moreover, while an excess of emotion is usually negatively coded, even some of the most extreme of these signs may occur in a ritualised context where they are not only permissible but socially valued. I discussed the Count of Foix's mourning earlier: shaving his head, choosing poorer clothing, and humbling himself, are arguably more formalised versions of tearing at his hair and clothes and harming his body. Cleansed of their excess and disorder, these actions take on a constructive and meaningful role in social interaction. Context is always crucial for interpretation.

Many of these signs are contiguous with the interior signs already mentioned. Blood may be said to stir, swell, or tremble—so too may the heart, or the whole body. The words used are often the same, and translation usually introduces a distinction not present in the original text. For example, a modern translator would usually render *fremir* as *tremble* when it relates to the whole body, but might use *shake* or *weaken* for limbs, *surge* or *boil* for blood, and *pound* or *falter* for the heart: this vocabulary is discussed in Chapter 8. Colour changes in particular hardly ever stand alone: they are almost invariably accompanied by emotional action (flushing) or prostration and inaction (pallor), or by narratorial statement of inner turmoil. We saw the pallor and redness of the Count of Foix and his son, and the contrast between the turbulent action of one and the agonised stillness and doubt of the other. Aside from colour, however, faces are rarely mentioned as sites of emotional expression. An

occasional exception is the eyes, which often glare or burn, and can act very powerfully on other people.²⁷

The manner of movement is often telling. Angry people move hastily or make sudden uncontrolled or wild actions (*Brut* 265, *Anonimalle* 154). Their actions may be contrasted to somebody who is very calm and still, for a stronger negative coding, and this contrast may be applied to their voices as well (loud, riotous, or wordless vocalisations, versus silence or quiet, measured speech). This loss of control may go far enough to be called madness, which is almost invariably negative. It may be a symptom or consequence of any kind of anger (excepting holy wrath, which is usually so idealised as to be immune), or of other similar emotions, such as grief. As such, it is not one specific emotion but a state of emotional excess. Swooning is the climax of this loss of control, being a complete loss of *sens*; but depending on the sensibility of the text this may be negative (excess, associated with Ira's self-destructive properties) or positive (a sign of the character's superlative noble heart). Swooning is rare in chronicles by comparison to other narrative genres, except as a result of physical sickness or injury: for example, the injured Audley swoons with a bloodless face (Geoffrey le Baker 132). One exception is Edward II in the same chronicle when, in 1326, he is forced to abdicate in favour of his son: at that moment le Baker is drawing deliberately on the emotional conventions of romance and hagiography, as discussed in Chapter 3 below. In many cases, a mad rage is only invoked as a possibility: characters may consciously struggle to keep their self-control, or may be implored to restrain themselves and not act with rash violence, especially if they are in a position of social power.

Violence is a category of behaviour that is more strongly associated with angers than with any other kind of emotion. Violence against oneself may be associated with grief, despair, or suicide—Jennifer O'Reilly has traced the continuity between visual representations of anger, despair/wanhope, suicide, and Judas—but perhaps the most powerful archetype of violence is the image of Ira in the *Psychomachia* tradition. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, but in short: Ira is depicted as repeatedly attacking Patientia, who serenely ignores

²⁷ In romances, such as those of Chrétien de Troyes, love will also produce rapid changes of colour.

This is one of the very few emotion signs that are typically ambiguous to other characters within the text: they will often signal to onlookers that the knight or lady in question is suffering from some mysterious strong emotion or illness but not exactly what, drawing the reader's attention to the difficulty of interpreting the face or accessing inner feeling. This is worth noting precisely because it is so very much at odds with the dominant emotional norms of medieval narrative. It is, however, consistent with the comparative invisibility and ambiguity of the face as a site of emotional expression, which I discuss in Chapter 9.

the assaults, until Ira begins to tear at her own face and hair. Eventually Ira kills herself with her own sword and falls. In narrative, this extreme is rarely reached, but self-harm can suggest a loss of control or a sinful excess of feeling which risks imitating Ira. See, for example, Edward I's anger at his son in the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough (discussed in Chapter 2): he tears his own hair in an excess of grief and anger, then collapses in exhaustion (382–83).

Violence to others may be as dangerous and excessive as self-inflicted violence, but it may also be laudable and honourable (for example, on the battlefield). I have included here immediate physical harm, and gestural threats of violence such as handling a weapon. I have not included threats of future violence here (such as declarations of war): I discuss those as speech acts instead.

Throwing objects at a person (or at their feet, or at the ground) has been included here too, but it has several different possible meanings: one is a similar physical threat to a drawn sword (especially if the object is a weapon), and another is aggression displaced onto the object (especially if this is accompanied by kicking the object or cursing it). There may also be some specific symbolic significance to the object in question (a ring, a weapon) which gives the action a specific meaning, such as the renunciation of loyalty, or a challenge. In *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, for example, Gawain flings the girdle at the feet of the Green Knight and curses it. Gawain rejects what the object means, and shows anger toward it and the Green Knight, but is unwilling to offer direct violence to the Green Knight (2374–78). Similarly, in the Fineshade chronicle, Edward I throws his son's petition to the ground and tramples it: a clear gesture of denial, but also a displacement of violence onto the document instead of his son (86r ll. 15–21).

Destroying an enemy's property is an act of war, and is more closely aligned in meaning with a physical attack on their person than with aggression displaced onto an object. The land and property and people, in this case, count as an extension of the "body" of the lord, and an attack on them is an attack on the lord's body (for which, see Section C), whereas aggression against a specific object is usually associated with an attempt at self-control. Accounts of damage inflicted during wartime often include mention of fire as a weapon of destruction: this is perfectly natural from a literal perspective, but it has symbolic weight as well, due to the associations of fire and heat with anger itself. Despoliation during war is one act of anger which can be glossed in many different ways. As it is very destructive and inflicts misery on many people it is often lamented, cried against as an act of wanton cruelty and violence, or offered as evidence of noble power out of control. In other cases it may be viewed

more or less neutrally, as an expected fact of warfare, or with moderate approbation, as a practical tactic and a means of supply. In these cases, it is often stressed that there were some excesses which the attackers did not commit. While Jordan Fantosme disapproves of the Scottish raids in general, he emphasises that David, the brother of King William of Scotland, is a good man, and therefore did not attack any churches or monasteries, nor seek to “desplaie” any nuns (1138). There are also narratives in which the author (and presumably the audience) shares wholeheartedly in the savage joy of plundering the enemy. A burned village is never just a burned village: it is a deliberate, semi-formal act of anger. This anger is not directed primarily against the town or village itself. The people being killed and starved are usually not even considered unless they have the effrontery to fight back, as with the Flemings’ malicious ring-barking of the fruit trees outside the besieged town of Prudhoe (Fantosme 1677–79). The real target is the lord whom it symbolically represents, a deliberate wounding of the land that he embodies. Froissart explicitly rejects this approach in his account of the sack of Limoges, which he considers excessively cruel: “I do not know how [the English] could not have taken pity on those poor people who were not important enough to have committed treason, but they paid for it more dearly than did their great masters” (SHF 1–666).

3. *Speech and voice*

a) Tone:

- i) Loud, clear, “high/haut” (in volume, not pitch), sometimes making the ground/room shake
- ii) Initial speechlessness

b) Declaration:

- i) Statement of anger: e.g., “I am angry”, and/or describing internal sensations of anger
- ii) Recital of grievances: “This person has harmed me in these ways”
- iii) Petition for redress of grievances

c) Threatening speech:

- i) Vows of violence / war: “I will accomplish these things against my enemy”
- ii) Maledictions: “May bad things happen to my enemy”

d) Provocative speech:

- i) Appeals to / denial of honour
- ii) Jeers and taunts (sometimes including laughter)

e) Wordless group speech

- i) Murmur: often quiet, spreading anger and dissent through a group
- ii) Clamour: unruly, tumultuous noise from a crowd, often including jeers

The manner or tone of speech can have emotional and political significance: speaking familiarly, or for a long time, or while eating together, is a token and invocation of love and friendship. A “clear” voice is associated with pronouncing or defending a truth, and is usually controlled rather than clamorous. It may also, however, be an angry voice; and if so it will probably also be described as “high/haut” (that is, loud), and possibly as shaking the room or producing some other potent effect on the surrounding environment or people. This powerful tone of voice, especially after a moment of speechlessness, is particularly associated with princely anger. The initial silence suggests a struggle for self-control; however, as it is often accompanied by a glare or some terrifying look that effectively proclaims strength and anger while striking fear into opponents, the apparent loss of self-command can be a very effective (narrative and/or real-life) tool for asserting power in the context of a very theatrical performance of anger.

Such a glare is often followed by a formal statement of anger—declaring oneself to be filled with rage at an enemy (either internal—at a vassal or comrade—or external, such as another prince), signalling a violent rupture in that relationship. This assumes and emphasises a contiguity between interior feeling and exterior/social action. It is often followed by recital of grievances—a public declaration of all the reasons one has for anger against the other party—and may lead into threatening speech (which anticipates future violence) or, if the target is present, into immediate violence (battle rage). Take, for example, the Emperor of Rome’s declaration of war against Arthur in the alliterative *Morte*, which includes several of these formalised speech acts but uses them in an atypical way to characterise the Emperor and his court. Earlier, we saw Arthur and Camelot performing anger to perfection. Now “the emperour irus was angered at his herte... ‘My herte sothely es sette, assente 3if 3ow lykes, / To seke in-to Sexone, with my sekyre knyghttez, / To fyghte with my foo-mene...” (1957, 1963–65). We have an authorial naming of emotion, followed by the character’s formal statement of anger and a vow of war—but from this moment on the vow is subverted. Rather than planning particular martial exploits, as we would expect and as Arthur and his knights did earlier under the same circumstances (287–406), the emperor speaks instead of the riot and revel he will enjoy during the campaign.

Speech acts which anticipate, plan, or invoke future violence occur at approximately this point in various emotion scripts but, for obvious reasons, can have very different

narrative effects and social context. I have divided them broadly into two categories: promises of violence, where the speaker promises to harm the enemy personally; and maledictions, where the wrath of God or some similar calamity is invoked or hoped for. The primary difference here is one of social situation and capacity: a woman or a lower-ranking man is more likely to use maledictions, beseeching divine or supernatural intervention to accomplish their revenge, while a knight or lord will vow to perform acts of vengeance in his own person. These acts are differently coded, and will differ in their subsequent effects and in their narrative handling. A man who *ought* to be able to take effective action himself but who instead hopes passively for future satisfaction will usually be portrayed as weak or as socially dysfunctional: for example, in the *Brut* chronicle, Edward II's reaction to the murder of Piers Gaveston is to become angry and to pray for the day when he might be avenged (207).

I have avoided the word “cursing”, because of its ambiguity. Provocative speech (“you son of a whore”) is not to be confused with malediction (“may God strike you down”). The aim of provocative speech is some form of shaming or denigration, and as such (especially if this is a public scene) it may be a deliberate attempt to provoke the other person to anger and action. If this is the case, while it will often provoke an angry response in return, the anger may or may not be directed at the speaker—this is discussed in Chapter 2. If, however, the intent of the words is malicious (jeers and taunts), this may reflect badly on the speaker: though a hero may jeer at a fallen enemy, jeering is more typically associated with the unruly speech of the discourteous or the low. Laughter is rare and is more usually derisive than joyful, so in most cases, unless there is some other indication, it should be associated with jeering speech (see Robert of Artois' secret laughter, *Voeux du Héron* 119). It may even form part of a martyr's torments, as in the case of Thomas of Lancaster in the *Brut*, both at the moment of his capture and on the path to his execution (219–20, 221–23; see discussion of the increasing use of martyrdom tropes in this episode in Chapter 3). Crowds and animals in particular are even prone to wordless vocalisations, such as the hue and cry when Despenser the Younger is captured (*Anonimale* 130), the citizens of Calais signalling to their king their willingness to continue to defend their city (GB 79–80), or the accusing despair in the cry of the familiar spirit scorned by the Lord of Corresse when it appears in the likeness of a sow (SHF 3–47).

4. Reactions to anger

- a) Communal emotion / sympathy: others share the anger
- b) Command of room / fear in reaction: others are intimidated by the anger

- c) Counsel scene: determines the correct amount of anger
- d) Plea for clemency or restraint: asking that the anger be reduced.

The reactions of other characters provide an important gloss on any anger event. They may help to characterise the type of anger, and are often a guide to the reader as to a proper emotional response. A lack of emotional unity between the angry character and onlookers usually indicates a socially dysfunctional anger; fear responses from enemies enhance the angry character's status; and a counsel scene or a plea for clemency may be employed to dramatise the evaluation of the appropriate degree of response.

5. *Symbols and analogies associated with anger*

- a) Fire and heat
- b) The colour red (including visible blood)
- c) Certain animals
 - i) Lions
 - ii) Boars
 - iii) Wolves
 - iv) Leopards
 - v) Dogs
- d) Demons, pagans, foreigners, peasants, etc.

Fire, heat, and the colour red, are by nature associated with anger, as to the ideas of violence and blood. This association is strengthened by Galenic humoral theory as well as by iconographical traditions. The vice *Ira* usually wields a red or flaming sword, and angry people in artwork will often have red skin or hair (the hair is often wild and flame-like in appearance too). In the case of large-scale anger between princes or nations, fire gains a stronger association by its use as a weapon of war (see 2.g.i above). It may also occur as a simple visual sign in text, as for example in *Roland*: when we see the Muslims preparing to attack, their armour, reflecting the sun, shines like fire (“reflambeit”, “flambius”, *laisse* 79–80). We see a similar effect later: Charlemagne and the French army are riding in anger (“cevalchet par irur... dolenz e curoçus”) and their “hauberks and helmets shine like fire” (“osbercs e helmes i getent grant flabur”, *laisse* 137).

For animals as symbols the direct referent is their qualities as described in medieval bestiaries and heraldry. Many are ambiguous: lions can be positive and regal, but also violent and destructive, depending on context. Boars similarly can stand for positive and negative aspects of warlike strength. The descriptions of the hunted boar in *Sir Gawain and the Green*

Knight, for example, draw on the language of battle fury: bestial but noble (1460–67, 1571–80, etc.). By contrast, a wolfish anger (such as Andrew Harclay “gelling as a wolfe” when he captures Lancaster in the *Brut*, 219) is negative in all senses: raging, ravening, low, dirty. Leopards are rarer, but where they do appear they are more often associated with anger than not: when Roland sees the Spanish army approaching, he becomes as fierce as a lion or leopard (*Roland laisse* 88). Dogs are more likely to be humble, dirty, or low. A bestial anger is often associated, too, with “bestial” people or supernatural beings such as pagans or demons: “You are a living devil. Deadly rage has taken possession of you” (*Roland laisse* 58).

The description of King Arthur’s anger in the alliterative *Morte* combines several of these types of symbols:

The king *blyschit* upon the man with his wide eyes,
That, very fierce with wrath, burned like hot coals;
He changed colour as the king, with a pitiless expression,
Looked like a lion, and bites at his lip! (116–119)

Note particularly the insistence on fire and redness. “Blyschit” here does not mean blushing but glaring: that is, Arthur “looks redly” at the messengers, with eyes that burn like coals. He changes colour, presumably to red; and to crown the effect, he looks like a lion.

Emotion scripts, and types of anger

Once we begin to observe these signs we see that they often occur in patterns: so, as in the above quotation from the *Morte Arthure*, a lord or king’s speechlessness (3.a.ii) is often accompanied by manifestations of heat (5.a or 5.b) and a glare (2.a.iii) that strikes terror into the target(s) of his wrath (4.b). If Arthur were to be portrayed as a weak and wilful king we might instead see wild movement (2.c.i or 2.c.iii), self-harm such as hair-tearing (2.e), the mention of the character raging like a devil (5.d), and the indifference of the target (4.b inverted). These different patterns of behaviour (emotion scripts) would carry different moral charges, but they also occur in response to different provocations and have different results in the narrative. The stimulant and the resolution are just as important as whether the author approves or disapproves: in other words, the beginning and the end are as important as the middle, when it comes to conceptualising a feeling. They seem, therefore, to be associated with different kinds of anger. I group these types of anger according to cause (what provoked

the anger?), emotion script (how does this anger manifest or how is it produced?), and goal (what is the desired resolution of this anger?).

Following this principle, I find five main types of anger in late-medieval narrative texts. The first two are the most common, and the most complex. They are at the centre of narratives and the debates implied by the narrative—consequently they are more likely to be mixed with other affects, or to be the subject of detailed moral evaluation by the author or by other characters. The other types of anger are simpler, and—especially in chronicles—usually incidental to the narrative.

Feudal anger is, simply, anger at a perceived violation of a formal bond, such as that between lord and vassal, or between allied princes. It is, by its nature, centred on the relationship between two parties, though one of these parties may be a group or an entire nation. The prototypical example is that of a lord angry at his vassal's disobedience. It is essentially a public emotion, conceptualised in terms of social relationships, and it signals (both from a legal and a narrative perspective) the shift in that relationship from love to war/revenge, until a successful reconciliation can be negotiated. Scripts and signs of feudal anger will be discussed in more detail in Section B.

Shamed anger is more personal, although it too may result in a formal declaration of hatred and war. It is a response to a perceived or actual loss of honour. From a narrative viewpoint it is an ongoing motivating factor in a way that feudal anger is not: a drive to violence and reparations that will restore lost honour, rather than the potentially static change of relationship signalled by the first. Where feudal anger negotiates a given relationship, this emotion mediates (and motivates) personal worth within society. See Chapters 2 and 3 for discussion.

Battle rage, as the name suggests, happens in situations of combat or similar confrontation, usually on the battlefield. It may be general or occasional: that is, a “furious” warrior on the battlefield provoked by no more than the fact of combat, or an aggressive rage prompted by a specific trigger. If the latter, the catalyst is usually a wound or a taunt, or seeing one's comrade(s) slaughtered. The hero or army responds by “raging as a lion” (or some similar expression) and experiencing a sudden burst of fervour, courage, madness, or strength, which temporarily or decisively turns the tide of the fight.

Othering anger serves to mark the alterity and evilness of the character in question. Such characters behave like violent demons, not in response to a specific provocation, but because it is their nature. English chronicles telling of battles against the Scots, for example, often depict them in imitation of Ira and raging demons, instead of as chivalrous opponents

like the French. In these texts Scottish anger or violent behaviour is given no connection with any cause (e.g., *GB* 4, *AP* 265). Similarly, Geoffrey le Baker's Queen Isabella is a furious virago and a "truculent lioness", in contrast to the patient suffering and noble love of her husband Edward II (20, 21, 24, 28). Any display of anger on the part of these characters marks their alterity and evil. Othering anger is usually indicated by imagery that explicitly recalls the visual traditions of Ira, the deadly sin, and will usually be opposed to either calm patience (as in the case of Edward and Isabella) or an appropriately marked righteous anger (a noble Christian army against their heathen or subhuman opponents).

Holy wrath is the opposite of othering anger. It is wielded by saints and by God—and curiously enough, though it is often imagined, it rarely appears outside of hagiography. Its existence is mostly theoretical: in practice, and even in hagiography, most narratives will use instead a hyper-positive version of battle fury or feudal anger (that is, the angry character may be provoked by the taunts of an evil character, or will speak on God's behalf as if he were an aggrieved lord). By my own rules this anger does not strictly belong on this list: this is a kind of anger with no regular, recognisable scripts, an anger that does not differ in any meaningful way from other angers, an anger that almost never appears. I have included it because it is present in its absence: authors and characters both want to imagine that it exists, even if they can give no real model for it.

Although they are distinct in their origins and clearly delineated in intent, two or more types of anger may be present in a single emotion event. Speeches involving the possibility of dishonour are often used deliberately to provoke anger to a specific end, and a leader may do just this before battle to encourage his men into a battle rage. The Saracens' abuse of their "false idols" in *La Chanson de Roland* characterises them as raging devils, but the manner in which they express their anger includes elements of feudal anger and the betrayal of a relationship (the god having withheld the protection they might reasonably expect for their service). Hagiographic tales may depict a saint's wrath on God's behalf in a way that mirrors a vassal's indignation at a slight to his lord—perhaps a more relatable anger than the somewhat impersonal pure anger of righteousness—and so on.

Once we begin to recognise these types of anger in the texts we may find them instructive as to how angers were understood to function in a social context: the anger that a lord of romance or chronicle might display in response to an impertinent demand from another lord or ruler is usually depicted as feudal anger. That is, it is shaped in exactly the same way as the lord's anger against an impertinent subject, rather than as shamed anger. This suggests that his immediate public response is more concerned with signalling the

immediate shift in relationship with the other man, than with resentment at a slight to his honour. Similarly, in Section B we will see Edward III assert his own right to Calais and France by responding to the burghers of Calais as if they were his own rebellious subjects, using the practice of feudal anger to turn his claim into practical fact. Where social structure is so fundamentally built around personal relationships, the choice of emotional expression must have a clear, immediate social effect: asserting the right to feel in a particular way would be a very real statement of social, legal, and political power.

Feudal anger is not purely externalised and social, but rather relies for its effect on collapsing any distinction between a lord's private emotions and his public political actions. In many cases, both feudal and shamed anger are present in a given emotion event; and they seem to be considered as distinct as are, for example, anger and sorrow, joy and reverence, or any other emotions commonly found grouped together. Where the core of feudal anger is the perception of either party that the terms of a feudal relationship have been violated, the core of shamed anger is the protagonist's sense that the shaming words are potentially true and that his honour is diminished. The opposite of feudal anger is love and the opposite of shamed anger is honour, but in both cases, the provocation of anger provides a drive to work toward its opposite state.

I will discuss battle rage and othering anger a little in Chapters 2 and 3, respectively, comparing them to certain manifestations of shamed anger. We will see there that, although battle rage and shamed anger are often provoked by a very similar emotion script, their resolution is very different. They belong to the same narrative and emotional style, and their close relationship allows authors to explore the boundaries of shame and honour and the contexts of permissible violence. Othering anger, however, is stylistically incompatible with shamed anger. They belong to different stories; and chroniclers may use them quite deliberately to effect a shift in genre within their narrative.

It should be noted here that the figure of *Ira* is often glimpsed, but is not a type of anger. She is the idea of anger not as emotion but as sin: consequently, she is invoked (by sign, not by name) when authors feel that one of their characters is excessive in their anger and begin to depict that anger in signs that recall the usual representations of the deadly sin. Signs of *Ira* are most likely to appear in othering anger, but they are not exclusive to it.

Chapter 2. Shamed anger

Provocative speech and the pursuit of honour

A knight stands up in the midst of a feast. In a loud voice, he calls his king the most cowardly man who ever lived, too craven to fight for his inheritance and doomed to die without it. Stung by shame, the king flies into a rage and vows retribution—but not against the knight who has insulted him. Instead, he vows to attack another man who holds his lands from him, and to regain his honour. In this case, the characters are Robert of Artois and Edward III in the verse chronicle *Les Voeux du Hérion* (80–118); but a very similar scene occurs surprisingly often in medieval narrative, and the disruptive words of the first speaker are hardly ever represented as transgressive.

The characters in question are usually friends: close allies, very likely family. A father might even call his own heir “you son of a whore”, like Edward I in the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, sharpening the apparent incongruity of his words (382). Yet these words, though they may seem violent or excessive at first glance, do not rupture that relationship. They do not even seem to give offence; and though the second character becomes angry, they speak not a word of reproach to their accuser.

This challenge is one of two common kinds of provocative speech act: specifically, the appeal to honour. Though the insults used are often indistinguishable from those used in hostile jeers, provocative speech is not hostile in the context of this script. The appeal to honour has a conventionalised function: an attempt to create shamed anger in the target, provoking them from inertia to honour-seeking action. The primary characteristics of shamed anger are that it originates in a threatened or actual diminution of a person’s honour, and that it leads to sustained action in an attempt to regain that honour.

This script is easily recognised in a narrative: the fierce words spoken by a friend, the resulting anger directed elsewhere, and its role in motivating the narrative that follows. It has a twin, however: another emotional script which follows a very similar pattern, but which is initiated by jeering speech instead. Both scripts raise the possibility of dishonour and set anger in motion to resolve it. Though there are differences in the intent and the outcome, the antagonist’s words and the protagonist’s signs of anger mirror each other closely enough that each script always invokes the possibility of becoming its twin—a rich ambiguity for an author to explore. The key difference between jeering speech and the appeal to honour is not the specific words employed, but the speaker’s intent—which may, on occasion, be misunderstood. The difference in outcome centres on whether the protagonist turns his

aggression on the speaker (usually battle fury) or another party (usually shamed anger)—or whether, perhaps, he fails to respond with any anger at all.

The script which is initiated by an appeal to honour (the A-script) makes a powerful framing device for narrative depictions of shamed anger, especially where the plot is based around a quest to regain honour or achieve vengeance. The B-script, on the other hand, suggests dishonour but puts that suggestion in the mouth of an enemy: the protagonist denies it immediately but the author may keep it in play by other means. Either script will invoke the possibility of dishonour, teasing its readers into judging the characters in those terms. This chapter examines the relationship between this pair of emotional scripts and the concept of shamed anger, exploring the nature and effect of provocative speech.

This chapter is also a direct demonstration of the methodology that I laid out in the previous chapter: it is an example of how, in a given text, one might use the signs and types of anger that I described as a starting point for a more sensitive, comparative textual analysis. Because of this, I spend more time in this chapter than in later ones describing (and in one case analysing) non-chronicle texts, to establish the continuity in authors' use of these emotional scripts across genres. In at least one instance, we find chroniclers and contemporary authors of non-historiographical narratives using the same scripts to unpack and examine the same cultural issues. It is probably not possible to say exactly to what degree these scripts reflect real emotional practice; but it does seem clear that there was substantial overlap, and that chroniclers, like other authors, could engage that to reflect on or challenge events in the world around them.

The A-script: appeal to honour

When an appeal to honour provokes shamed anger, the protagonist's anger is not directed at the antagonist. The antagonist states the cause of the protagonist's perceived dishonour, be it person or situation, and recommends or implies the best course of action to amend the situation. The protagonist's anger is directed at this cause.

The A-script involves three key stages: challenge, recognition, solution. The challenge is the initial provocative speech: an **appeal to honour**, in which the antagonist tells the protagonist that he is dishonoured. In the recognition stage, the protagonist acknowledges dishonour and exhibits **signs of shamed anger**. These may be internal or external signs, or a vocal statement of anger: they function only to signal the fact of his anger to the reader and to

the people present. The solution is the declaration of a course of action to remedy his shame. This is usually a **vow of violence** against the person or cause that the antagonist specified. If the antagonist suggested a course of action (“you must fight back against him or you are dishonoured!”), this vow will take up the suggestion and turn it into a more specific plan (“I will rally my men and attack him in this place within this many days”). The specific emotional signs used can vary, especially in the second stage—hasty movement, a flushed face, boiling blood, a recital of grievances, and so on—but the shape and character of the script remains the same.

Shamed anger drives the plot of *Raoul de Cambrai* until the death of the title character. The initial scene of shamed anger is crucial to the narrative, and is consequently given full treatment (laisses 32–33). It is both detailed and archetypal. The issue at stake is the title to certain lands: Raoul has a right to them, but they were gifted elsewhere by King Louis. Raoul’s uncle Guerri requests they be returned to Raoul—this request is denied. Guerri angrily declares his opposition to the judgement (“ce chaleng je!”, v. 479) and goes to find Raoul. Now comes our moment of provocation: Guerri rushes angrily (“par maltalant”, v. 481) into the room where Raoul is sitting peacefully playing at chess. All Guerri’s actions are rough and hasty. Seizing Raoul by the arm (tearing his mantle in the process), he insults him (“fil a putain”, “malvais lechieres”), demanding to know why he is calmly playing here when he has no lands (vv. 486–89).

These words—their accusation, their explanation, and their implicit recommendation of a particular emotional script—immediately spur Raoul on to a similarly violent state. Leaping to his feet, he speaks so loudly that the room shakes and everybody in the hall hears him (vv. 490–93). Guerri says that the king must hold him in dishonour to do such a thing—“bien te tient a honi” (v. 495). Raoul’s blood boils, he summons his men about him, and they all storm in angrily to see Louis. Raoul addresses the king with “grand maltalant” and demands the restoration of his lands, invoking his service to the king and his right to equivalent return (vv. 502–10).

When the king refuses, Guerri interjects, labelling Raoul “malvais et recreant” and swearing that if Raoul does not fight for his lands then Guerri and his men will never help him again (vv. 514–521). Though we have no reason by this stage to think that Raoul would back down from such a challenge, Guerri’s interposition seals the deal. Moreover, where before he only prescribed an emotional style, now he prescribes the course of action. Raoul has no choice but to issue his own vow to uphold his claim with war against his rival, since it would be to his “honte” to allow another man to hold his lands against him (vv. 524–533).

The narrator drives home the future effects of this vow:

This is the speech that Raoul was to stand by so unshakeably that many barons later died bloody deaths. (vv. 522–23)

This is a typical treatment of the “appeal to honour” version of the script for shamed anger. Guerri plays the antagonist, Raoul the protagonist, and the cause of shame is Louis giving Raoul’s lands to another man. Since Louis refuses to act, the solution becomes to displace anger from the king’s actions onto Raoul’s rival, and declare war on him. Raoul’s anger is never directed at Guerri, however. When a scene follows or implies this tripartite script, and particularly if it requires the protagonist to fight for his honour in the future, the anger in question is shamed anger—and, despite their violent words, the antagonist’s intentions are almost certainly friendly.

A crucial factor of a scene of shamed anger is that the action cannot possibly end with the provocative words and the protagonist’s initial surge of shame. The emotion of this scene gestures forward to future action: in a narrative context, that is its central purpose. Shamed anger is primarily seen not in a single moment but in the actions undertaken in order to overcome that shame.

The B-script: jeering speech

Not all verbal abuse, however, is so benign. The appeal to honour is only one of two kinds of provocative speech. *Jeering speech* can look very similar: the same insults, the same terminology, even a similar initial response from the protagonist. The emotional script which it initiates follows the same format, but it has several crucial differences.

The crucial difference between jeering speech and an appeal to honour is not the choice of words but the intent of the speaker. Unlike the antagonist of the A-script, the jeering antagonist wants the protagonist dishonoured. He or she will therefore be the protagonist’s enemy, and will usually be represented as evil or dishonourable by the narrative. The protagonist’s anger, instead of being used to attain some future goal, is directed at the antagonist. That is, the antagonist is identified with the cause of dishonour, rather than serving to point it out; and rather than acknowledging shame and using it to redress the matter, the protagonist rejects shame by defeating the antagonist (or tries to). Consequently, the protagonist’s anger is usually resolved in the course of the scene, rather than gesturing

forward to future action. The anger it provokes is usually battle fury: direct aggressive action, immediately reasserting honour and strength.

It is rare for jeering speech to be met with shamed anger. Shamed anger requires the protagonist to acknowledge some truth in the accusations of dishonour. An enemy who jeers is likely to be struck down very quickly, especially in a chivalric narrative, robbing his words of truth and his opinions of meaning. This is coloured by the general tendency in medieval narrative (not only as regards this emotional script) for jeering words to be associated with vice, rudeness, and low social status: that is, with the opposite of everything implied by the word “courtesy”. Instances of jeering group speech are also common—particularly a mocking crowd or pagans/devils tormenting a saint—which strengthens this association. (See the discussion of the *Brut* chronicle in Chapter 3.) Consequently, jeering speech is often used to mark a speaker as dishonourable or sinful, lacking in whatever virtues are prized by the genre in question. Think of Sir Kay in the Arthurian romance tradition: his jeers mark him as less than ideal in courtesy, and set us up for his failures in other aspects of knighthood, such as single combat. In the context of this emotional script, therefore, a hero who defeats a jeering enemy has demonstrated his superiority twice over. The B-script reads: challenge (jeering speech), offence (anger signs), solution (violence)—recognisably similar to the A-script, but with crucial differences in timing and intent.

Several chronicles attest that Piers Gaveston used insulting nicknames for various nobles when, after returning from exile, he felt secure in his position in Edward II’s affections. The chronicler of the *Vita Edwardi II* mentions this, and analyses how this exacerbated barons’ hatred of him, dismissing the idea that it was due only to his monopoly of the king’s favour. “It happens in almost all noble houses today that some one of the lord’s household enjoys a prerogative of affection,” the chronicler says, before speaking of his arrogance and insulting behaviour: “I therefore believe and firmly maintain that if Piers had behaved discreetly and humbly towards the great men of the land from the beginning, none of them would ever have opposed him” (26–29). The chronicler of the *Brut* presents the same conclusion differently, less analytical but more dramatic: Gaveston’s downfall is explained by presenting it in the form of the B-script for provocative speech.

... [W]hen [Gaveston] was comen aȝeyn into þis lande, he despisede þe gretteſt lordes of þis lande, and callede Sir Robert Clare Erl of Glouceſtre, ‘Horessone,’ and þe Erl of Lyncoln, Sir Henry þe Lacy, ‘Broſte bely,’ and Sir Guy of Warryk, ‘blanke hounde of Arderne.’ And alſo he callede þe noble Erl and gentil, Thomas of Lancaſtre, ‘Cherl,’ and meny othere ſhames and ſcorn ham ſaide, & by meny opere

grete lordes of Engeland, wherfore þai were towardes him ful angri
and sore annoiede.

[*The Earl of Lincoln dies, and charges his son-in-law and heir,
Lancaster, to maintain his quarrel against Gaveston.*]

... And so hit was ordeynede, þrouȝ helpe of þe Erle of Lancastir and
of þe Erl of Warrwyk, þat þe forsaide Piers was biheuedede at
Gauersiche bisides Warwik... (206–07)

We have here the same three stages as in the A-script—the challenge, a furious emotional response, and resolution—but the antagonist here is the target of anger, and suffers the wrath of the protagonist(s) directly. The ignoble enemy is put down, and order is—temporarily—restored. Note also that the protagonist has become a plural entity: a group of insulted people rather than a single hero. This does not alter the script, and the same may happen with the A-script: the large cast of characters in chronicles often leads to groups of characters performing emotion scripts in this way, especially when, as here, events are temporally compressed. The sequence of signs remains the same, and from a narrative point of view this counts as one “scene”. That is, the angry response of the barons and their decisive action against Gaveston follows immediately on from his insults, even though, logically, we realise that these events take place over a period of weeks or months. Consequently, we see no personal and embodied emotion signs, like Raoul’s hasty movements and flushed face: the narrative voice retains a certain distance.

The barons’ emotional reaction to provocative speech nevertheless follows the familiar B-script. The reader’s experience of it—and the reactions of Gloucester and the others to Gaveston’s insults—would have been influenced by the more affect-rich accounts of that emotion script narrated in *chansons de geste* (and, as we will see, in some chronicles). Consider *laissez* 93–95 of *Le Chanson de Roland*. Each *laisse* tells of an encounter between one of the French heroes and a Muslim nobleman – Roland, Oliver, and Turpin, against Aelroth, Falsaron, and Corsablix. Each follows exactly the same sequence: the Muslim insults France, the Frenchman becomes furious and slays his opponent, then the victor rebukes the dead body and cheers on his companions.

The nephew of Marsilie—Aelroth by name—rides first in advance of the army. And as he rides he says evil words of our Frenchmen: “Ye felon French [*Feluns Franceis*], to-day you shall joust with us. The one who should have protected you has betrayed you and the king was mad to leave you behind in the passes. To-day sweet France will lose her reputation [*perdrat France dulce sun los*] and Charlemaine will lose the right arm from his body.” When Roland heard this, God!

how angry he was [*si grant doel en out*]! He spurs his horse and puts it to the gallop and strikes at the heathen to the utmost of his force. He breaks his shield and tears open his hauberk, he cuts open his breast and breaks all his bones and cleaves him to the chine. He makes an exit for the soul with his lance. He has driven it in deeply and made the heathen's body totter and the length of his haft he has hurled him dead from his horse. He has broken his neck in two halves; but he cannot refrain from speaking to him: "Begone, son of a slave [*Ultre, culvert*]! Charles is by no means mad, nor did he ever tolerate treason. He acted like a brave man when he left us at the passes. Sweet France will not lose her reputation to-day. Strike, Frenchmen, the first blow is ours! The right is on our side and these felons are in the wrong." (Laisse 93)²⁸

Each of the three laisses repeats this sequence: the **challenge** (an insult to Charlemagne and a triumphant prediction that his knights will be defeated), the **fury** of the French knight (narrative statement of anger, hasty movement toward the enemy, offering him violence to clothes and to body), and the **solution** (defeating him). In all three cases, this is followed and emphasised by having the French knight return provocative speech to their enemy. Note again the differences from the A-script: their solution is not a vow of future violence, but immediate violent action directed against the antagonist. In light of this, the anger signs that precede it are not a *recognition* of dishonour, but a *denial* of it. Although they show traces of shamed anger—the same signs as we saw with Raoul—the French knights do not admit the shame so much as immediately disprove it. To emphasise this, they return similar jeering words to the corpse—who is unable to refute them. In this context, the initial *provocative speeches* (and the final replies) must be read as jeers, not as appeals to honour.

This script often appears on the battlefield or in another situation where the two parties are already poised for violence. This facilitates the shift to action in the form of murder or combat. A simplified version of this script is often used to dramatise accounts of battles. Two opposing knights meeting in battle, in almost any narrative genre, might exchange taunts

²⁸ Although this and the following two laisses describe what are ostensibly three separate incidents, they count as a single example. A triple repetition of *laisses similaires* is characteristic of this poet's dramatic and aesthetic technique—most famously, the moment in which Roland blows his horn is repeated in three consecutive stanzas, only slightly rephrased. In this case, the "rephrasing" includes changing the names of the characters, but there is very little difference otherwise between the laisses. This is not, therefore, three separate examples of the emotional script under discussion, but three different ways in which the poet might have said the same thing: in effect, three synonymous scenes. Laisse 94 may be found in the appendix.

before blows, or we might see something like Edward I's swift and thorough response when the Scots of Berwick speak mockingly of him: "When Kyng Edward herd þis scorn, anone þrouȝ his mightynesse he passede ouere þe diche, and assailed þe toun, & come to þe gates, and gete and conquered þe toune, and, þrouȝ his gracious power, quelled XXV MI & vij C of Scottes" (*Brut* 189). The result is battle fury being used to deny the possibility of the dishonour that has been suggested.²⁹

The key difference between jeering speech and appeals to honour is intent, and often the difference is clear from context. Content (that is, the choice of words) is not always a clear indicator, though on this occasion it too is obviously hostile. Still, there are enough similarities between this mockery and the words of Guerri to Raoul to deserve a closer examination.

Jeering and *appeals to honour* alike are often described as being spoken in loud tones, accompanied by other signs of anger such as violent body language. Both take the form of insults, often targetting the honour of the protagonist or the social group that they represent. Both result in a flush of fierce anger. The difference is that the friendly antagonist speaks up because they hold the protagonist's honour dear. Relative, friend, dependant, ally, sometimes even an enemy who is worthy of respect: whoever the antagonist is, their opinion must hold weight for the reader and for the protagonist. The true enemy wants to wound, not to mend.

This is where a difference may arise in the content of the speech: the friendly antagonist rebukes the protagonist for a particular failure and recommends or implies a future solution, while the hostile one delights in honour's loss. The protagonist's response takes this into account: they will acknowledge that there is truth or the possibility of truth in the words of a friendly antagonist, and will set out to fix it. In the case of a hostile antagonist, the protagonist (or the narrator) will deny the words' truth, implicitly or explicitly, and usually disprove them by direct and effective assault on the antagonist. In other words, the response of the protagonist plays a major role in characterising provocative speech—and that is something that a canny author can exploit.

²⁹ Speech acts that provoke a surge of battle fury on the field are not limited to jeering insults from the enemy forces. A leader might spur his fellows on to renewed valour (or fury) by saying how they will all be shamed if they lose, or by telling them that they are bound to win they have God, right, or strength on their side (e.g., *GM* 244–47). Classed together, these form a distinctive little narrative trope in their own right which could be the object of further study.

Engaging ambiguity: *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*

Why do these two different forms of provocative speech look so similar—in themselves, and in the angers they create? Is the anger that responds to jeers also shamed anger, and if not, why should the author enlist the possibility of shame?

As the terminology of this chapter suggests—“protagonist”, “antagonist”, “plot”—shamed anger is often associated with narratives that are essentially “literary” in nature. That is, shamed anger is more effective in texts whose author has been relatively active in shaping events into a cohesive story, and in which the action concentrates on the deeds and feelings of a small number of people. Clearly this emotional script was not confined to the page; but as I am accessing it via texts, I want to see the work that this Janus-like emotional script can be made to do in the hands of a master of fiction. We can then consider it in terms of the cultural work it does in the place and time of its writing, in conjunction with contemporary historiographical texts.

When he rides into the court of Camelot on Christmas day, the Green Knight suggests “a Christmas game” (283). He will give the magnificent axe he carries to the knight willing to strike him a blow with it—and to receive his return blow in twelve months’ time. When the strangeness of the terms leaves the assembled nobles of Camelot speechless, he looks around the table and laughs.

“What? Is this Arthur’s house” quoth the horseman then,
 “That all the renown runs through realms so many?
 Where is now your vainglory and your victories,
 Your ferocity and your grimness and your great words?
 Now is the revel and renown of the Round Table
 Overthrown by one word of one warrior’s speech,
 For all dither for dread without deed shown!” (309–15)

Which kind of provocative speech is this? Does the Green Knight’s speech fit the hostile script, or the friendly one? Both, of course: even at this early stage, the poet has established that everything in this poem is poised between two opposing possibilities. Most notably so far, the description of the Green Knight moves smoothly between wild and courtly, friendly and fierce. He laughs as he speaks, which seems like jeering; but his tone at first was courteous. The exchange of blows he suggests may be a game or a fight to the death, and this is ambiguous not only to the readers but to the characters within the story. The silence of the court, whether it be born from “doute” or “cortaysye” (246–47), is in its simplest terms also uncertainty as to how to interpret this invader/guest. Context is, therefore, deliberately

unhelpful; and that being the case, it would be unwise to rely on content and say that the Green Knight's words simply "feel" rude.

Les Voeux du Héron was written explicitly for and about the court of Edward III. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* may or may not have had a direct link with the court, but it is embedded in the same cultural context. Like *Voeux*, *SGGK* raises questions about the motivation behind the speaker's words—and like that chronicle, it uses this script to examine (and possibly to criticise) the response of king and court. After the provocative speech we expect the immediate emotional response: a flush of anger, directed against the antagonist or against a third party. Arthur makes his choice: he decides to interpret the speech as hostile, and he responds immediately with the next few signs in the B-script. He changes colour rapidly; is said to become "wroth"; advances on Green Knight (316–22); calls his words "nys" (foolish) and denies that any of his men are scared (323–25); and demands the axe himself, declaring that "I shall bestow the boon that thou hast begged" (327). The fact that the Green Knight explicitly invited an axe blow does not disqualify this as a "violent action", especially given its place in this sequence of signs: compare the very different way that Gawain picks up and handles the axe later in the scene. Just like Roland and his companions, Arthur responds to the Green Knight with a fierce anger that immediately turns into a battle fury, directed at the speaker—including hasty movement toward him and handling a weapon. That is how Arthur interprets the scene: jeering words, followed by the swift retribution that will immediately disprove them. If the Green Knight is really an enemy—that is, if Arthur succeeds in defeating him—then, by the logic of the script that Arthur is following, the intruder was wrong and Camelot was never shamed.

But in the moment before Arthur strikes, Gawain intercedes, with gently elaborate courtesy. Gawain's tone breaks the expected sequence of events and jolts us out of the script. He does not substitute it with the other script—this is not a case of one character playing out each of the alternate responses—but resets the scene to the moment after the Green Knight's provocative words, as if to allow the choice to be made again. And where Arthur has cast the Green Knight in the role of enemy, Gawain returns him to his previous ambiguous status by assuming the opposite. By addressing him respectfully, Gawain treats the Green Knight not as a malicious slanderer but as an honorable opponent—someone whose opinion may have weight.

Provocative speech, behavioural response, then solution. A friendly antagonist would have recommended a solution which, at this point, the protagonist would accept and vow to pursue. A hostile antagonist would be attacked in his own person. One scenario would

provide motivation for the future plot, the other would be resolved in the course of this scene. Did the Green Knight offer specific criticism and recommend a solution? Is the challenge he poses resolved within this scene, or does it continue to drive the remainder of the plot? Once again, the answer is “both”. The obvious criticism is spoken in a jeering tone and targets the cowardice of Camelot, and the implied solution involves attacking him. Arthur responds initially with battle fury, and he and Gawain and all of Camelot expect that the decapitating blow will not only prove Camelot’s courage but defeat the challenger at once. Like Roland’s opponents, the Green Knight should be silenced by the end of the confrontation, leaving Camelot’s voice triumphant.

But he picks up his head. He turns it toward the dais, and he speaks. He retains his words and his ability to challenge Camelot, and the threat he poses by so doing is *not* closed with this scene. And as we continue reading, we realise that he challenged Camelot to prove more qualities than simple physical courage. The Green Knight insulted Camelot not only for failing to respond immediately to his suggestion, but by implying that their reputation for courtesy and faith is unfounded; and Gawain’s task throughout the rest of the poem is to prove him wrong, not only by facing the final axe blow but by faithfully keeping his appointment and by his comportment in Bertilak’s castle.

The provoking words of the Green Knight do provide motivation for the whole poem—but not directly, not in a flush of battle rage or shamed anger sustained as a drive toward honour. That is offered as a possibility, and rejected. The qualities that are being tested are not exactly those that were impugned in the overtly mocking speech (“What, is this Arthur’s house?”), and Gawain does not, perhaps, realise this until the final revelation at the Green Chapel. Camelot as a whole never realises it. Gawain returns ultimately to a state of shamed anger targetted at himself, at the very moment when we would expect his quest to be complete and his honour restored. Since it cannot be resolved, the shamed anger subsides into shame, which he expects to be permanent. Camelot, on the other hand, considers the quest of their champion to be successfully accomplished, and the honour of their community to be restored. For them, shamed anger has been successful.

We have at least two different interpretations within the text of the results of the quest and of the qualities tested. The poet sets up these tensions, and invites the reader to consider their own response, by playing off these two emotional scripts against each other in the scene of the Green Knight’s initial challenge. Like *Pearl*, *Patience*, and *Purity*, which lie beside *SGGK* in the only manuscript witness to all four poems, this work invites minute reflection. How is honour to be defined? How can one appropriately and effectively respond when honour is

challenged? Does it even deserve its status as the highest courtly ideal? All these issues are gently laid open for inspection in the first confrontation, and their pieces are never entirely reassembled. The poet does not condemn the glorious court—Camelot is allowed to celebrate its victory—but he does offer it a mirror.

Since dishonour is an ever-present possibility, and shamed anger is the drive to move away from it, we can naturally expect a fierce response to any speech which suggests it. To the characters within the text, the fact that Arthur responds to the Green Knight by engaging the script for shamed anger proves that he recognises the possibility of dishonour and is immediately prepared to refute it. In many cases, as in the example from *Roland*, this is unambiguous: the narrator seems to agree (and expect the audience to agree) that the antagonist is wrong and the protagonist has proved his honour. In this case, Arthur leaps to the immediate solution—and then he is stopped, and we are stopped, and invited to think.

If this were an example of the classic B-script, the Green Knight's jeering words would be unjustified and would reflect badly on him, marking him as a discourteous oaf. But if he is justified—is Arthur then the oaf? Which of them is truly honourable, and how can he prove it? Why have them look the same in this case? To set up the possibility of dishonour and then to refute it—which leaves the possibility (for the author) of treating it more ambiguously, of engaging the way that these scripts work and the way the reader feels about them into the telling of a story. The status of provocative speech holds all these questions in precarious balance. In some cases it may not be resolved in the course of the text, but present a final demanding question.

Engaging ambiguity: *Les Voeux du Hérion*

Protagonist, antagonist, and plot. These terms are clear enough in the context of a fictional work: the Gawain-poet can shape his material however he likes. In historical writing, they become more complex: characters and events are, to a certain extent, pre-determined; but at the same time, those real historical people participate in a world whose dominant emotional styles are partly shaped by these narrative texts, including historical writing. I have not yet asked how closely this script might reflect real historical practice. Any of the three King Edwards has a discursive relationship with his narrative representations, as Raouls and Rolands and Gawains can never have.

Les Voeux du Héron is a verse chronicle, possibly satirical, written around 1346 and depicting the outbreak of the Hundred Years War. It is, in its entirety, a scene of shamed anger. This chronicler gives us Edward III as “protagonist”, with his lords following his emotional lead, and Robert of Artois (an exile from the Low Countries) as “antagonist”. The cause is Edward III’s failure to inherit the crown of France. Robert of Artois, having caught a heron, presents it to the merrily feasting court and challenges them to vow on it. Standing like the Green Knight in the glorious feasting court, he speaks loudly, calling everybody miserable failures (66–67):

“I believe I have caught the most cowardly bird
Of all birds, have no doubt of that,
...
And since it is cowardly, it is my intention
To give the heron to the most cowardly one
Who lives or has ever lived: that is Edward Louis,
Disinherited of the noble land of France,
Of which he was rightful heir; but his heart failed him,
And because of his cowardice he will die without it;
So he should vow on the heron and tell what he thinks.” (74–86)

This chronicle follows the A-script of shamed anger to perfection. Without a word of rebuke to the man insulting him in front of his court, Edward III responds with bodily anger against the King of France, then vows war to claim his inheritance.

When the king heard that, his face reddened.
His heart pounded [*fremis*] with anger and resentment [*d’ire et de mautalent*],
And he said, “Since ‘coward’ is thrown up to me,
I should defend myself, so I will speak my mind;
And if I live long enough I will see my vow realized,
Or I will die trying to accomplish it.” (87–92)

He goes on to specify plans for place and time. Nor is he alone in his response: the lords and knights in his court respond with identical shamed anger, each in his turn standing, sharing his anger, and uttering a similar vow. Though the chronicle ends after the vows are spoken rather than going on to tell of their accomplishment, most of the vows do predict or allude to events in the few years between the moment that the poem recounts and the date of its composition. In other words, the poem turns the opening of the Hundred Years War into a scene of shamed anger, casting the war itself as the “solution” which must be pursued to reaffirm Edward’s/England’s honour.

There is a strong focus on the spoken word as the poem moves between the speech acts of the lords and ladies present at the banquet. These include recitals of grievances, appeals to honour, and formal vows of anger, besides Robert of Artois' initial provocation. Walter Manny's speech, for example, is a typical vow of war: the particular accomplishment he promises is to destroy a certain city held by Godemars du Fay, burning it and slaughtering its inhabitants, and abandoning it with no wound to himself or his troops (232–51). All of these speech acts are “played straight” when it comes to their function as emotional signs: they follow the prototypical format and there is no hint of any discrepancy between what is said and what is felt. There is one exception: Robert of Artois himself.

Directly after Edward III vows war—before any of his other lords make their own vows in response—the narrative returns to Robert of Artois. He makes a speech of his own, a recital of grievances and a vow of war against the King of France, like that of every other lord, but it is not spoken aloud (119–45). This is a subversion of the more typical vowing speeches of the other nobles: though it has a similar format and structure it is remarkable in this text for being internal, and for the fact that he intends to bring about revenge not by direct martial action himself but by spurring others on to do it for him.

The contiguity between feeling and speech assumed of the other characters is emphasised shortly afterward when the Earl of Salisbury states his anger: “his mouth spoke the thought in his heart” (190). Although Robert's provocative speech functions in the text as an appeal to honour—that is, it initiates the narrative consequences and the emotional script of that appeal—Robert's premeditation and his pleasure in the scene give his words overtones of jeering as well. His insults seem to be motivated not purely by concern for his hearers' honour, but by a delight in offering them harm. The king and nobles, however, hear only an appeal to honour, driving them forward to noble action.

The “plot” that this anger initiates is external to the chronicle itself: a political and military situation which is still ongoing at the time of its composition, and in which most of its intended audience would have been actively involved. The poem recruits the moment of its own recital or reading into the story, reshaping that moment according to this narrative of honour and shame—although possibly in ironic terms. This engagement with the imagined future of the poem is heightened by the details of the first years of the war that were foretold in the vows. For those members of its early audience who heard it unironically, *Les Voeux du Héron* would potentially act as a stimulant, provoking them to share the shamed anger of the king and court and therefore to play their part as actors in the imagined future “chapters” of the story.

Failures of shamed anger

On the eve of the Battle of Bannockburn, according to the *Vita Edwardi II*, Edward shames the young Earl of Gloucester. Gloucester advised resting the tired troops for the day and attacking on the next morning, but “the king scorned the earl’s advice, and grew very heated with him [*excanduit*], charging him with treachery and deceit” (90). The earl’s furious desire to prove himself “neither a traitor nor a liar” leads him to fight rashly, rushing forward ahead of the others, and results in his death (93).

The confrontation is a brief scene, told in two sentences. The chronicler takes much longer over the battle and its results; and though Gloucester’s death and the circumstances surrounding it are the chief focus of the account, the chronicler does abandon his usual detached style to give us dramatic dialogue and personal interaction. Like most emotion events in lengthy chronicles, this brief exchange assumes that readers can recognise the emotional script and fill in the details of motivation, relationship, and behaviour for themselves. Being familiar with this script of shamed anger, from narrative examples or from lived emotional practice or both, readers would understand why a hot-headed young man in Gloucester’s situation must react as he does.

Mary Flannery points out how deeply by this period ideas of shame had become entwined with the ideals of chivalry. Dishonour is negative, naturally, but the Middle English word *shame* is more ambiguous: “as well as describing dishonor itself, it can refer either to the emotion resulting from an awareness of dishonor or disgrace, or to the *anticipation* of dishonor, the potential for disgrace to be experienced” (“Concept of Shame” 166). This tension between present/realised and future/potential dishonour is evident in the examples of shamed anger that we have been studying. The feeling itself, and the scripts surrounding it, are neither entirely positive nor negative, but help to negotiate that tension and resolve possibilities into action and social truth. In these texts, therefore, as in those that Flannery studies, “the ability to feel shame is not a negative thing, but is positive, generative, productive, and crucial to defining one’s social status or identity” (167). Gloucester is capable of feeling shamed anger, and feeling it includes engaging in the appropriate behaviours: striving to win back his honour. In other words, his ability to feel correctly marks him as a man of honour, one whose emotional practices are shaped by the chivalric ethos of shame and honour. Fighting well in the battle would not directly disprove the charges against him—he was not accused of cowardice—but it would prove him the kind of man incapable of being a traitor and a liar. Even if he has proved himself well in the past, honour is aspirational, not

absolute: it must be constantly proven and reproven, as it must for any of the characters in the examples so far.

A shaming challenge is a very real threat: it cannot be simply brushed aside on the grounds that a character has achieved honour before. Consequently, absence of anger in response to provocative speech can be an important negative comment on a character. The chronicle of Walter of Guisborough includes a confrontation between Edward I and his heir, shortly before the old king's death. The prince has asked his father to grant certain lands and titles to Piers Gaveston. The king responds with fury:

“You ill-born son of a whore, do you want to give away lands now, you who never won any? As the Lord lives, if it were not for fear of breaking up the realm you should never enjoy your inheritance.” And seizing his own hair in both hands he tore out as much as he could, and finally, exhausted, threw him out. (382–83)

This incident has often been cited as evidence of Edward I's irascible and violent temper—not least because it is almost invariably mistranslated to say that the king tore out his son's hair instead of his own.³⁰ Reading it in the light of previous examples, however, we can recognise Edward I's words as shaming speech: Guerri says almost exactly the same thing to Raoul, and Robert of Artois' words to Edward III differ only as to the circumstances. The king is attempting to provoke in his son an anger similar in effect to that of Raoul and Edward III: to make him cognisant of the shameful state that he has settled into, and to drive him on to more honourable behaviour. Whether or not Edward I “really” spoke in this way is beside the point: Walter of Guisborough and his readers would be so accustomed to narrative incidents of shamed anger that this speech would create the expectation of an immediate angry response. The prince, however, is completely inert: his father's hair-tearing and final exhaustion are tokens both of excessive anger and of despairing grief at this failure in his heir.³¹

³⁰ The Latin (“*apprehensis capillis vtraque manu dilaceravit eos in quantum potuit*”) omits a personal pronoun, as is usual for referring to one's own body parts. “*Apprehensis capillis*”—grasping/having grasped [the] hair—should therefore be read as reflexive. See Kilpatrick, “Edward I's Temper”, for further details and a discussion of the modern reception of this anecdote. It is attested in two chronicles: the other is the *Fineshade* chronicle, which may be found in the appendix, and which has suffered a similar error of interpretation based on a single pronoun: whether Edward I tramples the petition underfoot, or his son.

³¹ Similarly, Patricia DeMarco has shown how the *Siege of Jerusalem* warns Christians to be vigilant in maintaining their anger against Jews, in response to the suffering of Christ. This is battle rage, not shamed anger, but it does offer another instance of a lack of anger being represented as a weakness.

Raoul de Cambrai too fails a parental appeal to his honour, but his failure is the direct opposite to that of Edward of Caernarvon: too much anger, rather than too little. Rather than promising to amend his behaviour, he turns his wrath on his mother, as if she were the enemy (*laisse* 94). When she hears about Bernier, Alice is very angry and shouts at the top of her voice (“a haute vois”, v. 912). Raoul is beside himself (“le sens quida changier”, v. 922) and swears that he will not settle: he insults her, saying that only a cowardly nobleman seeks advice from a woman, and that she should be lying around getting fat and eating and drinking in her chamber, which is all that she is good for. She weeps (“si prist a larmoier”, v. 932) and reminds him of the services she has done him, then curses him with death in battle if he should persist. With a troubled heart (“ot molt le cuer mari”, v. 960), she then goes to church and prostrates herself before the cross to try to take the curse back.

By this stage in the poem, we recognise that Raoul’s anger is becoming immoderate. Though his response to Guerri’s appeal to honour at the beginning of the poem was normative and valorised, the narrator and characters around him have become less impressed by the excesses of his fury as the story progresses. Directly after his scene with Alice, Raoul rides into his rivals’ territory and orders his men not only to attack Origny (a town which had defied him earlier) but to sack and defile the church, to pitch his tent in there, and to rape the nuns. With reluctance, they begin to obey, but at the sound of the church bells cannot bring themselves to proceed, and so they make camp in the field outside. When Raoul arrives he rebukes his men for not putting his tent just where he ordered it, and the language he uses is exactly the language that has been established in this poem as provocative speech: “fil a putain” (vv. 1087 and 1094), “fel glouton souduiant” (v. 1087), and “molt estes ore cuvert et mal pensant” (v. 1088) (“You sons of whores, you treacherous, low-born villains! How base and wrong-headed you can be”, *laisse* 61–62). Even if the context of the irreverence and his soldiers’ responses were not adequate comment, the narrator makes it clear that he is acting: “beyond measure” (v. 1093). Guerri himself, who earlier goaded him on to anger, now echoes that sentiment—“you are *desmesurez*”—and adds, in an ominous echo of Alice’s curse, “If God takes against you, you won’t last long” (vv. 1098, 1100). The exchange with Alice is a clear point of no return. Not only has Raoul committed himself to vengeance beyond the restraints of counsel and reason, but he has received a curse that will, like most curses and vows, guide the narrative until it is accomplished. Raoul has here become the cause of his own dishonour, but rather than determining to defeat that cause, he turns his anger unjustly on his antagonist. In a sense Alice’s curse is a feminine version of the vow of future action that closes the classic

A-script: unable to enact revenge herself, she invokes it against her son, the cause of his own dishonour.

No text exists in a vacuum. *Les Voeux du Héron* was written in a courtly context, where it stood a fair chance of being read or heard by its intended audience—including those potential patrons featured in the poem itself. At this stage, we must consider the possibility that the text itself may function as shaming speech within its own social sphere. There are other texts that also seem to attempt to take the role of shaming speech onto themselves, even if they may not have direct access to their target.

The *Anonimalle* chronicle continually and explicitly shames Edward II, describing most of his actions with variants on “to his great *deshonur* and to the *deshonur* of the realm”. It was, however, written in York, after his death. If it does attempt to stimulate honourable action in a royal (or lordly) reader it can only be indirectly: presenting its readers with an image against which to judge Edward III, and an emotional standard to which they might hold him (and themselves). The *Annales Paulini*, written at Winchester or St Paul’s during Edward II’s reign, is more circumspect in its criticism. Rather than shaming him with the authorial voice, it places shaming statements in the mouths of many characters. The most vicious of these are attributed to characters such as Robert Bruce, whose words are framed as the vitriol of a discourteous enemy:

This tyrant, amongst the many blasphemies which he vomited forth in his abuse of the king of England, claimed to fear the bones of the dead king [*Edward I*] more than he feared the one who lived; and that it would have been a greater military glory to win half a foot of land from the King Edward who was gone than to win a kingdom from him who was left. (265)

This phrasing allows the author the safety of a certain distance, but he repeats Bruce’s words all the same. Moreover, the chronicler’s criticisms throughout are suspiciously similar in intent (if not so vitriolic in their expression), focussing on a contrast between the old king and the new, and a failure of the glory of the old order. He labels Bruce’s words as jeers, but in the context of the chronicle, they may possibly have a deeper purpose. Diana Greenway has argued that there was a distinct tradition of historical writing at St Paul’s with a semi-official advice function, favouring the production of manuscripts with a focus on political events, government, and international relations. If this chronicle was intended as part of such a tradition it may have had the possibility of “speaking” directly to the king: that is, to take on the role of provocative antagonist. In this context, speeches like those of Robert Bruce may be read as an attempt to prompt Edward II specifically to anger against the Scots, and generally

to a more appropriate emotional style. Whatever the specific intents of this chronicler, we must not ignore the possibility of authors deliberately engaging the ambiguity of provocative speech to criticise or deconstruct historical figures or events.

I suggested earlier that the audience or reader of *Les Voeux du Héron* who does not recognise the text's ironic or subversive elements might take part in the text's "plot" by being motivated to avenge king and country's shame against France. There is, however, some evidence to suggest that the poem might undercut its own apparent valorisation of the vows of almost every participant.³² Identifying irony across a significant culture gap is always a risky business, but if this text *does* mock Edward III and his court (even if in undertones) then it may have an even more powerful effect: the singer or book becomes Robert of Artois, deliberately inciting shamed anger in the audience. This would be all the more effective in a text likely to be read aloud or performed to a group audience. If so, this potentially subversive text might be read as an attempt to unite king and court, goading them on to unified and honourable action.

In *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and *Les Voeux du Héron* we see two courts responding to provocation from a person with a hidden agenda. Both kings respond hastily: and although each chooses a different script, both give the impression that they see less than the audience of the speaker's meaning and motivation. This effect is comparatively subtle in *SGGK*, implied by the mystery built up in the description of the Green Knight, the refusal of the narrative voice to characterise him as a villain/monster, and the trace of immaturity in Arthur and his court. In *Voeux*, on the other hand, we are explicitly privy to hidden knowledge in the form of Robert's internal monologue. In both cases, too, the court is a magnificent place, all spectacle and courtliness and celebrated valour. Great future deeds are promised, and there is elegant deferral to the ladies present, who are invoked to set the tone and to confirm the quest-vows of the men. The *excessive* valour of the king and court's initial response to provocation is perhaps undercut, perhaps even mocked; but that image of the glorious court remains intact and aspirational. Within that setting, both authors use this emotion script to study (and invoke?) the behaviours that create and result from the honour culture as epitomised by that feasting court—and to highlight the speed with which these quick responses can launch long-lasting quests, actions, and violence.

We can already begin to see here how a chronicler may use emotional scripts as an evaluative tool, linking the events or figures in their story into this or that tradition of anger

³² The editors discuss each of the vows from this point of view in the introduction to the text (11–14).

and prompting their audience's engagement, and their reflection. Given that (for example) *SGGK* and *Voeux* are for a very similar audience, and employ such similar techniques, it would be foolish to expect that the audience in question was not capable of reading below the surface level and recognising irony or criticism in the case of *Voeux*, when a text like *SGGK* invites such deep reflection and analysis. There is more work to be done here, especially in linking emotionality with medieval textuality, and with reading practices. These texts might be spoken or imagined as spoken, catching at the fierce immediate emotional responses of excitement and pride, but they could also can be contemplated as a physical object, inviting intimate and measured responses. Such a study would be particularly rich with texts that we can prove to have been read in several different ways—in solo (silent?) reading, aloud in small groups, in performance for a larger audience, and so on—crossing the boundaries between social and interior, and between private reflection and embodied emotion.

Shamed anger, then, functions within the text to set up a paradigm of shame versus honour which the character must negotiate. However, shame/honour is not the dominant paradigm in every text, or even for every story or anecdote within a given text. That is a question of genre: it depends on the style of narrative into which the text is shaped. I have already suggested that chroniclers' choice between feudal and shamed anger is loosely linked to genre, because these two types of anger invite different approaches, both from authors and from readers. But there are other emotional styles with far more dramatic differences, which give much more weight to that question of moral evaluation. In some stories anger figures as a loss of self-control with no positive figuring at all, and in these cases the key distinction is not shame/honour or anger/love, but calmness/wodeness: *Patientia* and *Ira*.

Chapter 3. Honour or sin?

The emotional style of genre

Ira

The figure of Ira is defined by a vast and influential history of the iconography of vices and virtues, and of the seven deadly sins. By the late medieval period, she embodies the rich cultural discourse around anger as a sin. Her primary characteristics have their origins in a tradition initiated and dominated by a poem by the early-fifth-century poet Prudentius. The *Psychomachia*, which depicts seven Virtues battling and defeating their associated Vices, was copied in high numbers throughout the Middle Ages, and usually illustrated. The poem itself was popular: the idea was more so, and the characterisations of the Vices and Virtues—as well as the idea of opposing allegorical figures locked in battle—became deeply embedded in medieval culture.

In the *Psychomachia*'s conflict between Ira and Patientia, a destructive wild Ira flings weapon after weapon at an unresponsive Patience, and eventually, in her fury, falls on her own spear and destroys herself. The visual signs associated with this Ira are essentially the negative extreme of all those in the “affect and actions” list of signs given in Chapter 1: wild distortion of feature and body, a grimacing expression with wide eyes and a snarling open mouth (often with an extended tongue), hair standing on end, flailing limbs, torn hair and clothing; and then, hasty uncontrolled movement, violence to herself and others, bloody or flaming weapons, and an association with the colour red. Patientia, meanwhile, is the opposite of these: tall, serene, slender, immovable, with pale elegant features that express nothing at all, folded hands and neat hair.

None of these qualities exists in a void. Patientia and Ira are defined by comparison with each other, but also in reference to a complex iconographic tradition. Setting aside for a moment the characteristics that particularly identify Ira—self-harm/suicide, associations with the colour red, the excess of violence—many of her other characteristics are not unique to her, but are more akin to species markers. The contrast between chaos and stillness, between chaotically flailing limbs and a slender upright figure, between emotional distorted features and facial impassivity, is a key indicator of evil versus good in medieval visual culture

more generally. Lester Little and Jennifer O'Reilly have both found similarities between Ira and other vices, demons, and tormentors of Christ or other martyrs, and between Patientia's elegant impassivity and angels, Christ, and saints. Debra Hassig goes further, establishing a visual continuity between representation of Jews, evil, the monstrous or subhuman, the racial other, social or cultural outcasts, the things that inhabit the margins of the map or of humanity, and the demonic. The list of signs she identifies—"ill-proportioned bodies, contorted postures, and ugly facial features which might include bulging or crossed eyes; large, pointy, or bulbous noses; mouths with fleshy lips; pointy or missing teeth; grotesque expressions; ruddy or dark skin; and facial blemishes"—is matched almost one for one with the lists of signs by which Little and O'Reilly identify Ira (29). This is not to say that Ira is just another demon. For one thing, demons and torturers in particular are often explicitly said to be angry in their frustration at the strength or impassivity of good, so that anger itself becomes a characteristic of representations of evil. However, Ira is inextricably linked with what Hassig calls a "general visual code expressive of sin, evil, barbarity, and subhumanity" in medieval representation (25). Shamed anger and feudal anger may have positive aspects: Ira is unambiguously evil.

For my purposes, the existence of this tradition is an important point of reference—but I will not treat Ira in any great depth. This is partly because she is, by definition, an extreme, and therefore comparatively simple and unsubtle. She gives very little room for analysis, and chroniclers seem to have found her similarly unproductive. Ira rarely appears in historiography, and when she does it is not *in propria persona*, but *in potentia*. Her crimson shadow looms whenever anger is in question, as a possibility of maddened excess: of the consequences when anger, whatever its cause, goes too far. Chroniclers invoke the *Psychomachia* tradition by describing Irate behaviour, or, by extension, its opposite. If one character rages at another who stands still and patient, or a character goes red and threatens violence and harms themselves, Ira and Patientia are the most immediate referent.

Ira is not a *type* of anger in these texts, like the other types that I have listed. She is the deadly sin: an anger taken to vicious excess, whatever its initial cause. Othering anger, for example, is usually drawn in imitation of Ira, precisely to create that sense of alterity that Hassig describes, but Irate behaviour and imagery are not limited to othering anger. The strict doctrinal position may be that anger is always negative, but almost all chroniclers allow that there are some situations in which anger is justified or can act as a positive social force. Any type of anger, however, can be indulged to excess. Ira invokes the deadly sin, with all its

fascinating violence and all its cultural history; and as such she is, in these texts, simply the point of no return for any type of anger at all.

Writing a martyr: Thomas of Lancaster in the *Brut*

Both Ira and shamed anger are defined in large part by their opposites, Patientia and honour: they exist as one half of a pair. While each could be viewed as the negative half of a binary, their relationship to these opposites differs. Ira is always negative. If a chronicler even hints at the Ira/Patientia opposition—by providing a Patientia-like figure as a counterpoint, for example—then anger is to be shunned. By contrast, we have seen that shamed anger has positive uses: the ability to feel it is an important quality of the noble or heroic soul, and it is a productive spur to the pursuit of honour. Shamed anger and Ira also differ in their relationship to plot. I wrote earlier that shamed anger demands a story: it implies past inertia or affront, and future action. That story, moreover, is a very personal one, depending on the assumption that an individual character can change and grow. But Ira does not require a narrative, and can erase personality altogether. In many cases, the character in question will be described as being angry by nature rather than in response to any particular event: Geoffrey le Baker's Queen Isabella, as we will see, is a wrathful raging virago for whom the sin of *ira* is the ground state of being. Similarly, in the *Brut*, Roger Mortimer “as a Deuel for wrap, bolnede for wrap þat he hade toward the Kynges men”: though a reason for anger had been mentioned earlier, his anger here has become a continuous state of being, and the chronicler makes its demonic aspects explicit (268–69). This is the raging Vice, with all its connections to demons “and other monstrous races” (as Hassig expresses it in her title). Where Ira appears she denies all possibility of negotiation or debate.

These two systems, Ira versus Patientia and shamed anger versus honour, are incompatible with each other: it is almost impossible to have both competing models of action and restraint active at the same moment in a narrative text. Where an Ira/Patientia model has been activated in a story, not fighting—not responding to injury—is a virtue. If shamed anger is in play, the lack of an anger response is a weakness or, worse, evidence of an ignoble soul. If we are to understand our text we must recognise which model is active in the narrative. The incompatibility of these models makes them useful for examining the relationship of genre to emotional style.

The term “emotional style” is usually applied to social groups or situations in the real world, but the same principle holds true of genres. Every genre is defined, at least in part, by its characteristic emotional style. Loosely speaking, a story belongs to a given genre if enough of its traits—plot events, subject matter, character type, themes, moral tone—are recognisably close to the mean for that genre. Emotional style belongs in this list of traits: think of the difference between the emotionality of a typical thriller movie and that of a romantic comedy. In the context of genre, emotional style would encompass the pattern of emotional behaviour that we expect to see on the part of the characters—which emotional reactions we see, which ones are valorised and in which circumstances, the degree to which they are indulged—as well as the anticipated reactions of the reader. Shamed anger is most characteristic of a chivalric narrative: a scene of shamed anger will invoke the emotional style of that genre, and engage the reader’s other experiences of that genre as a frame of reference. On the other hand, a chronicler may include a confrontation between figures like Ira and Patientia to shift the story toward a more moralising tone, or even all the way to the emotional style of hagiography.

When it comes to chronicles, *shift* is the right word: most chronicles tell many stories, one after the other, collected from many different sources. This is particularly obvious in the earlier sections of universal chronicles—chronicles which seek to tell the whole history of the world—which may include legends, hagiography, genealogies and so on. Even in the more continuous narratives of later years chroniclers will change genres freely according to how they want to shape a given episode or character; and emotional style is a powerful tool for the chronicler to effect that shift.

The key moment in the *Brut* where we shift into a martyr narrative is the confrontation between Thomas, Earl of Lancaster and Sir Roger Clifford ([217](#)). This is the end of the doomed rebellion of 1321–22. The remaining barons have fled north to the Earl of Lancaster at Pontefract. It was generally felt that Lancaster was far too powerful for the king to move against him; and so the outcome of the war was a profound shock for many, including the *Brut* chronicler. In Brie’s EETS edition the events of the first twelve years of Edward II’s reign take up only pages 207–12, having mostly to do with the battles against the Scots; the rise of the Despencers and the beginnings of the civil war are given more attention from 212–15, as a sort of prologue or context; and then, as Lancaster is brought to the fore, the chronicler moves into a detailed, passionate, and carefully crafted story.

Having assembled at Pontefract, Lancaster and those with him are “wonder wroþ” at the news that the Mortimers have surrendered and are imprisoned in the Tower of London

(215). They assemble their power and move to battle. This wrath is positive feudal anger, directed upward at their lord for his betrayal of the feudal bond. Lancaster functions as a good leader here, sharing his anger with his followers and moving them as one body into decisive action. One and a half pages are devoted to the battle of Burton-on-Trent and its results—including the desertion of Robert Holland, whom Lancaster “hade brouȝt vp of nouȝt, and hade norisshede... in his botelerie” (216). Now, Lancaster takes counsel with his remaining barons at Pontefract. All the barons agree that they should retreat north to Dunstanburgh, but Lancaster objects: “if we gone toward þe north, men wil seyn þat we gon toward þe Scottes; and so we shul be holde traitoures”. At this dramatic point, Clifford waxes wroth and threatens him with drawn sword; Lancaster, “sore adrade”, concedes (217). The company will retreat north, only to be intercepted and defeated at Boroughbridge by Sir Andrew Harclay.

Until this point the chronicler has not overtly taken sides, beyond the occasional disapproval of damage done by one side or the other. Now, however, he is implicitly refuting the royal narrative of the rebellion. In that story, Lancaster is the prime mover of the treacherous rebellion and intends to set himself on the throne with the help of the Scots, in exchange for recognising Robert Bruce as King of Scotland. In the *Brut* version, Lancaster had little to do with the early stages of the war, moving against Edward II only when called on by the other barons. The chronicler provides various foils in the form of “real” traitors (Holland and Harclay, besides the ever-vicious Scots) to set in contrast to the saintly Lancaster. Moreover, the royal version of events claims that Lancaster fled north with the remaining barons to shelter with his prospective allies—hence the political significance of pausing on his debate with Clifford, and dramatising it with direct speech and gesture.

But the chronicler does more with this scene than simply state his opinion of Lancaster’s guilt. He uses it to begin the shift into a martyr tale. In this chronicler’s account of earlier years Lancaster’s opposition to Edward II was political in tone. While he was always virtuous, his virtues were more feudal and chivalric—for example, his consent to the execution of Piers Gaveston comes in recognition of the harm that Gaveston is doing to the realm, and in obedience to deathbed promises to his father-in-law, the Earl of Lincoln, and his brother and former king, Edward I (206–07). Piety, yes, but a piety bound up in social ties and mutual respect, and narrated in a political context rather than a religious one. The same priorities are evident in the account of the baronial resistance in 1318–21, against the Despensers, in the frequent insistence that they abuse and disinherit landholders weaker than themselves. But once the martyr narrative is active these are neither the primary motivators for Lancaster’s actions, nor the reasons offered for admiration and sympathy. In the

confrontation with Clifford, Lancaster outright rejects the expected shame/honour structure. He fails to respond to challenge with shamed anger: in fact, he is explicitly said to be afraid. This is a startling moment—is he a dishonourable coward? But no: it signals the beginning of Lancaster the pacifist—Lancaster as Patientia—and the very fact that it recalls and subverts a scene of typical scene of shamed anger is an explicit sign to the audience of the moment of genre shift. Clifford's hasty movement, the drawn sword, the rising in wrath, the threat of physical violence: he takes on shades of Ira here, and we see her more clearly in other characters in the pages that follow.

From this point until his execution (223), Lancaster becomes more and more explicitly a saint. He prefers talk over fighting, makes prophecies about the fates of others, prays aloud, and is repeatedly compared to Christ and to Thomas Becket. He also endures the Irate fury of his tormentors, as we would expect of Patientia and of Christ or any other martyr. Chief among them is Sir Andrew Harclay, established as a false traitor by the narrative voice and by Lancaster's dire prophecy (218–19). Thanks to the chronicler's knowledge that Harclay was within the year to be executed for colluding with the Scots himself, he can serve as Lancaster's main foil—the real traitor to the realm, and the instigator of indignities. He taunts Lancaster before the Battle of Boroughbridge and captures him after it, “jellynge as a wolfe”, setting his “vileins ribaudes” on him and tearing him (Becket-like) out of his sanctuary in the church “as tiraunt3 and Woode turmentures” (219–20).

Over the next few pages Lancaster is surrounded by these loud voices, violent movements, and jeers, turning his passage to execution into a recognisable *via dolorosa*. From “the gode Erl” (217) he becomes “þe noble Erl” and “gentil” (219). Upon hearing the sentence of death, he evokes the spirit of Christ's “why have you forsaken me”, crying out “Allas, Seint Thomas, faire fader! Allas! shal y be dede þus? graunt me now, blisseful God, ansuere!” (222). He is dressed in rags and dragged to his doom by more evil foreigners (Gascons, this time), and jeered and assaulted by the crowd. (This being March in Yorkshire, their chosen weapon is snowballs.) As he is led to the block, he moves patiently according to his captors' will. He achieves an “into thy hands I commend my spirit” moment, resigning himself and the land to the King of Heaven, “for þe erpely Kyng hap vs forsak”. In a final indignity, “a Ribaude þat men callede Hugon of Moston” mocks him and refuses to let him face east to die, turning him north instead “toward þe Scottes, þin foule deth to vnderfonge [undergo]”. He answers obediently “wiþ a milde voice” and dies, to be lamented by the chronicler (223).

A brief interlude follows: Edward II suffers a defeat against the Scots and Sir Andrew Harclay, recently elevated to the earldom of Carlisle for his part in the defeat of the rebellious

lords, is himself executed for colluding with the Scots (226–28). Lancaster’s prophecy is fulfilled, and with it his holy status. The following three pages contain stories of the miracles done in his name, which is the usual conclusion to the tale of a saint’s life, while the chronicler refers to him repeatedly as “þe holy man,” “Seynt Thomas,” and “þat holy martr” (228–30).

In this context ordinary chivalric indicators of virtue and honour become irrelevant or negative, in favour of the vices-and-virtues take on emotion. To read the text correctly one has to be able to recognise the shift from one kind of story to another: this is the shift of emotional style. Shamed anger and Ira belong to very different kinds of stories, so different that they cannot co-exist. But an author can effect subtler shifts with their choice of emotional style. Shamed anger and feudal anger can each exist quite comfortably in the same chronicle, or even within the same scene. Though they do not contradict each other, they do still invoke a different pattern of responses. The author may use this to evaluate or implicitly discuss the character in question, but also to shift those expectations by which the reader considers other behaviours, or to change the focus of the story as a whole. Invoking feudal anger directs attention to one particular relationship, while also inviting the reader to consider how effectively the immediate social group (usually the lord’s *maisnée*) functions as a unified political whole.

Debating styles: *Anonimalle* and Geoffrey le Baker

This is the kind of anger that the *Anonimalle* chronicler would like to see in his kings. I will discuss feudal anger in more detail in the next section: for now it is enough to know that a key moment in any account of a lord’s feudal anger is the response of his followers, when they (should) all rally with him and feel as he does. The *Anonimalle* chronicler is not fond of Edward II, and his main criticism is Edward II’s lack of emotional engagement with his barons. Consequently, this chronicler sets up scenarios where we would expect the king to respond with feudal anger; he emphasises Edward II’s lack of connection with his men; and he writes of his secret inner anger instead. Geoffrey le Baker, however, takes the other side of the argument. For him, Edward II is a hero, and he adroitly engages the emotional styles of hagiography and romance to recast actions and events which are evidence of failure and vice to the *Brut* and *Anonimalle* chroniclers.

For the *Anonimale* chronicler, as for most, the character of Piers Gaveston represents the controversy of Edward II's reign as a whole. His account of Gaveston's death is typical of his attitude to the king:

... where he was judged by the peers of the land. And then from there he was taken to a stream which is called Gaversiche and there he was beheaded... When the king heard and understood how sir Piers Gaveston had been put to death by the lords of the country he was greatly angered and annoyed [*durement coroucee et irre*] and he secretly contemplated in his heart all the time how to revenge himself [*pensa privement touz jours en son quoeer de sei venger*] when he should see the opportunity on those who had assented to his death. (86)

As we will see in Chapter 4, expressions like “when he heard the news he was greatly annoyed (and took aggressive action)” are a standard shorthand in historiographical narrative for a performance of feudal anger. It may read to us as a laughably inadequate response to the murder of the man that the chronicler has told us Edward loves most in all the world; but feudal anger is almost always synonymous with a public declaration of war or punishment. In its cultural context, this line does not mean “the king was irritated”, but “this caused a serious formal breach between the parties”. Chivalric and historiographical narrative place great emphasis on emotional leadership, on the emotional unity between king and barons and land. Invoking feudal anger at this point positions us firmly in the world of feudal relations, in the genre dominated by those social ties and emotional values. Edward's anger, which should be used to unite him with his men against a common enemy, drives them apart instead. Instead of taking on the public role of emotional leadership he remains *privé* (always a negative word for this chronicler): closed up within his heart, plotting vengeance against his own people.

Geoffrey le Baker, recounting the same event, draws instead on an emotionality more common to the romance and similar genres, with their higher ratio of internalised and individualised feelings. Instead of writing Edward II in a story that would cast him as the leader of a community, and see him fail to measure up to a proper heroic standard, Geoffrey le Baker lets him begin to look something like a tragic hero of romance.

... on 19 June [Warwick] had Piers beheaded before their eyes at a place called Gaversike. The king committed his body to honourable burial in the church of the Dominican friars at Langley.

...

In this year the king had such joy in his baby son and in his queen, whom he loved deeply and cherished tenderly [*nimum dilexit et tenerrime confovit*], that, to avoid causing her any uneasiness

[*molestie*], he concealed the distress [*moleste*] which he felt at Piers' death. But his foresight had its limitations, for he did not know where to find a loyal friend [*fidei*] with whom he might share his secret plans or to whom he might entrust his life when it was in danger. For the death of Piers had openly or secretly stopped many nobles from being his friends. Also while the king himself neglected warfare and spent his time on amusements which were sometimes real but sometimes a pretence, and while the nobles of the realm were busy with seizing the moment to put Piers to death, Robert Bruce captured almost all the castles and forts of Scotland, and removed or killed the custodians assigned to them by the king and his father.

(Geoffrey le Baker trans. Preest, 5–6)

At the moment of Gaveston's death, Geoffrey avoids any mention of the king's personal emotions. We see nothing but an appropriate and pious public ceremonial response. It is only in the aftermath that we see personal grief from Edward. In this way, the narrative emphasis is deflected from the communal function of the king's emotions to a more individual level. Geoffrey acknowledges the privacy of Edward's emotions, but represents this as responsible leadership in the more intimate social context of his immediate family: Edward does not wish to cause any harm to his wife and his newborn heir. He acknowledges some responsibility on Edward's part for the Scottish invasion; but this is attributed primarily to the rift between the king and his barons, an internal division which brings about a direct assault from without on the "body" of the nation.

Both the *Anonimalle* chronicler and Geoffrey le Baker portray Edward as cut off from the emotional community of his baronage in one way or another, but they differ on where to place the fault. In the *Anonimalle* chronicle "the peers of the land" are united and pass legal judgement on Gaveston together: it is Edward who chooses to withdraw from this common accord and plot future division. For Geoffrey le Baker, the barons are at fault, both in the murder of Gaveston (which results not from judicial consensus but from Warwick's hostility and Pembroke's broken oath) and in their bickering and treachery that leaves their king unable to trust anybody, exposing the realm to attack from the Scots.

With Gaveston's murder, the king has been wronged as comprehensively as possible by the men with whom he ought to share a powerful bond of love. As we will see in the next section, feudal love is the opposite of feudal anger, and feudal anger appears when that love bond is violated. Now, if ever, a medieval reader would surely anticipate an eruption of anger from the king: a tirade about the wrongs done to him and trust betrayed, a decisive statement cutting himself off from the barons in question and declaring his anger, while the barons who

remain faithful unite behind him in shared outrage. The historical fact that this did not happen is, in narrative terms, awkward: the expectation of firm action hangs over this moment as a pattern against which to evaluate Edward's behaviour. The *Anonimalle* chronicle acknowledges it directly and flatly states that Edward failed to perform as he ought: instead of a public scene of this kind he remains hidden and turns inward, nurturing a socially dysfunctional anger in his heart towards the people with whom he ought to be united. Geoffrey le Baker, by contrast, carefully omits mention of any private emotion at the moment of Gaveston's death, showing us instead an appropriate and pious public ceremonial response. It is only in the aftermath that he attributes personal grief to Edward, and his insistence on keeping his emotions hidden is for the sake of Isabella and the future Edward III. Rather than showing us a failed public figure Geoffrey shifts the emotional setting to the domestic sphere, with one man suppressing his private grief for a beloved companion in order to provide effective emotional leadership to his household.

If this were all, however, it would not be enough to exonerate Edward II, in Geoffrey's account. So far his genre play amounts only to a little shifting of the focus from the king's public image to his domestic life, a hint that if he cannot provide emotional leadership for the realm he can at least do it within his immediate family. But Geoffrey goes further: this is part of a larger pattern of reframing Edward II's emotionality into a different kind of story. His love for his wife, and the treachery that surrounds him: these are the notes on which Geoffrey plays to change the genre Edward inhabits altogether, from the chivalric style of chronicle (which he does not suit) to a blend of tragic romance and hagiography. The same themes resurface with greater detail and greater pathos for the episode of Edward's deposition and death. Here, he becomes a patient martyr: he is, in fact, a figure of Christ and of Patientia, as Lancaster is in the *Brut*. This neatly brushes aside any question of failure in war or in anger by idealising quiet suffering, and casting his enemies as demonic tormentors—or, indeed, as Ira. In rapid succession Edward is compared to Jesus facing Caiaphas and the wicked priests, the "good shepherd" of John 10:11 (26), "the poor crucified one", "a monk-like recluse", and a "servant of God" (27), constructing an explicit parallel between his suffering and Christ's Passion. But the Patient Christ is not the king's only emotional model here. Within moments, and with no apparent change in tone, we read this:

This servant of God, even when he had sunk to the depths,
complained of no misfortune except that his wife, whom he was not
able not to love, did not want to see him, although he had lived a
widower from her embraces for more than an year, and that she did

not allow their son, the new king, or any of their children to give him the comfort of their presence.

Countless were the songs of love which this second Orpheus sang with pleading voice, but in vain. Imagine how often he wept and complained that such a noble woman and one so beautiful with all the gifts of nature could have drunk the bitter brew of betrayal. Sometimes he did not keep silence and swore to his hearers that since he had first seen his queen he had never been able to love another woman. This love shown by the despondent Edward and his patience [*paciencia*] in adversity awoke such pity in the earl his guardian and in both their households that they did not omit to send messages of the despairing love of the noble lord for his wife to a heart that was harder than an adamantine anvil. (27–28)

Suddenly, Edward II is also a second Orpheus, a pleading Lancelot outside the window of a cold-hearted Guenevere. And in *that* sort of story, with all its knights and kings wandering about in the forest for years, leaving care of court and politics to wives or stewards or to some vague arrangement that the audience never hears of at all, the concerns of the *Anonimalle* chronicler are so much petty irrelevance. The grand, indulgent woe of the pining solo voice sweeps them all away. This is the masculinity of *Sir Orfeo* or *Yvain*, not of the *Anonimalle* or even of the alliterative *Morte Arthure*. And lest we feel any nagging prickles of social conscience, the martyr narrative is always kept in sight.

Any narrative offers emotional contexts within which their audience can understand the actions of the characters—feeling different things, or responding to those feelings in different ways—and this is a context specifically formed by the generic traditions on which they draw. This is what makes an ending, or a particular plot twist, satisfying or dissatisfying: its interplay with the audience’s pre-existing expectations about the paths that it might follow. If Edward cannot be convincingly written as performing the emotionality of a war leader, he may be dressed in the familiar robes of the lovesick knight instead—and Isabella, correspondingly, may be assigned the role of the heartless beloved. She is an “enraged virago [*irata virago*]” (20); Jezebel (21); “that angry woman” and “virago” (24); “the iron lady [*ferrea virago*]” and “that fierce lioness [*truculenta leona*]”, with “a heart that was harder than an adamantine anvil” (28).³³ Edward and Isabella figure the lover and the pitiless beloved; but at the same time, they are versions of Patientia and Ira. The abject patience of the martyr and the abject despair of the lover are not at odds with each other here: one is a response to the public

³³ Page numbers are to David Preest’s translation. The corresponding pages in E. M. Thompson’s *Rolls Series* edition are 20, 21, 24, 29.

betrayal and the other to the personal. Both work together to move the readers to the pity that is modelled for them by his guards. In this, at least, Edward II succeeds in forging the appropriate emotional connection with his audience, internal and (potentially) external to the text. And he has one final triumph in this regard: in the moment of his murder,

His loud cries were heard by men inside and outside the castle, who knew well enough that someone was suffering a violent death. Many people in Berkeley and some in the castle, as they themselves asserted, were awoken by his dying shouts and took compassion on the sufferer, making prayers for the holy soul of one emigrating from this world. (32)

Edward II, in Geoffrey le Baker's reading, does not share his anger with his barons as a lord or king should in other genres, but despite the emotional isolation imposed on him by the betrayal of those around him, he manages to share more pious emotions with those subjects who still feel a proper love for their lord. He even manages to share those feelings with the readers of the chronicle. Geoffrey le Baker's storytelling is detailed and vivid, and the addition of the romance elements adds to the effect, while accounting for other elements of Edward II's character that would not fit so well into a martyr narrative. The result is seductive indeed. Geoffrey le Baker, although he is magnifying Edward II instead of accusing him, does not deny that the emotional divide critiqued by other chroniclers exists: instead, he subsumes it into a virtue by shifting the genre expectations of his narrative.

Reading or hearing different kinds of stories has a powerful effect on shaping how we experience our own emotions and how we understand the range of possible outcomes for them, as well as the moral charges we could place on any of those outcomes. Genre is, in essence, a recognised set of contexts—emotional context among them—around which we expect to shape a given story. And this is not confined to words on a page: Geoffrey le Baker and the authors of the *Anonimale* and *Brut* chronicles are real people, arguing by means of narrative about emotional styles embedded in literary tradition and in lived experience. Evaluating the emotions of people like Lancaster and Edward II, retelling them, reshaping and rehearsing them—in fact, “practising” them—chroniclers also prescribe and reinforce the same emotion scripts themselves, and record them with all the weight of cultural authority. No wonder if, by the time Edward III confronted the burghers of Calais, he would have had very specific ideas about the emotion scripts available to him in that situation, and how to use them to emulate and become the ideal monarch.

Section B. Feudal anger:

Anger and love on the public stage

Introduction

Outside the town of Calais, Edward III is encamped in regal state. The siege has gone on for almost a year. King Philip of France has come and gone without effect, and the starving town has tried to negotiate surrender. At first, King Edward insisted that Calais should surrender unconditionally and take the consequences. Now he has taken counsel and tempered his initial wrath—or rather, he has narrowed its focus. The people of Calais may go free, save for six of its most prominent citizens, who must suffer his revenge on their own persons on behalf of the entire town. They are brought before him. He glares, speechless with rage, as all the great lords and knights attendant beg him to have pity. But he will not be moved:

Every lord, knight, and warrior who was there wept for pity and could not speak: and indeed it was no wonder because it was a great pity to see good men in such danger.

The king looked on the burghers very angrily, for his heart at that moment was so hardened and so inflamed that he could not reply through his anger. And when he spoke, he ordered that their heads be cut off at once. All the lords and knights, weeping, earnestly begged him to have mercy, but he refused to listen.

[Walter Manny asks him to “rein in his heart” and show mercy so that people will not think he is cruel. The king refuses and sends for the executioner.]

“The people of Calais have caused the deaths of so many of my people that it is right that they should die.”

At that the noble queen of England humbled herself greatly, pregnant as she was, and weeping so tenderly in pity that nobody could remain unmoved. She threw herself to her knees before the king her lord and said: “Ah, my noble lord! Since I crossed the sea in great peril, as you know, I have asked for nothing. But now I pray and implore you with clasped hands, for the love of Our Lady’s son and by your love for me, have mercy on these six burghers.”

The king fell silent for a moment and he looked on the good lady his wife, who was heavily pregnant and wept tenderly on her knees. His heart began to soften a little, for he did not wish to anger/distress [*courroucier*] her in her current state.

He said: "Ah, lady, I wish very much that you were anywhere else. You pray to me so that I can not help but heed you. Though I do it against my will, I will give them to you. Take them and do with them as you please."

Froissart's *Chroniques*, Book I (SHF 1–312).

At the plea from his wife the king reluctantly shifts his mood: he grants mercy, and gives the burghers over into the queen's care.

So Jean Froissart tells the story of the burghers of Calais, perhaps the best-known episode of feudal anger from the fourteenth century. This scene employs the classic emotional script of feudal anger in all its grandeur, and with all the implied peril of excessive royal vengeance. It is presented to us as historical fact; but the artistry of the storytelling and the degree of creative intervention raise questions about the relationship between fictionality and representation. In previous chapters I have considered emotion scripts primarily as narrative devices, asking how chronicles engage with their audience's pre-existing imaginative structures governing anger. As feudal anger is the most prominent form of anger in medieval historiography, the question of how real emotional styles interact with those on the page is more complex and more important. In this section I continue to think in terms of narrative, but I will also begin to consider how chronicles and their emotion scripts might reflect and affect lived emotional norms.

The affective aspects of stories such as these are not merely colourful trappings to engage the audience's interest: they are central to the chronicle's narrative and to its meaning. When we are discussing a society whose politics are personal and whose emotions are socially created, there is a very real sense in which the emotions *are* the story. Feeling is deeply embedded in the legalities, the articulation, and the conceptualisation of social structure. This is not simply a theoretical association between ideas. When a chronicler says "anger arose between these two lords", this is not a metaphor for the legal shift from peace to war, but a direct statement of that change. Moreover, when barons weep or rage or rejoice with their lord they are not simply mimicking his emotion but feeling it with him, united as one body. A prince who cannot secure this emotional unity with his followers is no good leader. In its simplest terms, feudal anger is the emotion one feels when the other party violates the terms of a feudal relationship; but, given the extent to which emotions and legalities are intertwined in such a system, the reach of feudal anger is broad.

The Calais episode in the writing of Jean le Bel and Froissart engages consciously with both its literary roots and the political and cultural landscape of its time. As such, it is a particularly fertile episode for studying the conceptual structures behind such emotion

events. The ubiquity of this emotion script provides a stable interpretative thread, connecting this scene to broader social institutions and their corresponding emotional practices: feudal love, emotional contagion, the exercise of justice and mercy, and the role of counsel in representing and tempering displays of lordly anger.

It should be noted early that most of the examples that I consider in the next four chapters concern a very small subset of society: men who are either lordly or royal. Furthermore, in almost any given scenario the angry person is, out of those present, the one occupying the position of highest social privilege. The simplest reason for this focus is that the same bias is present in the source material. Further reasons will emerge over the course of this chapter, but broadly speaking, they have to do with the tendency of the narrative world of any medieval chronicle—and therefore its normative emotional scripts—to be shaped around the experiences of powerful men. Feudal anger is imagined first and foremost as it would be practised by an absolute prince. It may be felt by other people, including by vassals against their lord; however, because the most common script of feudal anger implies the lord's right to enact justice against enemies and traitors, it cannot always be easily mapped onto people in lesser positions of power, or people who do not fit the mould of an ideal lord in all respects. Towards the end of the section I will consider some of the ways in which chroniclers may deal with this problem: vilifying those who feel non-conforming feudal anger, erasing them, proclaiming their exceptionality, or trying to create a place for them within the paradigm that I have described.

Chapter 4. The script

Identifying feudal anger

Feudal anger is conceptualised in the context of a feudal relationship, arising in response to a perceived violation of the rules governing the social bond between two parties. It is the most common form of anger in medieval historiography, *chansons de geste*, and other political or heroic narratives, being almost synonymous with the outbreak of war or domestic conflict, and with the behaviour that characterises war while it lasts. Actions such as fighting and burning crops are called anger, not the *results* of anger (hence their inclusion in my lists of anger signs in Chapter 1).³⁴ War is not called “a state of conflict between two nations”, but “anger between two lords”. Anger is, in other words, both an event—the familiar moment of the prince starting from his seat in rage to declare war on an enemy, or to deliver justice against an erring vassal—and a continuous state, lasting until such time as the relationship is mended, and often marked in the meantime by other acts of anger.

The nature of feudal anger

Feudal anger may be recognised by four main characteristics. Firstly, there is a **pre-existing relationship** between the parties, one which defines for them certain modes of conduct and obligation towards each other. Secondly, the heart of the dispute is that one of them (or both) feels that the other has **transgressed these rules**. Thirdly, there is some sort of **public display** to initiate the split.³⁵ Finally, the parties **continue in a state of anger** until the issue is resolved—unless, as sometimes happens (and doubtless more often in real life than in narrative), the outburst of anger itself leads immediately to negotiation and resolution.

Most of the work that has been done so far on examples of this type of anger has been under the name of “royal anger”. The most helpful for this purpose are a cluster of

³⁴ Stephen White also makes a point of this elision between acts of war and anger in medieval narrative (“Politics of Anger” 137–39).

³⁵ The chronicler might not narrate such a display in detail, but as this is essentially a public emotion it must be at least understood to have happened. In short form, it is usually something like “when the news was brought to him the king grew very angry,” followed by anger acts like military action or punishment.

complementary articles in *Anger's Past*.³⁶ However, while *ira regis* was heavily theorised and discussed during the Middle Ages, there is no evidence in these texts that it was considered a discrete emotion in itself. Feudal anger was, it seems: although it has no specific name, it is distinct and consistent in its cause, in the physiological and behavioural changes in which it manifests, in its expected progression, its results, and its social implications. There is nevertheless a substantial overlap with the idea of royal anger: while feudal anger is not exclusive to princes, it is exemplified by them. Because this kind of anger is so deeply embedded in social relations and feudal bonds, the relative social status of the parties is crucial to the practice and experience of anger. For example, as Richard Barton notes, in a conflict between lord and vassal the lord's anger often seems by its very existence to justify retribution: because the performance of feudal anger is so closely associated with authority, "persons who resisted such authority would come to be seen a sinful, as deserving recipients of zealous rage" ("Zealous Anger" 159). By such means, the lord (or chronicler) might redefine the lord's behaviour from *anger* to *justice*. Consequently, anger directed upwards from a vassal to a lord appears only rarely, and is usually handled with great care when it does (see Chapter 7).

When studying a society which habitually thought in allegories and binaries, one of the most revealing ways to define a concept is to find what the source material considers to be its opposite. We have seen that honour is the opposite of shamed anger, and that *Ira* is always imagined in contrast to *Patentia*. Several people have identified an opposite to the royal anger they discuss: Gerd Althoff (studying a variety of historiographical and diplomatic texts) and Paul Hyams (studying the figures once painted on the wall of Henry III's bed chamber) each offer a different opposite. The mural before which Henry III spent his nights depicted *Ira* crushed beneath the feet of a crowned *Debonereté*: a complex virtue which Hyams characterises (broadly) as the king's good will and clemency towards his friends, in the context of creating and maintaining a unified courtly community. Althoff, rather than drawing a term from his sources, considers the overall sense of them and suggests the word "favour". To Althoff, *favour* exists at one end of a continuum whose other end is *anger*: one vassal has more favour with his lord than another and each tries to work his way closer to the positive end of the continuum. "Royal anger thus appears as part of [a king's] 'rulership practice,' that

³⁶ Those by Stephen White, Gerd Althoff, Richard Barton, and Paul Hyams. More recent studies include Orning's examination of royal anger in the political culture of medieval Norway, and Given-Wilson's examination of the relationship between Richard II and Richard FitzAlan with an eye to the acceptable limits of royal anger in the late Middle Ages.

is, as part of a personally grounded system of rulership based on a range of unwritten laws” (59). In this case, however, using a modern term obscures an important emotional truth. *Favour* is a rare word in medieval sources of this kind. In most cases the opposite of this kind of anger is not called *favour* but *love*: repeatedly, passionately, carefully expressed. It appears in the addressing of letters and effusive public embraces and professions—even where that relationship was rather precarious, as if the practice of this love would keep its opposite at bay.³⁷ It should also be noted that, while in practice Althoff’s model of a continuum might well have been true, in written sources love and anger are not conceptualised as existing on a line, or in shades of grey: they are binary opposites. Where they appear each is absolute, even superlative.

Feudal anger is, then, the opposite of the love that means amity, peace, social interdependence, and the keeping of troth. Hyams’s *debonereté* is one aspect of this love, with its emphasis on the strength of the fellowship between the king and his court. *Favour* may be technically correct so far as it goes, but it is limited, both because it is restricted to describing one type of relationship from one direction (lord to vassal), and because it denies that the performative or public aspects of such a relationship (such as receiving a lord’s gifts or being formally welcomed) may themselves be considered emotional acts, equal to a display of anger.

By its nature, therefore, feudal anger exists as part of an ongoing social negotiation. Unlike other forms of anger, it is rarely if ever described by medieval authors in internal psychological terms. This anger is not a private phenomenon at all: it is highly performative, and its primary existence is in its public expression, which signals—or initiates—the change in the relationship not only between the individuals involved but any lands and peoples they represent. Such anger need not signal a complete rupture: rather, as Barton remarks, it “serve[s] as a warning sign... announcing to all that the current situation [is] unacceptable and that social relationships [will] have to be restructured” (154). Anger thus becomes either a stimulus to mend the relationship, or a public enactment of that rupture. The parties involved

³⁷ “Every medievalist is familiar with descriptions of how honorably (*honorifice*) or magnificently (*magnifice*) people were received by the king, how wonderfully they were handled and entertained, and how they were loaded down with gifts and finally sent home with all possible honor” (Althoff 60). True; but that is largesse. Largesse can be a sign of favour, but it is not synonymous with favour or love: it may even be a threat. As we will see soon, Edward III is (like King Arthur in many texts) capable of using largesse, just as much as anger, as a statement of power.

are then in a continuous state of “anger” until the political state is resolved.³⁸ Similarly, a vassal may be said to exist in his lord’s love—a continuous state—and may be welcomed on reunion with love—a performative event, which both demonstrates and enforces that state. We need not imagine that, during Hundred Years War, Edward III and Philip VI went to bed every night gnashing their teeth and flushing red with rage, but the relationship between the two men—and consequently between their two countries, and between their vassals³⁹—is nevertheless defined continuously by *ira* rather than *amor* for so long as the war between them lasts. The performance of feudal anger, therefore, both dramatises and effects a social fact, a shift in the emotional landscape of the community.

The scene of feudal anger

There is one particular scene—familiar in its repetition—that usually accompanies demonstrations of royal anger in chronicle, *chanson de geste*, and romance. There is a good deal of variation in the detail of how such a scene may play out, but there is under most of them a consistent pattern, an emotion script which gives an almost ritualistic structure to the event. Given feudal anger is in its essence a public emotion, its performative aspects are conceptually central to it.

First comes the lord’s **expression of anger** at the rupture of the relationship. It is crucial in these scenes that it be an expression, a public communication, not simply an internal sensation (though he may describe it in embodied terms). The expression may be in gesture and action, rather than verbal: in many cases the protagonist is said to be too angry to speak, and simply glares, or more vividly darts fire from his eyes, making everybody cower. He then makes a **recital of grievances**, declaring the grounds of his anger by detailing just

³⁸ Althoff presupposes a continuous state, by setting up “anger” in opposition to “favour”—the anger as a tangible punishment/state of affairs. He focuses on that continuous situation; Barton, by contrast, focuses on the moment of the eruption of anger and negotiations it leads to, whether these succeed (leading to a conclusion of the episode) or fail. Both are true: the moment of rupture and (if not immediately resolved) the state of anger which follows are essentially the same thing. One signals and enacts the other.

³⁹ In broad and general terms and according to the usual model, that is. There can be individual exceptions—and Froissart changes the whole war into a large-scale chivalric contest, which allows for more complexity in terms of the individual relationships.

how he has been wronged—that is, how the other party has, in his view, violated the terms of their relationship. Next comes **a declaration of conflict**: an acknowledgement and proclamation that the parties have shifted to a state of war, rather than love. The final part of the speech **announces action**: he lays out his specific plans for war, or passes judgement on wrongdoers. In many texts this takes the form of a vow, legitimating the anger further by appeal either to God or to honour. The lord's public emotion is then **shared by his followers** - they all "feel" the same thing, they echo his words and actions, and are all roused to the same fervour. If the chronicler is feeling expansive, they may also make similar declarations of anger and vows of their own. These vows can be long and elaborate, and vowing poems are a minor genre structured entirely around these speech acts. We have already seen *Les Voeux du Héron*; *Les Voeux du Paon* is a rather less sarcastic example.

One of the most detailed examples appears in laissez 13–14 of Jordan Fantosme's verse chronicle of the civil war between Henry II and his sons, for the very good reason that Fantosme, writing within Henry II's court, is working hard to turn contemporary events into a *chanson de geste* and his king into its hero. The scene in the English court depicting the moment of rupture between the Old King and the Young—and therefore the outbreak of war—is crucial in setting up this dynamic for the whole of the chronicle.

[Laisse 13]

[v. 125] When Henry, his father, heard this, he was both saddened and angry [*greins... e irez*], and he swore his oath—alas that his son ever thought of doing such a thing—and he said to his knights: "My lords, now give heed to what I say! I was never so grieved [*adulez*] in all my life. I am so filled with rage that I am nearly crazy [*el cors me tient la rage, a poi me sui desvez*]. [130] The barons of Brittany have opposed me; they have joined forces with those whose hatred of me is mortal, with King Louis of France and with my eldest son, who are stripping me of my rightful possessions. He wants to take away my lands, my fiefs, and my inheritance. I am not so overcome with age nor so burdened with years, as is well known of many people, that I should lose my realm.

"Keep good watch this night in the clear moonlight and see that no Flemings or men of this region conceal themselves in ambush. The barons of Brittany, [140] right up to Finistère, are feudally subject to me; but Ralph de Fougères is in revolt against me and Earl Hugh of Chester is in league with him in this. For no amount of pure refined gold shall I fail to look them out, if I can come on them in their fastnesses. And since our enemies are so cocksure of themselves, it is a good policy to press in on them with great hostilities. A siege-

engine is a better weapon against foes in the full flush of insolence than a half-hearted attack when they are not so full of valour.”

His barons reply: “You are full of martial fervour [*buntez*]. [150] Luck has turned against your enemies. The land is yours, defend it well! Your son is in the wrong to make war on you.”

[Laisse 14]

See now the knights coming down from the castle, suddenly and swiftly seizing arms, putting on hauberks and coats of mail, lacing on their new helmets, and taking their Vianese shields by the arm-straps. Then you could have heard King Henry the Elder calling on God: “It will do these traitors no good to have met me in the stubble-fields!” The knights in their battle-array have come forth from the town: [160] some sixty thousand of them and more than sixty companies, and not one of them but thinks himself the equal of a Welsh king.

(vv. 125–61)

The stimulus for this outburst is Henry’s discovery that he has been betrayed by his eldest son: the Young King has allied himself with France against his father. The author informs us of his feelings (125) and he himself makes a **statement of anger** and grief (128–129): this is followed by a **recital of grievances** (130–134) and a **declaration of conflict** (135–36). He then **announces action** (137–148), which here includes naming those lesser barons in particular to whom his anger extends (some of whom ought to be feudally subject to him, and who have therefore also wronged him in this—“sunt en mes poestez”, 140). His feelings are then **shared by his followers**, who feel a similar anger, which makes them act as one and become greater than they were before (149–161).

The same pattern is followed (although in less detail) in two scenes at the French court (laissez 3–4 and 40–44). In the first case, a formal statement of anger by the King of France (on behalf of Young Henry) is followed by similar formal statements from his barons, each taking his own lesser vows about what he plans to do and whom he plans to defeat in the coming war. In the second, Count Philip’s speech covers the threat, the oath of violence, and the actual military planning, rousing the same emotional response and agreement from his followers. Significantly, however, there is no recital of grievances in either scene. While the French are presented as a worthy and noble opponent, and therefore their leaders may be permitted to employ idealised scripts of lordly emotionality, our sympathy must remain with Henry II. He is in the right, so his opponents must not be allowed to articulate any wrongs.

Variations on the script

This pattern does not belong only to one text, or one genre, or one century. If we move forward into the literature of Edward III's reign we can recognise the same sequence in the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, the text which Richard Barber considers "the closest literary representation of Edward [III]'s image of Arthur" (160). The scene of Arthur's confrontation with the Roman messengers is even more extended and detailed than Jordan Fantosme's depiction of Henry II's anger. This "scene" in the *Morte Arthure* extends over several days. First comes the Roman messengers' challenge and Arthur's furious response, in which he "declares" his anger by his furious speechlessness, and with eyes that seem to wound his enemies (137). Secondly, after a display of Arthur's menacing largesse in the form of grand hospitality, we have a counsel scene. Here Arthur tells his knights exactly why the Roman emperor's request wrongs him (265–287); he declares his intent to fight and his specific plans for war; then he receives individual vows from each of his followers and thanks them for their unity (345–398). Thirdly, there comes another scene with the messengers, in which Arthur repeats in greater detail the matter of his vow and his intentions for war (415–485).

As we recognise the pattern underlying these scenes we can begin to see how the anger at their centre works within the social world of the text. In Jordan Fantosme's chronicle, Louis' powerful emotional reaction for which he lists no cause at all ("A poi de duel n'esrage", v. 34) may read strangely to modern eyes, but when placed alongside the anger of Henry II it drives home the fact that the anger of each king is not a private thing: it is instead a shared recognition and enactment of a legal event. It puts into effect the change in the relationship between Louis and Henry II (to enmity), between Louis and Young Henry (to alliance), between Henry II and his opponents (enmity again), and between each king and the knights and barons who swear their literal fellow feeling for him. This first section of Jordan Fantosme's chronicle, devoted to the outbreak of the war, is almost legalistic in tone, as the author establishes the grounds and strength of various land claims, relationships, and feudal obligations. The most decisive factor in initiating war or in finding settlement is invariably the anger or love of kings. One of Louis' barons suggests that he might choose to return Normandy to Henry II "se ire vus assuage" (v. 53). Another declares that his own body is filled with rage, that he is Louis' man "par fei e par humage", and that he will offer so many men and fight for so many days—three statements placed simply side by side, as if the connection of anger-against / love-for / action-with was obvious without any hypotactic connection (vv. 45–50). The very first *laisse* of the poem declares that the author will tell the story of how the

“amur [e] druerie” between the Old King and the Young turned to “mortel... envie” as the foundation of this “guerre senz amur” (vv. 10, 13, 20). When we finally meet the fourth king—William of Scotland—he declares that if Henry II will not give him Northumberland he will no longer owe him “ne fei ne druerie”—and this statement of his feelings for Henry is understood by all around him as a formal (though conditional) declaration of war (299). Emotional language is used so consistently to declare legal events that there is no question of it being simply a metaphor or a euphemism: there is a direct equation between public legal fact and the emotional content of a relationship.

This formula may be recognised in miniature in moments such as this one, in the Middle English *Brut*:

When þis tydyng was comen to Kyng Edward [I], þat William Walis
hade ordeynede soche a stronge power, and þat al Scotland to him
was entendant [*heeded him*], and redy to quelle Englisshemen &
destroie his lande, he was sore annoied, and sent anone by his
lettres to [*various of his captains*] þat þai shulde take power, and
wende [*go*] into Northumberlond, & so forþ into Scotland, forto kepe
the contres. (193)

This is a common chronicle-style shorthand for a long, elaborate scene of the type given by Jordan Fantosme. The message is received, the king’s anger is aroused, and he responds accordingly in concert with his men. But recognising the scene invoked by these few words gives a good deal more meaning and political power to the note that Edward I was “sore annoied”. It is not just a decorative human touch, or an irrelevant moment in the midst of a report of the progress of hostilities. It is the turning point of events: the start of war. William Wallace has gone too far, and now the Hammer of the Scots will fall on him.

The script of feudal anger is so ubiquitous and familiar that it is rarely given full treatment. It only appears in more developed form when there is some need to work through its details and consider its discourse. Even Jordan Fantosme’s chronicle, with its insistence on sticking to the letter of the script, and the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, lingering with such lengthy delight on the image of King Arthur at the height of his regal power, are in their own way deviations (even while they stand as exemplars of the script for other texts), precisely because very few authors go into this level of detail. To do so is in itself a variation, almost a protestation: in Fantosme’s case, presumably, against competing interpretations of the civil war and its players (less flattering to Henry II); and in the case of the *Morte* against the inevitable downfall of Arthur and the idealised emotional unity at Camelot.

Froissart too, though he can be voluble when he chooses, often uses an abbreviated version of the same scene. Here, for example, we have it broken into two due to the absence at first of the offending party (or his representative).

When news reached the Prince of Wales that Limoges had gone over to the French and that the Bishop of the place, who was the godfather of one of his children and in whom he had always placed the greatest trust, had been concerned in all the negotiations and had been a party to the surrender, he was furiously angry... He swore on the soul of his father—an oath which he never broke—that he would attend to no other business until he had won the city back and had made the traitors pay dearly for their disloyalty.

...

When they first broke into the town a contingent of the English made for the Bishop's palace. He was discovered and seized, and brought without ceremony before the Prince, who looked at him very grimly. The kindest word he could find to say was that, by God and St George, he would have his head cut off. Then he had him removed from his presence. (*SHF* 1-663, 1-666)

As it happens, the Bishop does not lose his head, because the Pope asks for his freedom. It is not necessary that he actually be executed: like the burghers of Calais, it is necessary that he face the anger he has incurred, that the confrontation take place. That anger is itself a punishment, a movement away from love and grace.

The Calais episode

Scenes such as this are abbreviated or adapted versions of the classic scene of feudal anger that I have described: they rely on a shared cultural understanding of how such an emotion event proceeds, but are flexible in their application of it. But for the finale of the Calais sequence Froissart neither abridges nor alters: he employs the full-scale ritual, complete with dialogue and dramatic action, and emphasises its performative aspects with a few touches of vivid scene-painting. The scene is a grand spectacle, public and glorious, and the central emotions are figured in the bodies of Edward III and Philippa. The king grinds his teeth, glares with flashing eyes, is so overwhelmed with emotion that he cannot speak (although his silence is in itself a forceful communicative act); while she, noble, hyper-feminised, and abject,

“weeping tenderly on her knees”, embodies the forgiving tenderness not only of the monarchy itself but of the heavenly queen.

Unlike the confrontation in the alliterative *Morte*, this sequence in Froissart is truly one single scene, unified in time and place. All of its elements are present and conventionally ordered, even though most of them have, in fact, already been established within the narrative—for example, Edward has several times stated his grievances against Calais. This does not, however, diminish the scene’s effect: rather, it enables the scene to function simultaneously as the rewarding culmination of an extended episode of steadily increasing affective force, and as a self-contained variant on an emotional sequence that every reader or audience member would have rehearsed, in person or imagination, many times before.

The scene is set, in its glory and valour, and its public nature. “The king was at that moment in his chamber with a large company of earls, barons, and knights... He went out into the square in front of his lodgings, and all the lords and a great many other people followed him to see the people of Calais and what would happen to them”. Froissart lists the main witnesses in all their glory, including the queen, “who was heavily pregnant” (SHF 1–312). The burghers are presented to Edward and, like Arthur, rather than stating his anger he enacts it with a speechless glare, the power of which is felt by all around him. Because he expresses himself without speech he makes no recital of grievances. For every member of his audience, however, this box has already been ticked: for the burghers, in Jean de Vienne’s conversation with Manny and his recital of the king’s words back to the townsfolk; for Edward’s court, when Manny pleaded for Calais on Jean de Vienne’s behalf; and for the readers, on all these occasions. Even so, to preserve the pattern, Froissart intervenes at this point with the narrator’s voice and informs us of the reasons for the king’s anger: the “grans dommages” which they had done to him. The third stage—that is, the statement that the relationship is now characterised by anger (on the one hand) and fearful pleading (on the other)—is split likewise between royal action and narrative interpretation: Froissart tells us that nobody of worth could avoid weeping with the burghers, while Edward regards them angrily and reiterates with that gaze that his heart is too angry for speech. He then moves on to the next stage: decisive action, with an order that their heads be struck off. The response from those around him is wholeheartedly emotional: not with approbation of his actions this time, but an acceptable variant which allows for the segue into an intercessory plea. Queen Philippa’s petition, with all its associated ritual of feminine intercession, triggers the shift to a different emotional register, out of the scene of anger, allowing the king to move beyond rage into mercy.

However, the famous confrontation with the burghers is not the only scene in the Calais sequence for which Froissart employs this narrative pattern. The other falls earlier, and is so nearly free of affect that it hardly seems, at first glance, to count at all. It is Edward III's reply to Philip, when the French king has requested that Edward abandon his unapproachable position outside Calais in order to meet the French army in combat.

The king of England, hearing these words, took counsel and then responded with these words: I understand well that you ask this of me on behalf of my adversary, who holds my inheritance wrongfully [*a tort*], as it seems to me. Tell him from me that I am here by right [*en droit*] and have been here almost a year. He knew this quite well, and could have come here sooner if he had wished it. But he has let me stay so long that I have incurred great expense, and I believe that I shall very soon be the lord of Calais. I am not minded to do anything for his convenience. Tell him that if his people cannot pass, they must seek out another approach." The messengers of the French king saw well that there would be no other reply. (*SHF 1–309*)

Here the classic pattern is adapted to the time and circumstance. Edward opens with the second stage—the recital of his grievances—and adds immediately a pre-emptive denial of Philip's own right to claim a grievance in the same matter: he is here by right and Philip might, moreover, have chosen to take him on at any time before this, when Edward's investment was less and his tactical advantage presumably less secure. There is a hint—but no more than a hint—of stage three (declaration of conflict) in his statement that he is determined not to oblige Philip. That is, it establishes that the relationship is not currently one of amity, but does not make that statement in emotive terms. He concludes with a vow, that is, with stage four.

Notable by their absence are stages one and five—that is, an initial expression of anger, and the emotional reaction of those around him, especially his followers. These two stages usually do most of the work of establishing an event as an emotional one, with stage three (here minimised by courtesy) buttressing the centre of the arc. Froissart adapts the recognisable confrontation structure and almost entirely cleanses it of emotion, or at least of passionate emotion. Edward's emotional unity with his followers is established by mention of the counsel that precedes his reply, and the effectiveness of communication by the reactions of the French messengers when he is done, but it is not necessary for him to stage a complete emotional display in order to achieve this. It is not that Froissart disapproves of royal emotion in the same way that, for example, the *Anonimale* chronicler does. Rather, his ideal king is one who can wield emotion as a tool appropriate to the moment, employing the recognisable shape of a scene such as this as an effective communicative tool with or without the affect

loading of the scene with the burghers. Whether we consider the artistry to belong to Edward or to Froissart, the “grey-scale” effect of this scene foreshadows and heightens the effect of the full-colour, highly rhetorical performance of the final scene in the Calais episode.

Froissart performs a similar sleight of hand at the outbreak of the Hundred Years War itself, using this script to insist on the absence of anger, at least in the sense of a passionate negative emotional response. For Froissart the origin of the war is entirely chivalric: in talking to Philip’s messengers Edward finds that he has no choice but to publicly declare this relationship’s failure; Philip smiles, and speaks amiably to everybody, and everybody is very pleased. As with the typical script, we go through the checklist of monarch’s bodily expressions, monarch’s voice, crowd’s response, but it is all positive, anger replaced with a comradely impulse to gallantry. Froissart avoids laying blame or raising the possibility of criticism, making this one major outbreak of war more admirable than affecting (*GCF* 5–22 and 5–23). It is worth noting, too, this confrontation-by-proxy does not exist in Jean le Bel’s account: Edward simply decides to press his claim, in consultation with his barons, and goes about seeking allies before committing himself. Other smaller altercations, such as that between the Prince and the Bishop, retain their angry content.

Clichéd narrative tropes are clichéd for a reason. The classic scene of feudal anger has a vast body of literary (and, doubtless, real-life) antecedents, but it is no less vivid for that. In fact, full appreciation of its emotional effect depends on the audience’s familiarity with that cultural script, without which the rapid shifts from one stage to the next would be lost as they are on most modern readers. The universality of the scene makes it recognisable, powerful, and realistic (or at least verisimilar), but also highly malleable in the hands of a skilled author.

Chapter 5. Anger's opposite

Love and its betrayals

Feudal anger arises, I have claimed, in response to the violation of a social bond. But what is the nature of that bond, and what kinds of personal relationships are most likely to generate anger? For Henry II, in Jordan Fantosme's chronicle, it is the most powerful and personal bond in a feudal system: that between a parent and child who are also lord and vassal. In the case of Arthur in the alliterative *Morte*, it seems much more distant: two independent rulers, not even neighbours, who have apparently had very little to do with each other personally until this point. How is it, then, that these scenes read so very alike? Or, to put it another way, how are feudal love and anger *felt*, that these two scenes should follow almost exactly the same emotional script?

Defining feudal love

To consider this, we first need to lay a wider variety of examples on the table. Richard Barton opens his chapter in *Anger's Past* with a historical example of a dispute in northwest France, 1120, which reads very like the literary examples under consideration here. In the charter recording the incident the lord, Juhel, writes that one of his men refused his request to contribute land to a new priory. At this point, "having become greatly angered with him, I said he was my serf (*colibertus*) and I was able to sell him or burn his land, or give it to whomever I might want as befit the land of my serf; and rising against him, I would have laid violent hands on him had not Clementia, my wife... and many other honest men forcefully ushered me into the inner chamber".⁴⁰ As it turns out, Guarinus Probus was not, technically, Juhel's serf: Juhel's father had enfranchised him without Juhel's consent, but as Juhel had been of age at the time he felt this enfranchisement was invalid. Barton locates the core of the conflict in this tension over the nature of the relationship, arguing that the matter of the priory land served only as an occasion for both parties to bring it into the light and renegotiate the terms of that relationship (154). Barton also cites other incidents with a similar pattern, from charters,

⁴⁰ *Cartulaire Manceau de Marmoutier*, ed. Ernest Laurain (Laval: Goupil, 1945), 2:15–17; cited in Barton 153.

chronicles, and other sources that rove back and forth across that murky conceptual border between charter records and literary interpretation. Some of his examples involve a familial relationship—William of Malmesbury’s account of the dispute between Count Fulk of Anjou and his son is one. Others, such as that of Juhel and Guarinus Probus, do not. Nevertheless, in all cases the dispute arises out of a desire (usually mutual) to re-negotiate the terms of the relationship. The nature of the relationship remains more important than the actual point of contention, and in the moment of resolution, the focus is not on who won or the nature of the prize, but on the reaffirmation of that bond:

[Fulk], whose old animosity still throbbed, rose up, and kicking Geoffrey as he lay, repeated three or four times “You are conquered, conquered at last.” His spirit survived being conquered, and indeed was so distinguished, that he responded “By you alone father, because you are my father, am I conquered; by all others I am unconquered.” With his swollen soul mollified [*tumentis animus emollitus*] by this speech, Fulk comforted the shame of his child with paternal compassion and restored him to his principality.⁴¹

To Barton, anger is productive: it is a tool for renegotiating a feudal relationship, the means by which characters (historical or literary) move through conflict or an unsatisfactory relationship to a new affirmation of that bond.

I agree, so far as this goes; but it is also true that, for this to be effective, the state of anger must be conceptualised as the opposite of that bond, not merely a tool for its negotiation. Consider the famous episode between Uther and Gorlois written by William of Malmesbury’s contemporary, Geoffrey of Monmouth (184–85). Uther, desiring Gorlois’ wife Igerna, lavishes pointed attention on her. When Gorlois notices, he “angrily storm[s] out of court without permission [*confestim iratus... recessit*]. No one could call him back, since he feared to lose the thing he valued above all else”: probably not his wife, as a modern romantic reading would assume, but his honour. Angry at Uther’s transgression, Gorlois transgresses the rules of their relationship in response by leaving without permission. Uther returns like for emotional like, “angrily command[ing] him to return to court, intending to punish him for the slight he had inflicted”: that is, he means to mend the relationship by putting Gorlois firmly back into his place. “When Gorlois refused, Uther was enraged and swore to ravage his province if he did not comply immediately”—so Wright translates it, but Michael Faletra’s “unless the duke gave him immediate satisfaction” is closer to the Latin: “nisi ad

⁴¹ William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum, Libri Quinque*, ed. William Stubbs, Rolls Series 90 (London 1889), 2:292. Cited and translated by Barton (164).

satisfactionem festinasset”, Geoffrey writes, his focus still firmly on making the appropriate moves to restore some kind of equilibrium between the two men (Geoffrey of Monmouth trans. Faletra 158). “Manente predicta ira inter eos”—literally, “with the aforesaid anger remaining between them,” with the same emotional and political state continuing to govern their relationship—the king sets about ravaging Gorlois’ lands as promised. Gorlois dares not face him: he fortifies his strongholds, seeks help from Ireland, belatedly thinks of his wife, puts her in Tintagel and goes himself to Dimilioc. When Uther hears of this, he does not rush to Tintagel: rather, he goes to besiege Dimilioc. “After a long week had passed, he recalled his passion for Igerna and summoned Ulfyn of Ridcaradoc”, and the tale of Igerna’s seduction and Arthur’s conception resumes (Geoffrey of Monmouth trans. Wright 184–85). Today we are accustomed to read this as a story of romance or rape, focussing on the heterosexual relationship (and the child who results). But Igerna is of minimal importance in Geoffrey’s account, even as an object of transaction. Uther even manages to forget her entirely for some time: all his focus, until he arrives at Tintagel, is on the feudal bond with Gorlois.

But surely the burghers of Calais are not to be read as Edward III’s vassals? And there are very similar examples throughout Froissart. I have already mentioned the Black Prince’s anger against the Bishop of Limoges: consider also his behaviour toward the Cardinal of Périgord after the Battle of Poitiers. Before the battle, the cardinal had led attempts at mediation between the French and the English, but when mediation failed he had allowed some of his own men to fight against the English. With the battle done, the Black Prince sends the Cardinal the body of his slaughtered nephew on a shield. Lest we think this was motivated by some improper emotional response, Froissart arbitrates between event and interpretation and provides us with the proper meaning:

Now some would say that he had acted in mockery, but I will tell you what moved him to do this. He had already learnt that some of the Cardinal’s people had stayed on the battlefield to fight on the other side, which was quite improper according to all the rules of war. Those who belong to the Church and attempt in good faith to mediate between two sides should not take up arms in favour of either, for obvious reasons. It was because these had done so that the Prince was indignant with the Cardinal and sent him his nephew’s body, as just related (SHF 1–386).

The prince uses his anger to make public display of the wrongs that the Bishop has committed against the “rules of war” and his own role within it as mediator between the two sides. It is these rules that define their relationship and had previously bound them “in good faith”. In the same way, the Black Prince’s anger against the bishop of Limoges centres not on the

Bishop's actions but on the fact that they betray the familial bond they ought to have. What remains consistent between these anecdotes is that the source of the anger is personal. This is not just "you should not have behaved in this way" but "you should not have behaved in this way *towards me*".

I have mentioned already that "anger arose" (and variants) is the most common phrasing for the outbreak of war. Stephen White has noticed this too, and the fact that its resolution is called a return to love ("Politics of Anger" 144). We see, for example, Edward II and the Earl of Lancaster temporarily reconcile with public kisses and embraces (GB 10)—not simply a hypocritical performance of a love they do not feel, but a declaration to the community and each other that their mutual anger has now been assuaged, and love has resumed. Love is the ideal amity that ought to exist between the parties according to their bond.

The King Leir of the Brut tradition fails to understand this of his daughters, in an episode which highlights the transactional nature of the relationship, but which also exemplifies in Cordeile the behaviour proper to this "love" even where Fortune fails (*Brut* 17–20). Cordeile says that she loves Leir "as miche as me oweþ to loue my fader; and forto bring 3ow more in certeyne how loue goþ, I shal 3ou telle, for-as-miche as 3e bene worþe, as muche shal 3e bene louede" (17). In anger, he divides his worth (his lands) between Rigan and Gonorille and gives nothing to Cordeile (17). Once he is reduced to poverty, Leir comes to recognise the truth of Cordeile's words, and her own real worth: "when y was ryche, alle men me honourede and worsshepede; and now euery man hath of me scorne and despite!... [and so I let Cordeile] gon fro me as a þing þat y sette litel pris of" (19). He goes in secret and in rags to Cordeile (now queen of France), who hears his story and gives him money—so that he can go away again and bathe, and fit himself with the right wardrobe and retinue to visit his daughter as a king. *Then* he is received with "michel honour", his daughter and son-in-law reconquer his land in his name, and Cordeile inherits after him.

Cordeile is a powerful figure for defining the nature of feudal love—remember that in that story too the daughters are not only daughters but vassals, rebellious or faithful. This episode is relatively short, but it has a strong foundational role in the chronicle as a whole (and to the nation, as Leir is one of the series of early kings for whom key places are named). Kenneth Tiller examines it from this point of view, arguing that it "addresses fundamental questions of succession and the relationship of successful interpretation to leadership"—and,

consequently, to the role of historical writing itself (157).⁴² The “love” in this story is constructed in parallel with those between Edward III and the burghers of Calais, or Arthur and the Roman messengers, but it is hyperbolic, as befits a fable. It is a lesson in feudal love and its failures; and it tells us a good deal about how these relationships are conceptualised and how deeply personal war and anger could be.

Feudal love as a negotiating tool

Did the Black Prince love the Bishop of Limoges or the Cardinal of Périgord before each moment of anger? We might believe that there was at least some formalised love between Uther and Gorlois, but surely King Arthur did not love the Emperor of Rome? To answer this we must revise our definition of “love” as we have already done with its opposite, from our internalised, heart-and-mind definition to something grounded primarily in public, social networks. While it is in a certain sense a formal bond, this need not mean that it is impersonal, insincere, or superficial. Rather, it means that all these loves—lord and vassal, father and child, God and humanity—are modelled to the same conceptual shape. Other less uneven relationships, such as those between Arthur and the Emperor, or the Black Prince and the Cardinal of Périgord, seem to be capable of emulating this powerfully resonant characterisation, especially when under stress. In other words, these loves are all the same “shape,” though they may vary in their strength. The anger that heralds their violation, therefore, is also consistent. Across the entire literary corpus more narrative space will be given to the more emotionally powerful examples of the model—especially those involving family—not because they are exceptional but because they are representative, modelling an emotional style and providing catharsis in the most powerful possible terms for any equivalent betrayal in the audience’s own lives.

What, then, is the nature of Edward III’s relationship with Calais? The first statement we have on the subject is from Edward III himself, in the retort to Philip that we have already

⁴² Tiller is examining Laȝamon’s *Brut*, not the Middle English prose *Brut* that I am discussing here (a late fourteenth-century translation of one of the Anglo-Norman redactions). Some of his comments are specific to Laȝamon’s version, by comparison to Geoffrey of Monmouth’s and Wace’s texts, but his general observations about the function of the Leir story in the broader narrative hold true across all of these versions.

examined (SHF 1–309). He justifies his actions on the grounds that a) Calais (or possibly France) is part of his heritage by right and that Philip is keeping it from him “a tort”; b) a form of squatter’s rights, insofar as he has been camped in front of Calais “pres d’un an” and Philip has not yet tried to dislodge him; and c) the level of his investment, that he has “despendu grossement du mien”. All of these together seem to add up to a sort of claim; and curiously, of the three, the first one (which might appear to have the most weight in terms of legitimation) receives the least narrative emphasis. It is never mentioned again. Froissart does mention Edward’s genealogical claim to France less than several other chroniclers (especially the English ones) but here it seems less a case of tactfully avoiding that issue for his French-aligned readers, and more that it simply, genuinely, does not matter. For Froissart—and for Edward here—inheritance is not the basis of his claim to Calais. Out of the three reasons that Edward lists here, the one that is repeated most often by the narrator and characters is his investment: either in time and resources, as here, or in the lives of his men at moments of heightened rhetoric and feeling.

This passage, however, comes in the context of an exchange with Philip, which is shaped as another anger event, albeit one of lower affect. In tone and structure, therefore, it has more to do with the relationship between the two kings than between Edward and Calais. The question of whether or not Edward can stand in a lordly relationship to Calais does not arise in any meaningful sense in this scene. It is a clear point of contention, however, in the very first exchange between Jean de Vienne (representing the city) and Walter Manny (on behalf of the king). “Dear sirs,” says Jean de Vienne, “you are very noble knights and accomplished at arms. And you know that the King of France has sent us here and commanded us to hold this city and this castle, such that there should be no dishonour [*blasme*] to us and no harm [*dommage*] to his interests: we have done our best” (SHF 1–311). His first concern is to establish that Calais has done right by her lord and king—and by doing so, to assert that they stand in relation to Philip, not to Edward. Had Manny accepted this opening statement Calais would have been accepted as Philip’s people, acting right by their lord and not personally answerable, certainly not guilty of the kind of personal wrong toward Edward that might justly incur feudal anger.

But, as Stephen White points out, one characteristic of feudal anger—when performed by a lord—is its ability to control the discourse of “justice”, to prove by its very existence that a wrong has occurred. Walter Manny immediately rejects the grounds offered by Jean de Vienne, denying Calais’ right to negotiate on equal terms. They must come to Edward as petitioners only, he says, making no requests or terms but throwing themselves on his

mercy—because just as the opposite of anger is love, once justice is invoked its counterpart is mercy. Whether or not Edward’s legal claim to Calais has any grounds, he has the power to insist on conducting this business as a lord punishing an erring dependant; and by accepting this discourse, Calais makes it inevitable that events will play out in those terms. Manny, for Edward III, speaks of Calais’s citizens as of rebels: “the people of Calais have done to him such *contraires* and cost him so in money and in lives” that he must naturally respond with the full force of his anger (SHF 1–311). Edward’s anger is not only a justification for his behaviour: it is a legal and personal reason for shifting Calais from a potential negotiator to a proven traitor whose only hope is for a merciful lord. These relationships are about more than legalities. Mutual acknowledgement is a powerful force: if both parties behave as if Edward has the right of a lord, then so he does.

It was common practice for a city to be denied any mercy in surrender if it had held out against aggressors. The curious thing about this episode is that nobody is so crass as to invoke that tradition—at least in those terms. From Jean de Vienne’s careful emphasis on Calais’ duty to Philip, to Edward III’s betrayed anger, the narrator and all the characters are anxious to figure the episode in terms of a feudal relationship, to which the negotiations of love and anger may apply. There is no enmity between the parties here, no sense of real alterity, with its consequent dehumanisation and the delight in practical brutality and riches. They are, instead, erring friends. Everybody in this glossy chivalric world is “our sort of people”: a convenient fiction which originates in the words of Jean le Bel, Froissart’s source for these early years, but which is sustained and strengthened throughout Froissart’s original work. In one sense, the feudal bonds (which would, under usual circumstances, define a relatively small community) have here to be extended across continents and even social strata due to the massive scale of the war. In the Calais episode we see a relationship which could have been defined by the rules of honour and war refigured as something closer, more personal, allowing the author (the chroniclers, and/or Edward III himself) to use that emotional script which is both more powerful and more persuasive. If the king can direct feudal anger toward Calais, that anger justifies his actions, reinforcing his claims and legitimising his revenge, while also allowing for the possibility of mercy without weakness.

This legitimating function would be enough on its own to justify this figuring for the episode. However, it is not an isolated impulse in Jean le Bel’s work, and still less in Froissart’s. Read in the context of both chronicles as a whole, the use of a glorified version of the script of feudal anger seems more like a wholesale attempt to control and contain the chaotic brutality of war by shaping it into something which, if it is not quite a game, may at

least be governed by civilised and amiable relationships; in which violence is contained by rules and ultimately serves the purpose of resolution and a return to love.

Chapter 6. A proportionate response

Counsel, intercession, and emotional leadership

To most chroniclers, anger is not necessarily a sin, so long as it is proportionate to the cause. As Raluca Radulescu has demonstrated with reference to the work of Thomas Malory, a lack of “measure” in any emotional response attracts more criticism and concern than the type of emotion itself (“Out of measure”). We have already seen how Raoul de Cambrai’s anger was considered laudable by his companions, until it became excessive. There is no stable consensus, however, on what counts as “excessive”. Each anger event must be judged on internal clues. An author may interpret for us explicitly, with a direct narratorial statement, but just as often, the reader is left to observe other emotion signs and draw their own conclusions. In particular, the answering emotions of other characters play a crucial role in determining a proportionate emotional response.

Emotional leadership

Out of the five stages of the emotion script of feudal anger, the last one is the most important for interpreting the scene. Friends and enemies will all respond to the feudal anger of a powerful leader. Ideally, enemies will be moved to fear, and followers to the same anger as their lord. This response guides the reader’s own reaction, demonstrating to them whether a given instance of feudal anger should be read as socially functional or dysfunctional.

I use the term “socially functional” because, in most cases, “right” and “wrong,” with their implications of a resolvable moralistic discourse, are of little use in evaluating feudal anger. The key question is not whether this instance of anger would count as a sin by the logic of any particular medieval theologian (say, Aquinas or Cassian), but how it works on and within the network of existing social relationships that make up the community within the story. Emotional contagion—that is, sharing one’s emotions with one’s followers, or inspiring fearful respect in one’s enemies—is a crucial skill in a medieval leader.

We have already seen Henry II’s followers sharing his feelings and echoing his vows, and the way this serves to unite them into a single military and emotional body against the

enemy. There is a more compact example not long before this scene, when the French are frightened at the news that one of their number has been captured: although “the heart of the boldest trembles and misses a beat”, “he who ever leads them all strengthens their resolution: *his* heart is full of anger and his blood boils with rage” (*Fantosme laisse* 22). Scenes of a heroic leader inspiring battle fury in his men are familiar: for example, “seeing their king fighting so valiantly, the Britons took heart [*audatiam capessunt*] and all together assaulted the Romans, closing ranks as they advanced” (Geoffrey of Monmouth trans. Wright 247). I mentioned several of these examples in Chapter 2, where we saw a lord’s court or a knight’s friends share in his shamed anger. Angers are not the only communicable cluster of emotions, as I will discuss in more detail in Section C, but when it comes to narrative depictions of feudal anger, contagion or its absence plays a vital role in discussing the dynamics of social power.

Froissart’s Edward III, naturally, can inspire battle fury (SHF 1–274 and elsewhere), but he also appears as the centre of the vigorous, valorous court: “the King was enjoying this gaiety and his knights were cheerful at seeing him so cheerful” (“moult liet... le veoient sy joieus”, SHF 1–324). Even in death he has the power to centre communal emotion on his royal body:

There was great sorrow in England... The corpse of King Edward was carried in a grand procession, with weeping and tears, followed by his children, the nobles and prelates of England, all through the city of London, with its face uncovered, to Westminster where he was entombed with Lady Philippa his wife. (SHF 1A–778)

Similarly, the ever-superlative Charlemagne causes a hundred thousand Frenchmen to share his violent demonstrations of grief at his nephew’s death (*Roland* laisse 207). These are socially functional emotions, whatever the emotion shared may be. Striking fear into the hearts of the appropriate people—as Arthur does in the alliterative *Morte*, and as Edward III does when faced with the burghers of Calais—may be considered as the same quality, the same ability to lead the hearts of one’s people.

Dysfunctional anger—in fact, dysfunctional emotion in general—is usually marked by the followers’ inability to share fully in the leader’s emotions, or by the leader making no attempt to connect with them at all. In Chapter 3 we saw two chroniclers dealing with Edward II’s failures of emotional leadership, usually classing his feelings as isolated or inappropriate. *Raoul de Cambrai*, as I mentioned in Chapter 2, provides a classic example of failure by excess. When the title character begins his anger-fuelled war against his enemies, his men fully support him, feeling his rage with him (*laissez* 32–35). Eventually his rage progresses beyond the bounds of the acceptable, until by the time he attacks Origny his men obey only because

they dare not disobey him (*laissez* 60–68). This recalls the warning of Sir Walter Manny, when he advises Edward III not to pursue full vengeance against Calais. Manny threatens the king not so much with reprisals from his enemies as with a similar loss of emotional unity with his men: “If you should choose to send us to hold one of your fortresses *we should go less willingly* if you put these people to death as you say, because the same may be done to us in a similar case” (SHF 1–311, emphasis mine). Reprisals against Edward’s men would be a real possibility, but to Manny (and presumably Edward) the real harm would be not the potential losses but the new unwillingness of the English to enter wholeheartedly into their king’s cause.

Sir Walter Manny’s threat is effective precisely because the figure of Edward III at Calais *is* such a model of emotional leadership: he can command the emotional response of his followers, of his enemies, and even of his readers. We first see him, in the Calais sequence, constructing a marvellous encampment around Calais, complete with market and comfortable lodgings for his army through winter (SHF 1–288). When the burghers are led to him it is a magnificent and public scene: the impression is of richness and power. Edward is surrounded by valiant nobility, who follow his emotional lead: a “grant compaignie de contes, de barons et de chevaliers” (SHF 1–312). Everybody on the scene feels not the emotion that Edward does—the anger—but the emotion that he means to inspire in them, a pity so strong that they weep. He is the centre and the origin of a magnificent unity, in which the reader is invited to take part. Several times throughout the sequence, and most notably in the climactic scene, we hear something along the lines of “there was no noble person there who could refrain from weeping”. This idealised communal emotionality is the result and evidence of their nobility—and, moreover, the reader is encouraged to share in it, to be a part of that audience. Affect reaches beyond the page when the chronicler repeatedly turns from these moments to say that “there could not be a heart in the world so hard that it would not have wept to see that sight”. Whether we consider this as an instructional guide to noble emotionality or a cheap ploy to intensify the reader’s emotional response, its effect must be to allow the reader to imagine, as they read or hear this tale, that they are themselves a part of the scene and can *feel* with all those noble lords and ladies—that the power of Edward III’s emotional leadership, for this moment, extends to them too.

Counsel: determining the proportionate response

Manny's words invoke the possibility of failure: for a moment the ghost of royal excess and abused power is raised, and laid open to discussion by readers and characters. "Rein in your heart, sir," Manny says to him: "You are known for sovereign *gentillesse* and *noblesse*: do not now do anything that will mar it, or to associate your name with villainy" (*SHF* 1–312).

Edward III is mobilising in his audience the desired emotional response, certainly; but it is a perilous line to tread, raising the stakes involved and emphasising the potential for cruelty. His followers do not share his anger against the burghers, but are weeping, begging the king to change his mind. This variant on the script initiates the public display of counsel or intercession to curb the wrath of a king. It straddles the line between the positive feudal anger of Henry II and the tyrannous excesses of Raoul de Cambrai, and is effective precisely because the outcome is not pre-ordained.

This uncertainty is harnessed by a counsel scene, in which the proportionate response may be explicitly discussed and decided. "Proportionate" is the key word here: in most cases, the anger is not to be soothed away altogether. Feudal anger is an important tool for a late-medieval ruler, but it is also important to allow one's anger to be tempered by wise counsel. The counsel scene names—and, if successful, contains—the spectre of uncontrolled and excessive wrath, and the discord between lord and followers that would result. It invokes and dramatises the possibility of excess, without allowing it to become disruptive. This is not a failure of the barons to follow the lord's emotional lead, but rather an example of them all working together to achieve emotional unity.

Mediation is not always successful. *Raoul de Cambrai* explores a world in which that discord has been unleashed and rages uncontrollably from character to character, page to page. Despite dozens of scenes of counsel and attempted mediation, in which one character or another shows at least a grudging willingness to compromise, the war-torn society cannot pull itself back from violence. Barton finds that the most remarkable aspect of the text is "not the prevalence of anger and violence, which were always associated with disputes, but rather the constant failure of attempts at mediation and compromise... That these attempts continually fail is the real tragedy of the story" (168 and footnote). Tragic, yes, but the sheer number of counsel scenes has another function: not only do they offer (and continually deny) the possibility of reconciliation, but they serve to articulate and discuss the fact of excessive anger, and the role of counsel in managing it. Even in this war-torn society, at no point do the mediating parties suggest that the knights or lords in question ought not be angry at all. "Lord

Raoul,” his knights tell him, at one of the reconciliation attempts, “[Bernier] has good cause for grievance: he has served you with his steel blade and you have rewarded him terribly... May God our judge confound whoever blames him for wanting revenge” (*laisse* 85). There is no sense that anger, or even violence and war, are intrinsically negative. Instead, the focus is on negotiating the exact level of atonement or reparation that is due to assuage that anger. That is, the anger is (or ought to be) quantified, negotiated with one’s peers, and brought back into the control of the community.

At times these negotiations can become openly transactional, calculating the worth of emotion against commodity, ritual, and gift. In the scene quoted above, Raoul offers compensation by means of precisely quantified humiliation: “From Origny as far as the town of Nesle—fourteen leagues, it is right that I should spell it out—each one of 100 knights shall carry his saddle, and I will carry yours on my head. I shall be leading Baucent, my Castilian charger, and I shall not meet so much as a man-at-arms or young girl without telling them, ‘This is Bernier’s saddle!’” (vv. 1593–1599). The insistence on evaluating personal emotional ties in finely calculated material terms recalls the episode of Cordeile and Leir in the Brut tradition, although there is no misinterpretation here of the intent. Everybody hails Raoul’s offer as handsome and appropriate, and there the matter might end; but, like Leir, Bernier denies the equivalence between emotion and money. He will not allow any kind of price to be put on his wild anger, not “all the gold in Aquilance” (v. 1606). His refusal to make terms leaves him still at odds with Raoul and angers Guerri and the army; and so the feud spirals on outward.

The counsel scene in *chanson de geste* and chronicle is an externalised form of self-moderation, grounded within the immediate community. In another sense, from a narrative point of view, it is also a perfect literary set piece: it serves to display the author’s rhetorical skills, and provides an opportunity for every important character to speak their piece. If any of these characters are still alive this can also be a moment for flattery (or satire). But it is also a good set scene for exploring and confirming the relationship between king and counsellors: it offers a chance for the author to foreground, discuss, and moralise upon the role and dangers of feudal anger and its destructive potential. Stephen White observes that these “conventionalized arguments” are “a common motif in histories, biographies, charters, and *chansons de geste*”, used to dramatise the socially generated change from anger (149). While this is true so far as it goes, it assumes that the anger itself is a negative thing, a temporary aberration to be soothed away by the community. In most cases, as I have said, the anger is not removed so much as moderated and directed: counsel provides not a change away from

that emotion itself but from its harmful potential, towards a socially useful and unifying force. Anger, war, and violence become dysfunctional only when these communal negotiations fail to contain the passions of individuals.

In most scenes of the type, the counsellors' aim is to adjust the lord's affect further away from anger (or at least from excessive anger), in the direction of compromise and forgiveness. But occasionally it is necessary to do the opposite: to stimulate a slothful, stupid, or unknowing lord on to anger against those who deserve it (sometimes by using provocative speech to prompt shamed anger). Earlier in the story, in Raoul's youth, his mother and uncle must advise him to increase his anger in response to people encroaching on his rights. This is excusable: Raoul is young, and he learns soon enough (too well!) not to tolerate such slights. The *Anonimale* chronicler is not so forgiving when it comes to Edward II. In 1318, he relates, a man named John Poydras came to Oxford and claimed to be the real heir to England's throne, calling Edward II an impostor.

He was told to cease talk of this kind which touched such great matters and he replied that he would not do so... Because of this he was taken to Northampton to the king's parliament and there he was examined about his claim, and before everyone he maintained his contention in everything he said and stated openly and confidently that he ought to be king by right and reason. Those who were said to be his father and mother at Exeter were summoned to the king at the said parliament... And for fear of death, they did not dare to say otherwise than that he was their son begotten between them. The king did not wish to have him put to death but ordered that he be given a club, in English a "bauble", and that he go around as a fool, but certain lords who were there did not wish to accept this but wanted him to be put to death, with the result that he was drawn and hanged... concerning which there was much talk one way or another. (94–95)

The king's amusement contrasts with the concern expressed by every other voice—including that of the chronicler. The only other character who seems not to realise the gravity of the situation is John Poydras himself, the fool and impostor who threatens to change identities with the king. The lords are obliged to overrule their king and enforce royal justice themselves: they recognise infringement on the king's rights, the violation of that relationship, when the king himself will not. Edward II, in this text, feels inappropriate anger at inappropriate times, and cannot be moved to proper lordly anger even when he ought.

Intercession: *Justice and mercy*

A public display of counsel, then, dramatises and externalises the adjustment of the lord's emotional response to the correct point between two opposing options. But Philippa at Calais does not *counsel*: she pleads. Intercession is subtly different. An intercessor need not be a trusted advisor, as a counsellor is. The intercessor pleads, rather than advising: they ask not moderation but mercy. Mercy, as I suggested earlier, is the opposite of justice, which is not quite synonymous with anger. At this point, *justice* is the correct amount of anger that has already been agreed: mercy permits that anger to be reduced without weakness. The person making the request positions themselves as weak. They may be a subject, or they may be an enemy, or a powerful friend. The more powerful the supplicant, the more effective is their self-abasement. A queen is the most effective supplicant. She combines this dramatic humbling with a traditional intercessory role and the permission to embody the gentler qualities of leadership. So, early in the reign of Edward III, we have an incident when the ladies' staging collapses at a joust, throwing Queen Philippa and the king's sister Eleanor "and other great ladies of the land" to the ground, causing several injuries.

This sudden accident was due to the fault of the carpenters. The king of his free will and gracious mercy [*de sa franche volente et gracieuse grace*] and through the prayers of the lady the queen pardoned the fault, and had peace and love proclaimed everywhere, and that no one should be in any way scared or afraid. And the king ordered the queen... to mount her palfrey quickly and to ride up and down the lines with a good countenance to reassure the people [*ove bele semblaunt, a conforter le poeple*]. The staging which fell so suddenly was repaired at night and was made strong enough so that the next day the game was continued in a noble manner. (*Anonimalle* 146–47)

Careful to draw a contrast between the young paragon of kingly virtue and his chaotic father, the author does not say that Edward III grows angry at the carpenters. Even "justice" is only implied by its hastily invoked counterpart, mercy, and by the chronicler's assignment of the fault to the carpenters. The emphasis is instead on the king's virtue in allowing his implied wrath to be tempered into "graciously grace" by his queen—and on his subsequent care for the emotions of the community, banishing fear and proclaiming "pees par tut, et amour", and continuing the games "noblement".

Geoffrey le Baker, however, does not shy away from naming emotions, as the *Anonimalle* chronicler does. Speaking of the same incident, he phrases the amelioration of the king's reaction a little differently: "The pious queen did not allow the carpenters to be

punished, but by her prayers and genuflexions so recalled the king and his friends from their anger that by this act of mercy she caused everyone to love her, as they thought about her goodness" (43). It is to Philippa rather than Edward that the chronicler attributes the quality of mercy, and it is she who is the focus of the people's love—but this is not to Edward's detriment. It is proof of his queen's piety, which is not a contrast but a complement to his kingship.

There has been some critical focus on the queen as formal intercessor, singular and severed from otherwise masculine power structures.⁴³ Our concentration on the gendered aspects of intercession has obscured the fact that, up until the moment of intervention, the queen often figures simply in the non-gendered role of a counsellor. Juhel's wife and Raoul's mother both participate exactly as the men do in counselling their lord to respond with appropriate levels of anger. Even an intercessory role is not necessarily gendered by nature. Anybody may abject themselves to plead for mercy, just as all the courtiers tearfully plead with Edward III for the burghers, and Fulk grovels before his father's kicks. It is true that a queen (and, by analogy, the wife or mother of a man in a position of social power) is symbolically closer to her king than any counsellor, more fundamentally a part of his royal body and royal function, externalised into a dramatisation of royal justice and mercy. She can invoke this if necessary; but in practice, up until the moment of staging the dramatic, hyper-feminised scene of pleading, there is a significant overlap in form and function with the role of the counsellor.

The intercessory queen (or wife, sister, or mother) comes into her own, however, when the time for reasonable adjudication has passed: when all agree that the correct measure of response would be to punish the carpenters, to execute the burghers, and the only way out is forgiveness. At this point she may plead in a manner that deliberately invokes her gender, with its associations of weakness, humility, and compassion reminiscent of St Mary, to add affect. Philippa's brush with danger, in the case of the collapsed staging, could only make this weakness more potent. Compare Froissart's text of Philippa's intercession with that of his source, Jean le Bel:

⁴³ See particularly the highly rehearsed intercession of Anne with Richard II on behalf of London, discussed by Paul Strohm in *Hochon's Arrow* (1992). This is followed by Lois Huneycutt in 1995 ("Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos"); Helen Maurer in 2003 (*Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England*, esp. concluding remarks pp. 208–11); J. L. Laynesmith in 2004 (*The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445–1503*); and, more recently, Lisa Benz St John in 2012 (*Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England*, esp. pp. 34–63).

But the king frowned and replied: "Accept it, Sir Walter: I have made up my mind. Call for the executioner. The people of Calais have cost me the lives of so many of my men that these men, too, must die."

[At that the noble Queen of England, weeping bitterly, fell on her knees before her husband and said:] "Ah, my worthy lord! Since I crossed the sea – in great peril, as you know – I've asked for nothing. But now I beg and implore you with clasped hands, for the love of Our Lady's son, have mercy on them."

The worthy king fell silent for a moment; he looked at the Queen on her knees before him, weeping bitter tears, and his heart began to soften a little and he said:

"Lady, I wish you were anywhere but here! Your entreaties are so heartfelt that I daren't refuse you! Though it pains me to say it, take them: I give these men to you."

(Jean le Bel trans. Bryant, 2003)

There is a footnote on the bracketed sentence, translated verbatim by Nigel Bryant from his source text (Viard and Déprez's 1905 edition for the Société de l'Histoire de France): "There is clearly an accidental omission in the surviving MS of Le Bel; all versions of Froissart contain phrases to this effect". But Froissart adds more than only that phrase:

But the king **ground his teeth** and replied: "Accept it, Sir Walter: I have made up my mind." **And he sent for the executioner, and said,** "The people of Calais have cost me the lives of so many of my people that these men, too, must die."

At that the noble queen of England humbled herself greatly, pregnant as she was, and weeping so tenderly in pity that nobody could remain unmoved. She threw herself to her knees before the king her lord and said: "Ah, my worthy lord! Since I crossed the sea – in great peril, as you know – I've asked for nothing nor begged any gift. But now I pray and implore you humbly, in proper gift to the son of Saint Mary and in love of me, have mercy on these six burghers."

The king fell silent for a moment; he looked on the good lady his wife, **who was heavily pregnant** and wept **tenderly** on her knees. His heart began to soften a little, **for he did not wish to distress her in her current state.**

He said: "Ah, lady, I wish you were anywhere else! Your entreaties are so heartfelt that I daren't refuse you. Though it pains me to say it, take them: I give these men to you. **Do with them as you please.**"

(My translation, adapted to match Bryant's where the texts are the same and bolded where they differ.)

In the Calais episode, Froissart adds the detail of Philippa's pregnancy—it is not present in Jean le Bel's version. Given her next child was born nine months later she certainly was not heavily pregnant at the time, but that extra femininity, vulnerability, and Marian association adds the finishing touch to the power of the scene. She reinforces that association by framing the burghers specifically as the *don* which she has never yet asked of her husband, and which may be now made to Mary and to her husband's love for her. She is wife, supplicant, and mother, and a devotee of the saint who epitomises at least two of those three.

Geoffrey le Baker subverts this queenly role in his account of the arrest of Roger Mortimer in 1330. As Edward III and his friends burst into the room in disguise and capture Mortimer, Queen Isabella cries out in French, "Beal fitz, beal fitz, eiez pitie de gentil Mortimer" (Geoffrey le Baker 46; 41 in Preest's translation). But her son does not reply, and Mortimer is executed. Why should this appeal fail? Because this is the woman whom Geoffrey le Baker has repeatedly described as a raging virago, a subversive Jezebel with no justification for her crimes. This is a subversion of the intercessory script that Philippa will embody so well. Compare his account of the moment of capture and the plea with that of the *Brut*, which provides the closest analogue to this scene (and is, most likely, Geoffrey le Baker's main source):⁴⁴

Tho toke þai þe Mortymer, as he Armede him ate þe toures dore,
When he herde þe noise of ham for drede [*Then they captured
Mortimer, as he armed himself at the door of the tower in fear, having
heard the noise of them*]. And When Quene Isabell saw þat þe
Mortymer was taken, she made miche sorwe in hert, and þise words
vnto ham saide [*and said these words unto them*]: "Now, faire sires, y
3ow praye þat 3e done non harme vnto his body; a worþi knyzt, our
wel bilouede frende and our dere cosyn." (*Brut* 271)

Then they found the queen mother apparently prepared for bed and sleep and the earl of March, the man they wanted. They seized him and took him away into the hall, with the queen crying aloud, "Dear boy, dear boy, have pity on gentle Mortimer." For she suspected that her son was there, even if she could not see him. (Geoffrey le Baker trans. Preest 41)

⁴⁴ See Richard Barber's introduction to Preest's translation (xix).

Geoffrey le Baker, in short, lays on the implications of sexual misconduct as heavily as he can (which he has suggested before, including before the death of Edward II: 20 and elsewhere). Mortimer moves from the tower door to the bed chamber, and the queen is present and dressed for bed, instead of in some other room or location. In the *Brut*, Edward III is not among those present, and she only asks his captors to convey him safely. Geoffrey le Baker seems to add the young king for dramatic effect. The drama is heightened by her shift into French (which Preest's translation does not preserve): a rare moment of direct speech given even more impact by that change. For twenty pages, in Preest's translation—half the chronicle so far—Isabella has been in the ascendant, plotting her revenge then exulting tyrannously over her enemies with Mortimer at her side. In this moment of downfall, she attempts the intercessory plea that looks so inappropriate to her pride. But her son does not even reply.

It is only very shortly afterward, once Geoffrey le Baker has told of Mortimer's degrading execution and explained why it was just, that we see our first image of Edward III and Philippa as true king and queen—at the tournament when the stage collapses. Pages 41 and 43, in Preest's translation—46 and 48 in the Rolls Series edition—a beautiful piece of meaning-making by juxtaposition. Geoffrey le Baker's Isabella has betrayed her status as woman, wife, and queen, and her plea has no effect. Philippa's plea, when she moves from gender-neutral counsellor to queenly supplicant, is feminine in the extreme. This moment introduces the new order, for Geoffrey le Baker: a perfect royal couple who can turn disaster into glory by the performance of the proper roles. Anybody may plead, certainly, but it takes a woman—better yet, a queen and a mother—to invoke the specific figure of the queenly intercessor and the full emotional impact that encompasses. It is the power of this plea that allows the turn from justice to mercy.

Pure counsel has its limits. It is focused on determining the appropriate level of response and allowing for necessary performance of anger—which may, nevertheless, not result in punishment. Sometimes the “appropriate” level of anger would involve a course of action so extreme that it would be better all around to find some way of avoiding it. Petition may go further than counsel, in this way. Only mercy may supersede justice, just as the Queen of Heaven and mother of Christ plead with God for even the worst of sinners.⁴⁵ Strohm reaches the same conclusion regarding Philippa's intervention permitting “a differently grounded appeal, invoking a different sort of authority,” although for him that other authority

⁴⁵ The “Nativity of Our Lady” and “Assumption of Our Lady” in Jacobus de Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* include several stories of sinners, especially thieves, rescued by Mary from divine or earthly judgement for no reason other than that they prayed to her for protection.

is “her dutiful self-marginalization”—the fact that she appeals from a position outside the masculine power structure (*Hochon’s Arrow* 101). Either way, the intervention allows a shift in the terms of discourse, a change to a different sort of reasoning.

There are two counsel scenes in the Calais sequence: the dénouement is the second, but the first is Manny’s advice to Edward (after meeting with Jean de Vienne) that he not punish the entire town. This earlier scene is pure counsel, determining the correct level of anger response, and resulting in the king agreeing to punish the six burghers in token of the whole city. In the later scene that level of anger is already determined: they are guilty, and the anger may not be persuaded or negotiated away without weakening the king. This more famous scene is instead primarily an emotional intervention. The lords plead with Edward, weeping, instead of advising him to wisdom. Even Manny’s speech in this scene, although it echoes his earlier speech, urges not policy or restraint but “pitié”, acknowledging the shift to a different emotional register. But these in themselves are insufficient to effect an emotional change: it takes the queen’s action and pleas, and the king’s long moment of silence in which the spectacle of her (pregnant, in tears, on her knees) is fixed in our eye, to bring about that change.

Chapter 7. Uneasy angers

The limits of exemplarity

For most of this section I have concentrated on the anger of lords and kings against their equals, or people lower on the social scale. The simple reason for this is that the idea of feudal anger is, though not exclusive to lords, shaped around social power, especially as performed in that one most characteristic script. The idea of pious suffering is exemplified by the martyrdom of Christ (and reinforced by imitative episodes in the lives of saints), to the extent that chroniclers may reshape the experiences of contemporary figures to fit the pattern (as we saw with Thomas of Lancaster and Edward II in Chapter 3). Similarly, the idea of feudal anger is imaginatively based around a certain kind of person, and a certain procession of events. But a relationship involves more than one party, and a violation of that relationship presumably involves an emotional response from both. What happens, then, when chroniclers are obliged to consider feudal anger in somebody who does not fit the script: a vassal, or a woman, or somebody who does not belong to the nobility at all?

Rebellious anger and its absences

The *Book of Vices and Virtues* (a fourteenth-century English translation of Lorens d'Orléans' confessional manual, *Somme le Roi*) divides anger into four branches: anger or war against oneself ("for whan wrapþe is ful in a man, he turmentþ his soule and his body"), against God (when "for sum worldely loos or harm... he gruccheþ aȝens God and his halewen [saints]"), against inferiors (when he is "[so] wod þat he smyt and betþ his wif, his children, his seruauntes, and brekeþ pottes, coppes, and disches"), and against equals ("þer-of wexeþ strif, and after gret angre ybore in herte... and after al þis, mortel, þat is dedly, werre among alle þe frendes on boþe sydes") (25–26). By its nature this text speaks only of anger-as-sin, with no interest in the causes or contexts of the sinful feeling. It is interesting, however, when cause and outcome are removed, the power dynamics become the most important classifying principle. It suggests a general sense that, whatever the cause of anger, there is a fundamental difference in the nature of anger depending on whether it is directed upwards (to God or superiors), downwards (to dependants, or even objects), or between equals. The different

behaviours observed in each case imply different scripts of possible action, and presumably different moral constraints, depending on the target.

The case that first drew my attention to this problem is that of Bernier, Raoul de Cambrai's friend and liegeman. *Raoul de Cambrai* is, as I have mentioned, an exceptionally angry text: characters flare up, curse and rage, refuse to resolve their differences, and turn grudges into feuds that involve entire families and their followers. Perhaps the greatest feud is that between Raoul and Bernier, once dear friends. The increasing division between them is an index of Raoul's slide from righteous anger into excess. Consequently, in this case, the story of the increasing rift in this lord/vassal relationship is unusually sympathetic toward the vassal, and gives as great a voice, or greater, to his emotion as to Raoul's. But in order to maintain the audience's sympathy and retain Bernier's moral character as unimpeachably noble, the author must do some very delicate narrative manoeuvring. Despite the ubiquity of anger in this text, Bernier seems unable to feel outright anger against Raoul, not even when Raoul forces Bernier to wage war on his brothers, kills Bernier's mother, and insults him—not until he is no longer Raoul's man. He asks Guerri for advice as to what to do, he faints, and he wails for his mother, but helplessness and grief dominate his response until the moment when Raoul strikes him, releasing him from their relationship—and allowing him, from that moment on, to experience anger.

Seizing a big spearshaft that huntsmen had left there, [Raoul] angrily raised it up high and hit young Bernier as he approached, fetching his head such a powerful crack that his delicate ermine was showered with blood. Seeing this, Bernier went out of his mind [*tot a le sens changié*] and grappled furiously [*par grant iour*] with Raoul—now he might have allayed much of his raging grief [*duel*] [*i.e., by killing Raoul*], [but] the other knights come rushing up, and separate them before they can do each other any harm. Young Bernier calls his squire: 'Quick, my arms and my double hauberk, my good sword and my banded helmet! I'll quit this court without any farewells!' (*Laisse 84*)

Note that, once his first violent impulse is thwarted, Bernier's second response is the same as that of Gorlois when wronged by Uther: he leaves the court without permission and without taking leave. Love between them is at an end.

This reluctance to express (and thereby feel) anger against one's lord is borne out by the behaviour of other characters in *Raoul*, as well as those of *La Chanson de Roland*. When Louis gives Raoul's land to Giboin, Raoul and Guerri both turn their anger on Giboin rather than the king, and Guerri is not even said to feel anger while in the king's presence. He leaves

the hall then goes angrily to Raoul; Raoul, less restrained, turns angrily away from the king and then leaves the hall, but still never directly expresses anger to the king (*laisses* 32–35). Although the author attributes the blame firmly to King Louis, the injured party and his men turn their anger on a man of approximately equal rank (and later, on the lords of the Vermandois). Similarly, although the author of *La Chanson de Roland* (and Charlemagne himself!) attributes to Charlemagne the responsibility for the choice of Ganelon as messenger to the Saracens, and of Roland as rear-guard, Ganelon and Roland turn their anger on each other. This may be prescriptive—an ideal knight would not feel anger against his lord even under those circumstances, and Bernier is an ideal knight, therefore he does not feel anger until Raoul is no longer his lord—or it may proceed more fundamentally from a sense that this anger is only something that *can* be felt when that bond is damaged, and that therefore all of Bernier’s feelings before that moment were not anger, but something else.

This authorial sympathy with the lower-ranking party is rare, however. Part of this difference in representation (and perhaps on experience) must be due to the fact that most chronicles and *chansons de geste* centre their narrative on the most socially elevated figure in any given sequence. The emotions of lesser folk, where they come into conflict, are therefore less interesting, and when they do appear they are likely to be condemned, unless in exceptional circumstances. One such circumstance is emotional estrangement between the lord and his followers, as discussed earlier—in which case, as we saw, an author may tell the tale in such a way as to lay blame on either side.

Bernier must not display, or even feel, open anger against his liege lord if he is to retain his moral status within the text as noble and virtuous (or at least more virtuous than Raoul). There is, after all, a fine and sometimes non-existent line between anger against one’s lord and rebelliousness, the threat of the final sin of Dante’s ninth circle. It is very common for chroniclers depicting bottom-up rage to deny it all legitimacy, or even any semblance to noble emotions: sinful animal fury, rather than the moral and emotional complexity of a lordly anger. Paul Freedman summarises the two-dimensional depictions of peasant anger in the thirteenth to early sixteenth centuries thus: “peasant anger was ludicrous with respect to individuals, and it was capable of instigating terrifying mass violence... their anger could only exceptionally be represented as dignified, not only because that would be more socially subversive... but because anger was an essentially noble prerogative” (171). For these purposes most people in society could be classed as “peasants” for most writers, almost as far up as barons. The anger of barons, representatives of cities, and other citizens not dismissed

as rabble, was more likely to be human but rebellious, and is better documented by studies of complaint literature and the legal system than of anger.⁴⁶

Froissart's depiction of the Jacquerie is a stark contrast to his narration of wars amongst the chivalric classes: it is mob violence, with no emotion even named (SHF 1–413). More disturbingly, it is deeply unnatural: rather than being presented as a petitionary cause, or even as unjustified anger arising in response to the wars, it resembles a perverted scene of feudal anger. Froissart emphasises their lack of a leader—there is no central figure to unite the emotions and initiate the script—and they mill around, without the structure of the scenes we have seen, and with only some indirect speech reported which does not quite manage to be a recital of grievances: “They said that all the nobles of the realm of France, the knights and the squires, were putting the realm to shame, and that it would be a good deed to destroy them all”. There is a group speech act in which they all agree that the gentry should be destroyed. This is neither a formal statement of anger, nor much of a battle plan, but it has the effect that a vow of war usually would have at this point in the script, initiating the gathering of the “army” and the departure for war: “They gathered together and set off, without any more counsel and armed only with cudgels and knives”. Compare this to the glorious array of Henry II's knights as they gallop off to war, pennants fluttering. As for emotional unity, they have no leader to shape it: certainly, they all seem to agree to do violence, but no emotion is named at all. They merely commit atrocities, without feeling or reason, “like mad dogs”; and the allusions to the carefully controlled structure of the script of feudal anger makes their behaviour seem even more horrifying and chaotic. This is the implied threat behind upward-directed feudal anger: rebellion writ large, and a dissolution not only of social order but of meaning and humanity. We rarely see it on this scale in chronicles, but the possibility is always there, and that is reason enough for upward-directed anger to be almost invariably condemned.

On the occasions when the author does want to situate a follower's anger within the context of feudal anger—that is, as resulting from a transgression of their relationship and therefore at least partly justified—careful steps must be taken (such as Bernier's remarkable lack of anger) to avoid letting it slip into sin instead. The *Anonimalle* chronicle—so critical of Edward II's failures of emotional leadership—includes a series of confrontation scenes that explicitly do not conform to the typical model, but seem to hold it implicit in the background as an illustration of how far affairs have deviated from the normal or natural. This framework

⁴⁶ See particularly Wendy Scase, W. Mark Ormrod, and several papers in *Feud, Violence, and Practice* (ed. Tuten and Billado).

allows the chronicler to justify the actions of barons and people against Edward II—actions which often fit patterns of anger, or take on the role of angry lord within these scenarios—but the author is as careful as that of *Raoul de Cambrai* to avoid naming their emotion as anger.

First we have the Ordinances of 1311, a series of regulations imposed on Edward II by the baronage in an attempt to exert some kind of control over him and limit his power and—according to this chronicler—his arbitrary and changeable behaviour (*Anonimalle* 82–85). Here the petition format provides a pattern for protest: carefully not phrased as anger, but the mirror image of the classic scene of the angry king. Froissart’s avoidance of emotion words in the Jacquerie dehumanises the mob, denying them access to the emotions that he quite freely discusses and valorises in his other characters, but the *Anonimalle* chronicler has a different attitude to emotion. He never names an emotion unless condemning the character(s) who feel it, so the avoidance of emotion words in this case represents the barons as reasoned and united, in contrast to the passionate and changeable king. Emotional unity does follow the negotiation, but it is unity behind (and oaths sworn to) the Ordinances, not the king (84–85). This form of regularity emphasises the legality of the proceedings; but it is also a sign of the unnatural state of affairs. When Piers Gaveston is exiled, the Ordinances take the king’s place there too: Gaveston’s actions are a grievance against the Ordinances, not against the king, and he is punished in their name. The conclusion of this episode is that, while the Ordinances are fully justified, they are themselves a sign that the world has gone topsy-turvy, as subsequent events prove.

Forward ten years and a few pages, and the lords come armed to parliament in 1321. This is, we are assured, not “en despit du roi”, but against his new favourites, the Despensers: this is discord between peers, not rebellion against the king (*Anonimalle* 100–01). Nevertheless Edward II assaults Leeds, and oppresses his people, and Lancaster attempts mediation (102–03). He writes to the king “amiablement” on behalf of the people, and he speaks to the king with love. Even on the eve of the rebellion, rebellious anger is carefully written out—but the justifications, the “recitals of grievances”, are left in.

Five years later the inversion of the script is complete: Edward II is deposed. Where the typical script of feudal anger centres on the voice of the king, here the voice of the people dominates (*Anonimalle* 132–33). The people cry out their protests and agree to the act of deposition, and we even have a formal recital of grievances when the Archbishop of Canterbury reads out several articles against the king. Action, and the severance of the bond, is legitimated through the spoken emotions of the people instead of the king—although still

we have no actual statement of *anger*, as that is too heavily associated in this text with irrationality and disorder.

Froissart does not deny the people of Calais their emotionality, as he does with the “jacques”: on the contrary, he handles the problem by permitting Calais as an entity a full range of aristocratic emotion. Calais is not considered dysfunctional or subhuman for its earlier anger at Philip, when he makes no real attempt to break the siege: Philip has failed his side of the relationship by declining to protect Calais (*SHF* 1–307). Froissart does not dismantle the emotional norms of feudalism governing the experience and expression of noble emotion, but he can be flexible about whom he allows to feel them.

Feminine angers

Setting aside questions of rank, there is still one half of the population very poorly suited to embodying that intimidating, idealised Arthurian figure. If feudal anger in vassals and peasants is rare, that of women is even rarer—and less likely to be portrayed as positive. It is, in fact, very difficult to discuss: there are too few instances to form any kind of representative sample, and generalising would be unhelpful in any case, as they are all exceptional by definition.

We saw already Cordeile and her sisters acting effectively as barons in the *Brut*’s story of King Leir. In that story they fit into the feudal structure precisely: though Rigan and Gonorille are married and are theoretically subordinate to their husbands, they each take with them half the kingdom, and they are the antagonists, so they easily assume the roles of rebellious vassals in the narrative. Similarly, Cordeile’s husband, though the King of France, has little to do with her relationship with her father-lord aside from providing her with the strength to reclaim his kingdom: she is the party who has the vassal/ally relationship with Leir, not her husband. None of the three women, however, is said to experience anger at any point: the narrator says that Gonorille and Rigan “werrede upon him” (18), but the feelings we see them and their husband experience are “scorne and despite” (18 and 19), in contrast to the “michel honour” (20) with which Cordeile treats Leir and the (feudal and filial) love by which she is defined. No anger appears, not even when Cordeile attacks and defeats her sisters—not until, after the death of her father and husband, the sons of Rigan and Gonorille rise against her in their turn, because *they* “to here hade enuy” for holding the lands that

should have passed to them (20). Even here, where the women function as vassals and lead rebellions and wars, the anger is left to the men.

The mother of Raoul de Cambrai *does* feel anger, and an anger which is implicitly approved by the author. She is angry on behalf of her underage son because King Louis has denied Raoul his rights: the anger of a woman and of a vassal, therefore, though on behalf of a man. She is a woman of no “cuer frarin” (“inferior/frail heart”, *laisse* 5 and 7), who has been ruling her son’s lands in his name until he should come of age, and whose indignation at Louis’ betrayal is echoed in even stronger terms by her brother Guerri (also a noble and worthy vassal, as we are repeatedly assured). Although she is permitted to *feel* anger, and to express it to Guerri and (later) to her son, her gender presents practical difficulties for her when it comes to acting on it, and therefore her behaviour and the manner of expression of her anger cannot match any classic pattern of feudal anger. She can only threaten to burn herself to death rather than allow Louis to hand her son’s lands over to Giboin—especially since the plan involves marrying her off to Giboin as well—and protest that a cur should not be introduced into the bed of a thoroughbred hound (*laisse* 15). Her anger is not criticised, but she is unable to either claim her son’s land in her own right or raise an army to enforce his claims until he should come of age. She may rouse her followers to share her emotions, but as we have already seen, words and emotional contagion are her only weapons. When Raoul angers her, she cannot take physical action against him, as any of the male characters might have done: she can only curse him and lay his punishment in God’s hands (*laisse* 54).

The figure of Isabella, queen of Edward II and responsible in large part for his deposition, is a woman who might easily be presented as either rebellious or betrayed. Chroniclers respond to her in various ways, but in all cases her emotionality is a counterpart to their depiction of her husband’s. Where Edward is criticised, she is a model of Patientia; where Edward is sanctified she is a raging, furious harpy. We have already seen Geoffrey le Baker’s iron-hearted Jezebel, standing opposite the patient martyred king. The *Anonimale*, by contrast, has Isabella as the suffering victim and Edward as the culprit. The *Brut*, more even-handed, shifts its rhetoric from mild sympathy for Isabella (during the later years of Edward II’s reign, 1318–26) to increasing condemnation (when Isabella and Mortimer are ascendant, 1327–30). In that account, neither Edward nor his wife are fully blamed: the chronicler’s vitriol is saved for the Despensers and Andrew Harclay in 1321, and for Roger Mortimer after 1326. Isabella does become “wrop” against Edmund Earl of Kent (Edward II’s brother), but only after Mortimer’s “hert gan bolne” for wrath and he goes to her to represent Kent’s

apparent betrayal (265).⁴⁷ For the most part it is Mortimer, not Isabella, who is characterised as the vicious raging other: “sore annoiede, and angry as þe Deuel a3eynes ham þat wer of þe Kyngus Conseil, [saying that] he wolde on ham bene avengede, how-se-euer he toke on” (268).

Isabella has a kind of negative emotionality: a counterpart to her husband in Geoffrey le Baker and the *Anonimalle*, and in the *Brut*, a figure less to be blamed or praised than the men around her because her feelings are less explicit. In none of these cases is she permitted to feel feudal anger, though we might consider the relationship to be betrayed: in no case does the chronicler both consider Edward’s betrayal of their bond *and* allow her to feel anger over it. If she is angry, it is aberrant and without reason; if she is betrayed, she is either saintly Patientia, or emotionally inert.

The *Brut*’s Isabella is less vitriolic than that of Geoffrey le Baker, but she is still not an admirable woman; and though her emotionality is not so explicit as it was to become in his later version, she is still a troubling figure, unnaturally twisted out of alignment with her “proper” feudal role. Julia Marvin (studying the Anglo-Norman version, which is very similar to the Middle English I have discussed here) sees her as still more dangerous. Marvin points to the addition of the Albina legend to Brut texts in the fourteenth century, and suggests a link between Isabella’s “reign” and the fear/condemnation of female rule. Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Brutus landed in Albion and defeated the giants already living there: the added Albina legend tells of the origin of those giants and of the name of the land. Albina and her sisters are unnatural, murderous, incestuous, and many other terrifying adjectives associated with female power in the bedroom and the kingdom. But “by providing an enemy to defeat”—their monstrous descendants—“the sisters’ evil redounds to the eventual good of Brut and his people” (175). Similarly, the downfall of Edward II and the image of a power-hungry Isabella provide the perfect backdrop of the rise of a perfect gallant young king: “Whether she wants to or not, Isabelle ushers in a rightful and successful king and provides Edward of Windsor with the occasion to prove himself as Brut does... [The Albina story] offers a comforting resolution, for even unpunished crimes play their part in the plot of history” (175).

This is the figure lurking *in potentia* behind any display of female anger, especially if she aspires to power in her own name: a raging, tyrannous, devouring inversion of any

⁴⁷ Kent was executed March 1330 for his part in a strange little conspiracy that of several powerful and canny people who believed, or pretended to believe, that Edward II was still alive. Chronicle accounts typically use this incident as the climax of Mortimer/Isabella’s tyranny, the last straw that prompted the young king to put down Mortimer, end the queen’s regency, and take up active rule himself.

potentially positive female power within the network of feudal relationships. Philippa abases herself beautifully and dutifully to Edward III, to beg in tears for the life of the burghers of Calais; but even here we glimpse a shadow of a possibility of what might be. Edward yields in part because he does not want to *distress* her in her pregnancy; and yet the word used is *courroucier*. Certainly it can mean distress, and in a literal sense it probably does, here; but this is one of very few occasions in Froissart or elsewhere when it does not mean, simply and explicitly, “to arouse/feel anger”. Even if it lies below the literal meaning of the text, the possibility of stirring Philippa to *that*—especially pregnant and in her extremely feminine state—is raised as an aberration, as a warning of this script going very wrong.

The problem of scriptlessness

For all these people and situations, there is no standard exemplar for the expression of feudal anger—still less, one that is presented positively. Women, vassals, commoners: chroniclers (and other medieval writers) acknowledge that they may feel the violation of a feudal bond and be moved to anger by it, but they are uneasy and inconsistent in their narration of that anger. Sometimes, the character may be shown as feeling shamed anger or grief instead; sometimes they may turn their anger against their peers instead of their lord; sometimes the chronicler may avoid narrating any feeling on the character’s part at all, or turn them into Patientia by protesting their exceptional *lack* of anger; and sometimes they may be completely vilified, portrayed as rebellious and bestial, with no structure and order to their feelings at all. There is no script in these texts for feudal anger other than that wielded by a lord: no recognisable patterns of behaviour, no sequences of emotion signs, no known story through which one might move to a resolution. “Royal anger” is the name that feudal anger usually goes by, because it is most visible and recognisable in kings or sovereign princes. What effect does that have on it as an exemplar, as an emotional practice? It is aspirational, certainly, part of an emotional style held up as an ideal for all those of “noble” feeling— but the emotional practice that this script represents is not available to every person. It is simultaneously recommended and forbidden, prescribed and proscribed; and it has no consistent alternative.

To what extent do these texts reflect (or affect) lived emotional practices? Firstly, we may assume this, with a reasonable degree of certainty: feudal anger and the ability to practise it are deeply embedded in the negotiation of power. This applies to the characters in the texts, to the chroniclers writing them, and, presumably, to the real people using these

scripts to shape and understand feelings in their social world. Edward III at Calais uses largesse and feudal anger together to position himself politically and emotionally relative to his own people, to Calais, and to Philip; but on a more fundamental level, he uses them to establish his own right to determine the discourse and define that relationship. We can see this in effect in the story as told by Jean le Bel and Froissart; we can see, in the popularity of Froissart's *Chroniques* and the enthusiasm with which his writing was adopted and encouraged and commissioned by gentry on both sides of the Channel, how these texts themselves had a similar power to affect self-definition and the emotional styles valorised by their target audience during the second half of the fourteenth century. We cannot see exactly what Edward III did at Calais, but we can see what his exemplars are and what that story became, and begin to formulate some idea of the discursive interaction between text and practice. Edward III and his court would have grown up surrounded by stories presenting certain models of emotional behaviour; Edward III actively promoted and harnessed certain chivalric ideals in his court and in waging war; Edward III was himself able to perform valorised emotional scripts well enough to become the embodiment of Arthurian perfection in contemporary narratives, historiographical and fictionalised.

Chronicles of his time reflect, teach, and discuss these scripts, and record them for current and later generations. They witness the key role of emotionality in negotiating relationships and legalities in a feudal society; but they do more than witness it. They reinforce certain emotional styles, practices, and scripts, and criticise or erase others. They teach them, and they use them to shape events and persons in history, recent or ancient. They also engage the reader's emotionality: at Calais, the reader is encouraged to become a part of the emotional community responding to the glorious spectacle, to weep and to fear as the nobles witnessing the scene do, if they have a noble heart themselves. In other words, they are guided in the development of their own noble heart.

It is entirely possible that, given the social emphasis on emotional unity (of which, more in the next section), ideal readers ought by default to be participating in textual emotions, rather than observing. Even if this is only partly or occasionally true, the text itself becomes a means to rehearse emotion scripts and styles for the reader. The nature of complex emotion scripts, such as the script of (lordly) feudal anger, allows for a safe degree of variability within the familiar. The reader's emotional response to such a scene would already be rehearsed, almost ritualised, guiding them to a cathartic, controlled, satisfying conclusion to a complete emotional journey. For Edward III, this particular emotion script could also be

applied directly within his own life—used to shape and evaluate and moderate his own feelings—but not so for every reader.

To a certain extent we can witness this in the texts as well. We can see that the lack of a standardised script for non-lordly feudal anger is self-perpetuating, that chroniclers become uncomfortable or confused when it comes to understanding or representing these angers. Would this same discomfort and confusion be present for individuals, in their own emotional experiences?

Chronicles, of course, are not the only means by which people might learn models of feeling. Equally obviously, their effect would be more weighty for those social groups more directly and strongly influenced by this particular class of textuality. However, chronicles by their nature draw on the traditions of several different genres: they represent and contain traces of a far broader narrative tradition, which does include oral transmission and which does travel across social boundaries, though it does not ignore them altogether. As we know today, representation matters—though our media is more universally accessible and (intermittently) more diverse. We know, too, the power of negative stereotypes on the anger of certain social groups. A woman who is regularly dismissed as hysterical or bitchy, or a young Black man in America who is often treated as violent and potentially criminal, will almost inevitably internalise those ideas into their own experiences of anger. In the medieval context, the absence of authoritative models for socially functional feudal angers—for productive ways to experience and engage that anger to mend a relationship—must have had a powerful effect.

Section C: Writing the feeling body

Introduction

Galenic humoral theory is not the governing model of emotional production in medieval England. What is the dominant model? That's a good question, one in urgent need of answering. (Sarah McNamer, "Feeling" 245)

Over the last few chapters I have been somewhat flexible in my use of theoretical terms such as 'emotional style' and 'emotional practices', adapting them as necessary while I explored my material. I want now to tighten my theoretical framework and examine a few details of Monique Scheer's suggestions for the application of practice theory to the historical study of emotions. The end of the previous chapter was speculative, asking questions about whether we can deduce lived emotional practices from historiographical texts, and about the possible role of textuality in constructing, teaching, and delimiting those practices. Scheer's model provides a more rigorous structure for thinking about exactly what "emotional practices" can mean, and how they function relative to learned culture, the physical body, and the conscious self. In this final section I will frame my work more explicitly in terms of emotional practices, trying to answer McNamer's question by extending our understanding of the medieval feeling body.

Scheer defines emotion as a kind of practice with reference to Bourdieu's sociological model of practice theory: as something that is learned, on conscious and subconscious levels. This learning happens not only in the mind, but in a body which includes the neuroplastic and physical mind:

Practice theory is... interested in implicit knowledge, in the largely unconscious sense of what correct behavior in a given situation would be, in the "feel for the game." Thus, practices are skillful behaviors, dependent (as the term suggests) on practice until they become automatic. (202)

Emotional practices, then, could be—in the first instance—behaviours that one does in order to have or modify emotions. Scheer, however, moves beyond this initial definition to grapple with "'doing emotions' in a performative sense, which would implicate thinking of emotions themselves *as* a kind of practice" (194). Instead of *having* emotions—being assailed by them, or feeling them rise up from some unknown place within—one would *try* them, *shape* them, *make* them, *do* them.

To do, and to make: *faire*. We will see, in this section, Edward III “faire bonne chiere” in his court, and Hugh Despenser the elder “ma[k]e miche sorwe”, and I will return again to the fact that the idiom of feeling is far less passive in the fourteenth century than it is in modern English. Here, too, “feeling” is something that one does, not something that happens to one. This makes the language of emotional practices well suited to studying the Middle Ages—although it may, perhaps, lead to the risk of a circular argument. Let me emphasise what I hope will be proved in the first two chapters of this section: this active, constructive approach to emotion is not something that I find only because I am using practice theory. The idea of “making feeling” through one’s actions—with active, embodied verbs—is in fact embedded in the language and the discourse around emotion in these texts.⁴⁸

That raises the question of the body as physical object. In Scheer’s model, “practices are executed by a knowing body”: the body “stores information from past experiences in habituated processes and contributes this knowledge to human activity and consciousness” (199, 201). She emphasises the role of the body, including the adaptable brain, in unconscious categorisation and behaviour: in short, in learning and doing cultural practices of emotion. This provides a useful toolset for thinking about the internalisation of emotional practices in relation to the socially situated body—a toolset which is, again, particularly appropriate to these texts, since they are so focussed on the social aspects of feeling-making.

Scheer proposes four types of emotional practices (or four types of work that emotional practices can do): mobilising, naming, communicating, and regulating. Practices which *mobilise* emotions include “habits, rituals, and everyday pastimes that aid us in achieving a certain emotional state”: anything we do to produce a certain feeling or to moderate or alter an existing one, from hugging a friend for comfort to the elaborate sequences of behaviours that make up courtship practices across different cultures (209). *Naming* emotions “is part and parcel of experiencing them... expression organizes the experience” (212). She includes William Reddy’s model of emotives as one kind of naming practice, but also allows for more diversity of form than Reddy does: feelings named not only in speech but in writing and thoughts, and with different meanings and effects depending on context (212–13).⁴⁹ Emotional practices that include *communicating* are most obviously socially learned, involving both a set of “clear, socially agreed-upon signs” and the question of

⁴⁸ Corinne Saunders also argues for the inextricability of mind, feeling, and body in this period, and discusses how this intersects with reading practices (“Affective Reading”, 29 and elsewhere).

⁴⁹ Scheer refers specifically to Reddy’s formulation of emotives in “Sentimentalism and its Erasure”. See also his *Navigation of Feeling*.

success: has the message been received as intended (214)? In this context, the question of sincerity is also highly culturally determined. The parameters that structure whether and when conventionalised or deliberately expressed emotions are considered to be “real” are not universal, and these parameters can be an object of historical inquiry in themselves (214–15). *Regulatory* emotional practices involve the interaction of societal and group expectations with the development of the individual’s emotional repertoire, and include, for Scheer, most of the work already done on emotionology, emotional norms, and emotional regimes as regards regulation and constraint. She proposes that practice theory can take this further by breaking down any assumption that the feelings being regulated and constrained are something that would otherwise have been “hard-wired”: rather, the group influence helps to shape and create those feelings and the body’s capacity for feeling them (216).

Scheer’s model, however, is not explicitly textual. When she offers suggestions about methodology for historical emotions research in general, the role she assigns to textual sources is primarily that of historical witness, not participant. Secondly, she suggests a rather vague regulatory role, with texts as “providers of templates of language and gesture as well as mediators of social norms” (218). I have already gone so far myself in previous sections, but I think it is possible to go farther and consider the possible role of medieval literature in naming, communicating, and mobilising emotional practices.

Sarah McNamer has already begun to bridge this gap, though not by the name of practice theory. She suggested, in “Feeling”, that literary texts should be considered as doing more than “absorb[ing] and replicat[ing] theories or discourses of emotion”, possibly even as being “a primary site or mechanism for the *making* of emotion” (245). She puts her own suggestion into effect in *Affective Meditation and the Invention of Medieval Compassion*, published two years before Scheer’s article on emotional practices. The primary goal of McNamer’s monograph is to argue for this particular kind of compassion as “historically contingent, ideologically charged, and performatively constituted” (3), but she also foregrounds the role of the text in shaping and nourishing it, and in helping readers (especially women) to rehearse this affect, this bodily response: in Scheer’s terms, to incorporate it into their *habitus*.

McNamer’s texts are well suited to such a project. They foreground embodied emotion, and attempt to shape a one-on-one relationship with the reader which includes offering direct instructions as to feeling and emotional behaviour, in a highly regulated and institutionalised context. Chronicles are rarely so intimate or so explicit, nor is the context in which they are read so easily defined. Nevertheless, they can both valorise and provide instruction in specific

emotional practices. Moreover, McNamer's work proves the existence in this period of a reading culture that demands that work of meditative engagement and emotional learning. Fiona Somerset confirms this when she too suggests a practice of conscious emotional learning from texts, with reference to fifteenth-century Lollard writing (*Feeling Like Saints*). In that light, my suggestion at the end of the previous chapter of a culture of emotional contagion between written characters and readers appears plausible.

This section, therefore, has two aims: for the most part, I will treat my texts primarily as witnesses to and regulatory participants in emotional practices, describing and discussing those ideas of the feeling body that they presuppose and help to construct. From time to time, however, I will pause to consider the possibilities of the texts as participating in Scheer's other three types of emotional practices—naming, mobilising, and communicating—that is, as emotional objects and as emotional actors themselves.

The order in which Scheer lists her four types of emotional practice fits her explanatory structure. There is a story here: a person acts to produce an emotion (mobilising), identifies and typifies the emotion they are feeling (naming), and seeks to convey it to others (communicating), at which point it may be judged and modified by others (regulation). The story is cyclical, since regulation constantly works on mobilisation. Most of the mobilising practices she lists (courtship, confession, and so on) are heavily scripted by and embedded in social interaction; and there are similar overlaps and interactive effects between any two of her four types. For my discussion, another ordering works better. There are four chapters in this section: in the first two I will focus on naming and communicating—that is, the language around identifying and experiencing emotion within the body and how the feeling body interacts with those around it—before moving on to mobilising and regulatory practices.

Chapters 8 and 9 examine the language used to describe the role of the heart and internal sensations, and move outward from there to various parts of the socially engaged feeling body: through action and speech, to gaze and countenance. The logic behind this ordering is not dictated by the anachronistic idea of emotion as something that begins within and moves outward (*ex motio*), but by degrees of social engagement and social monitoring. As we will see, gaze and countenance are in these texts more self-consciously embedded in social emotion than are speech and gesture: they show feeling in movement between persons, where action and speech may involve either individual or collective feeling. Consequently, emotional practices surrounding gaze and countenance are more consciously monitored by the individual and by society: accomplishments which can be acquired (at least, by those who

have “noble” feeling), to rehearse and produce the ideal emotional effects in oneself and others.

After examining all parts of the feeling body, I turn in Chapter 10 to examine the semantic range of the words *dole* and *grevance* as a case study for the elision between the physical and the social body: *dole* is felt as a response to both emotional and physical harm, and can be felt by an individual, a community, or an individual representing a community. I conclude in Chapter 11 by considering cases where a chronicler is obliged to take for his subject a king whose emotional practices appear to be dysfunctional: how authors may handle a dysfunctional or rejected feeling body, who must nevertheless embody his people. I conclude with some suggestions about emotionality and historiography in the Middle Ages, and, more broadly, about how we might think about the role story-telling as emotional practice in studying the history of emotions.

Chapter 8. The act of feeling

Boiling blood and heavy hearts

I begin my exploration of the concept of the feeling body by looking at descriptions of internal sensations of emotion. Although I begin with internal organs and blood, it soon becomes clear that there is no meaningful distinction between (say) a pounding heart and an impassioned gesture. The entire body is involved in the act of (creating) feeling—action, speech, and internal sensation—and the same language of stirring and movement and changes in temperature is used for all of the body, internal and external. Although an author may express emotion with reference to any of several parts there is no difference in their function in the generation of feeling: the feeling body is an integrated and porous emotional unit.

Performative “signs” of emotion have equal value with the invisible and interior ones: why?

The word “sign” was appropriate in Chapter 1, when I was considering how a modern reader might “diagnose” emotions in a given text. Now, however, my aim is to consider the conceptual logic that underlies the writing of these texts. Gesture and sensation must now be read not as passively revealing an emotion (to the reader or to the witnesses within the text) but as actively participating in its construction.

We begin in the same place that my lists of signs did in Chapter 1: inside the body, with hearts and blood. The heart is the body part most commonly named in association with emotion of all kinds. It frequently appears as the site of passion, or is said to feel that passion itself: so, Beaumont has anger *in* his heart (*Voeux* 303), Edward II’s heart *is* pious (*GB* 26), and Isabella “ma[kes] miche sorwe in hert” (*Brut* 271). Philip VI has “grant angoisse au cuer” (*SHF* 1–280). Edward III has “fin amour” for the Countess of Salisbury in his heart—and, after she rebukes him, he takes care to shut his feelings up “fermement... ou cuer” (*SHF* 1–157 and 1–159). There are also several commonplaces about a heart’s role in feeling idealised emotions. A heart should be soft/tender enough to be penetrated by gentle emotions such as pity and love: Froissart/le Bel says that no heart could be so “dur” as to not feel pity for the people of Calais, and Edward finally softens (“amolia”) his heart (*SHF* 1–312); meanwhile, Geoffrey le Baker’s Isabella will not hear her husband’s love and despair because her heart is harder than an adamantine anvil (28). The heart may also be the seat of courage or of heroic grandeur: Robert of Artois tells the company that Edward III is behaving in a cowardly way because his

heart has failed him (*Voeux* 84), and the author of the *Vita Edwardi II* warns his readers that a fearful heart is ineffective in action (213).

At first glance, therefore, one might be tempted to identify the heart as the seat or origin of passion and associated personal qualities; but it is as often named in connection with decision and rational choice as with passion. There is no modern opposition here between the thinking brain and feeling heart: the heart is often hardly to be distinguished from the will. The author of the *Anonimalle* chronicle complains frequently of Edward II's changes of heart, by which he means his unsteady will and his tendency to—as we would put it—change his mind. The very third sentence of the chronicle accuses him of being “so *chaungeable de corage et de quoer*, that what he granted one day for the common profit of the land he would want to retract on another” (80–81).⁵⁰ Elsewhere, Edward “pensa... en quoer” and his heart determines on vengeance, while John of Powderham acts on the ideas that “le deable li mist en quoer” (*Anonimalle* 86, 102, 94). The Roman emperor, being “angerde at his herte”, gathers his lords and tells them that his “herte sothely es sette” on war (*Morte* 1957, 1963). In one chronicle, Salisbury speaks with his mouth the “pensement” of his heart (*Voeux* 190); in another, his Countess protests that the “pensee” of adultery never entered her heart, and prays that it never shall (SHF 1–158). Edward II's heart is finally persuaded to agree to his deposition: the fact that he weeps as he does so suggests strongly that his consent is not *wholehearted*, in the modern sense, but only a concession of the will (GB 26). Many of these thoughts and decisions may be emotional in whole or part, but the narrative emphasis in each case is on the heart as the agent of consideration and choice, not on a passionate impulse. Arthur does raise the question of whether thoughts born in the heart may be too impetuous and unconsidered:

“Sir Cadour,” quod the kynge, “thy concelle es noble;
Bot thou arte a meruailous mane with thi mery wordez!
Ffor thow countez no caas, ne castes no forthire,
Bot hurles furthe appone heuede, as thi herte thynkes...” (259–62).

This distinction, however, is not so common as the simple conflation elsewhere of heart and thought; and, unless one assumes that Edward II's fickleness of will in the *Anonimalle* stems

⁵⁰ Childs and Taylor translate “*chaungeable de corage et de quoer*” as “fickle in purpose and feelings”. Since the chronicler does not elsewhere make much distinction between “*quoer*” and “*corage*”, and does have a tendency to pair similar words together for rhetorical intensity, this rendering probably overstates the distinction; but “purpose and feelings” together comes close, I think, to this conceptualisation of the heart.

from the fact that he is thinking with his heart, I can find no direct analogue in any of the actual chronicles. In the ordinary usage of the chroniclers there is no meaningful distinction drawn between the abstract mind and the embodied heart—or, indeed, between feeling and the will.

But just how embodied *is* this heart? Occasionally we are given a sense of the heart as a specific physical organ, when it responds to emotion with movement—usually trembling or swelling—or with heat. Edward III’s heart “est fremis” (*Voeux* 88), and Arthur tells us that his “herte trembled” at the insolence of the Roman messengers (*Morte* 270); while Roger Mortimer’s heart “bolned” with wrath (*Brut* 265), and hearts in the *Anonimale* chronicle frequently swell (e.g., 102, 126). A fluttering or thudding heart sounds familiar enough to a modern audience to assume that we may understand the physical sensation implied by these descriptions: the heart beats faster, harder, draws attention to itself. Norris J. Lacy translates “fremis” cited above in *Voeux du Hérion* as “pounded with anger and resentment”. Even the mention of a heart swelling with emotion may seem to some modern readers to straddle the line between literal and metaphorical: terms like “a full/overflowing/aching heart” are still familiar enough today that we can associate a physical ache with this sort of expression. However, the medieval habits of symbolism and synecdoche complicate any attempt to determine the degree to which the heart is considered literally as the bodily organ in any given case. It is capable of functioning simultaneously as the source of the fluttering sensation in one’s chest and as the symbol of the whole body, feeling, or soul. Its symbolic functions are literalised on the death of Raoul de Cambrai, that superlative warrior of powerful, noble, but erring passions: when his heart is removed from his body, it is found to be larger than that of an ox at the plough (vv. 3065–68).

Even in the moments when it seems to read most as a literal physical organ, we should be cautious of reading this “heart” in precisely anatomical terms. The actions of *beating* and *pounding*—or rather, the verbs usually translated as such in modern readings—are also used to describe the actions of the blood and the rest of the body in feeling emotion. *Fremir* cannot always mean beat, *tremblen* cannot always mean pound: both verbs are also applied to blood. *Bolnen* is more slippery yet: it is not always possible to tell the difference between motion and changes of temperature. The verb is usually one that, in its literal sense, indicates movement: *mouvoir* in French, *estuar* in Latin, *bolnen* in English, and so on. In the case of the Latin and the English, the primary meaning is to describe the swelling or surging of liquid, as of waves: the associations of heat are secondary, through the image of a boiling pot. Given that many strong passions are associated with heat, “boil” is often a reasonable translation—but not

always. As we have already begun to see, movement or disturbance is also deeply embedded in the bodily experience of strong passions; and then, not all emotions that may be described in terms of movement of the blood are ones associated with heat. The blood of the Count of Foix “li mua” in anger; but his son trembles and is “sancmué et effraïé”: that is, his blood moves with fear, a feeling usually associated more with cold than heat (SHF 3–21). While the father flushes in anger, the son turns white. Then, too, the heart (and the whole person) may “bolnen”, in which case “swell” or “bulge” seems a more natural translation than “boil”. That it is sometimes imagined with a sense of inflation rather than seething is shown by moments that express the same concept in different words: for example, the “grossure” of Edward II’s heart “surmonta” in an emotional moment (*Anonimale* 102).

The language of internal emotional sensation is dominated by the idea of inner parts seething, moving, swelling, and changing temperature—and the difference between the exact sensations described seems as fluid and porous as the distinction between the parts themselves. Nor is this language confined to the interior of the body. The heart is in many cases interchangeable with the whole body or the self, and the same phrasing can be applied to both: so, Geoffrey le Baker says that envy is banished from Edward III’s *heart*, and two sentences later, that Jean II *himself* is “[c]onsumed with wrath, which is the bastard offspring of envy” (98). Roger Mortimer can “bolne[n] for wrap”, and the same expression is applied to his heart (*Brut* 268, 265). The sight of the people of Calais by the end of the siege is so pitiful that there is not a heart in the world so “dur” that *it* would not pity them (so we are told twice); but the heart of Edward III is so “dur” that *he* cannot speak for anger (SHF 1–312). People may heat up, as well as hearts and blood—the rampaging Scots burn (GB 4), Isabella blazes up in anger (GB 16). So may they tremble—Philip VI “quite *fremissoit* with anger and rage” and the frightened son of the Count of Foix “began to *trembler* hard” (SHF 1–280 and 3–21). The chronicler of the *Vita Edwardi II* speaks of courtiers who are inflamed by malice and swollen up with rancor (“*rixa excand[ere]*” and “*forte rancore tumesc[ere]*”, 98–99), and Philip VI is “inflatus” by anger and pride (GB 51). Sometimes people are simply moved: Isabella is “non amore mota set furore commota” (GB 28).⁵¹ Even the feeling itself may be said to change its temperature or to stir: the anger of the Black Prince grows hot against the rebels

⁵¹ “Not moved by love but *commota* to/with fury.” This slight wordplay draws attention to the fact that, though *commovere* is technically simply a verb of motion and agitation, it is used almost exclusively for anger—just as nowadays, if one is “aroused” in English, or “eccitato” in Italian, the passion in question is assumed to be sexual unless otherwise specified. Preest elides the verbs and renders the line “not stirred to love... but to anger”.

of Aquitaine (“incanduit ira principis”, GB 110), and the barons’ hatred of Gaveston “incanduit” (GB 11).

The feeling body in these texts, then, is not made up of discrete parts, with separate functions. Emotion does not originate in one part of the body then move outward to others, nor is one particular aspect of the body or mind tasked with containing unruly passions or combatting them with reason. This is true even of the womb. The feeling body is not gendered, as female bodies appear too rarely in these texts to have any distinctive language of emotion associated with their bodies. The body is male by default, gendered only if it deviates from that norm. Nor is there any evidence here of Galenic humoral theory: its associations of particular emotions or heavenly bodies with specific organs or humours seem to have very little relevance to the perceptual experience of emotion within one’s own body as witnessed in these texts.

In practice, emotions do not seem to be experienced as isolated in specific parts of the body, or even as affecting them in different ways. The body acts as a whole to generate emotion. Each of its parts moves simultaneously in the same way, whether that motion be trembling, swelling, or changing temperature. A heart may seem to tremble or heat, but so may a body. Cheeks may redden (heat) or pale (cool) just as the body may. Even the pounding of an agitated heart sounds like trembling. Nor is this conflation of passion and body restricted to the historiography. Both the *DMF* and *AND* attest that passionate people may *buillir* and even *frire*—both in their persons or in their blood—and the Middle English *boillen* has the same usage. The *MED* lists many instances of trembling hearts under verbs such as *quaken* and *tremblen*; and *panten* may mean rapid or laboured breath, but may also be used to describe the action of an agitated heart. The *AND* lists for *fremir* meanings such as trembling, convulsing, the beating of a heart, the boiling of blood—and the surge of the sea.⁵² And Middle English hearts may *quappen* (“struggle or wriggle in death agony; of someone’s vital force: suffer convulsion or agitation”), a verb which may also be applied to the tossing of waves. The body generates feeling as one cohesive unit, performing the same fluid action in all of its parts.

Despite the analogy of liquid, this model has little in common with the model which Rosenwein named “hydraulic”. The hydraulic model is essentially passive, imagining emotion as something happening *to* the subject—rising up from below or within. The subject can only contain, express, or modify that emotion: they have nothing to do with its actual production.

⁵² The *DMF* is terser with its definitions—only “S’agiter d’un mouvement... trembler, frémir” for an object, or “*Se fremir. Trembler, s’agiter*” for a person—but its examples include many quaking hearts, and one wind-tossed ocean.

The feeling body in fourteenth-century historiography is anything but passive in the production of emotion. It does not respond to emotion: it generates it by those very internal movements which we see described. Almost all the verbs of emotion are active unless being used as a transitive verb: one can *wrathen* intransitively (become angry) or one can *wrathen* somebody else (make them angry)—by contrast with modern English idiom, in which we typically use an adjective with a relatively passive construction (to be made angry / to get angry, or to anger somebody else). We no longer have verbs which can be used of the subject to signal an active shift to that emotion: linguistically speaking, we can no longer *do* many of our own emotions.

These patterns in the descriptions of internal feeling give us a strong foundation for understanding the naming practices surrounding the feeling body: that is, how sensations and emotions are categorised, typified, and understood. We can see the active language used to describe (and experience?) emotional production, and we can see certain kinds of internal sensation being grouped together conceptually regardless of what body part they are affecting. Moreover, we can begin to see how deeply the vocabulary of liquid movement is embedded in the experience of feeling. Boundaries are porous here: between the various parts of the body, between the body and the outside world, and even between literal signification of the various words. As we will see, too, the same vocabulary may be used not only of an individual body but of the movement of feeling between different individuals and through an entire community.

The fact that this is not restricted to one or two words, or even to a single language, suggests a fundamental and widespread perception of how emotion and sensation act within the body. Given the power of language in organising and enacting experience on both a personal and social level, this is more than a mere metaphor, or a few half-forgotten etymological associations. “Putting a name on our feelings is part and parcel of experiencing them: expression organizes the experience” (Scheer 212), and if so, these texts are not only witnesses to naming practices, but participants: teaching the language and organisation of emotion, modelling the experience, and offering patterns for reinterpretation after the fact of one’s own experiences of feeling and for the feelings of others.

Behaviour and speech, feeling actions

What, then, of the role of communication? There are two particular aspects of the feeling body which are more directly observable by others, or which interact with other people: behaviour, and speech. These do not presuppose an audience—people often practice emotional behaviour or speech when unobserved—but they do make the internal emotional state visible to others, and can involve social engagement in the mobilisation of emotion. Being more directly monitored by society than internal sensation, they are more consciously acquired emotional skills. These, however, are clearly “skills” in Scheer’s sense: acquired and internalised well below the level of awareness so as not to occupy the working memory, to the extent that they are exercised unconsciously and considered normal, like knowing when to offer a handshake, or, on a more fundamental level, how to organise the muscles to keep oneself standing upright without conscious effort. Within these texts, emotional behaviour and speech are still considered “natural” proofs of feeling, rather than cultivated “skills” which one consciously puts into effect.

As I argued in Chapter 1, the internal sensations of emotion are no more valid as indicators of “real” emotions than communicative action or speech, at least when it comes to the narration of emotion events in these texts. If we consider this in terms of practice theory, it is a simple matter to say that the text itself as emotional practice sees no difference between these various manifestations: that is, the author, in constructing the emotion event, considers all three to be equally valid ways to create the emotion within the text and engage the reader in its creation.

Certainly affect and behaviour are in unity with internal feeling in these texts, functioning as part of the same action: all are generated by the same impulse, and all act to generate the feeling in the subject and in observers. Rushing forward to embrace a friend; taking heart in battle or fleeing in panicked confusion; self-abasement by dressing humbly, or by begging on one’s knees; gestures of this kind function on the same level as internal sensation in terms of narrative communication of emotional state. They rely on this conformity of meaning for their social effect within the text and for their narrative effect outside of it; but they also have an additional function, which is stirring emotion in onlookers within the text.

This conformity of feeling with physical movement of the body is reflected in the ubiquity of feeling-action, or feeling *as* action. By this I mean expressions like “making dole/merry”, “lamenting”, “celebrating”, in which the verb or verbal phrase foregrounds the

feeling rather than the precise action involved in expressing it. These are by far the most common type of emotional action that can be imagined in relation to the body (as opposed to political or large-scale actions like holding a loveday or starting a war). So, for example, Hugh Despenser the Elder “made miche sorwe” when banished from England (*Brut* 214); Edward II “remua sa sege et ala a Loundres mult dolent” (*Anonimalle* 98); Guenevere “in care lenges” at Arthur’s departure (*Morte* 696). People are often abashed (“esbahir” / “abasshen”), which blends embarrassment, shame, distress, and visibly not knowing what to do and how to behave in a given social situation (e.g., *SHF* 3–21, *SHF* 1–159, *Anonimalle* 128, *Brut* 216). When we see terms like “dolente” or “lamenting” it is almost impossible to know how precisely this is imagined to relate to the body—whether as emotional action, verbalised lament, or grief felt internally. Isabella, for example, “dolet” with anger, with tears, and with words, blending feeling and body and voice in that one verb (*GB* 17). This very confusion (or flexibility) shows the extent of the conceptual elision between inward feeling, outward behaviour, and social feeling. Such unified feeling-actions all have social meaning. Many of them engage directly with other people, or even have a ritualised significance. Feeling-actions therefore actualise the emotion in the social world, generating emotional response in others and in the subject, while simultaneously positioning that emotional response relative to culturally established norms for feeling and behaving. By using these gestures and actions they therefore help to create and categorise the emotion: they take on something of the force of emotives, declaring and affirming that *I am angry*, or that *we are grieving together*.

There is a wide variety of speech acts which function as emotional expression beyond simple statements of joy, woe, or anger, from “praising” or “giving thanks” to the tumultuous roar of an army in battle. Wordless speech—or speech of which the words are not reported, which comes to the same thing—functions in the same way as feeling action, and the borders between them are fluid. Wordless speech may be used to indicate degree and general kind of passion, but sometimes can act in emotive mode, especially the more formalised or ritualised utterances. Even the inability to speak is sometimes used to show an excess of emotion, sometimes accompanied by the grinding of teeth, or the biting of a lip (*SHF* 1–312, *Morte* 119 and 270). Froissart provides an interesting variant on this loss of control of speech when the agitated Count of Foix slips into Gascon instead of his usual “good” French (*SHF* 3–21).

Emotional group speech relies on a characterisation of the group as a body, and is usually formless and wordless (shouts, cries, roars), often representing the group as somewhat animalistic and uncontrolled. It may also appear in the form of murmurs or rumours (which some chroniclers may use to voice their own veiled criticisms, as do the

authors of the *Annales Paulini* and the *Anonimalle*). The language with which the generation of group speech is described often draws on the same vocabulary of movement and disturbance as the language of sensation within the body. Consequently, that group may be characterised negatively or positively by means of that feeling, depending on whether it is considered as a virtuous feeling or not. The contrast between rowdy, chaotic noise and silent, calm, pious discipline before and during a battle is often employed by chroniclers to foreshadow which army is likely to win, and why (e.g., the battle of Crécy: *GB* 72, and *SHF* 1–277 to 1–280).

At the other end of the scale from the chaotic and formless are those speech acts with formal or official effect, such as vows (*Voeux* throughout, *Brut* 215), recitals of grievances (as the Count of Foix against his son, *SHF* 3–21, or the town of Bristol in 1316, *VEII* 126), cursing (Hugh Despenser the Elder, *Brut* 214), and public proclamations (Edward II angrily banishing his wife and son, *Brut* 233, or proceeding against the clergy, *VEII* 71). Praise or thanksgiving to God can be individual or collective speech acts. Edward II's insistence on calling Gaveston his brother, or on other people's calling him the Earl of Cornwall, and Edward III calling the French king his cousin until Robert of Artois stirs war between them, probably fall into this category as well (*VEII* 15 and 9, *Voeux* 12–13). All of these speech acts have a function of enacting an emotion as a public and personal fact, engaging the community at large in a formal top-down act of feeling. But the most directly analogous to emotives are the moments where somebody simply stands forth and states his or her feeling—as for example, the king standing forth in the court and proclaiming his feudal anger. These are naming practices, similar to but broader than emotives: as part of a public performance according to a ritualised code of *feeling*, they effect emotion not only in the speaker but in the community.

I mentioned earlier that Hugh Despenser the Elder “made miche sorwe” when banished from England. Here is how he “makes” it:

And Sir Hughe þe fader went to Douer, and made miche sorwe, and felle adoun by the see bank, & clipped acros wiþ his Armes, and sore wepyng, saide: ‘now, farewele Engeland! & gode Engeland, to Gode y þe bitak!’ and þries cussede þe grounde, and wende neuer haue comen aȝein, and Wepying ful sore, cursede þe tyme þat euer he bigate Sir Hugh his sone, and saide ‘for him he hade loste Engeland’; and in presence of ham þat were him aboute, he ȝaf him his curse, and went ouer the see to his landes. (*Brut* 214)

This is a single emotion event. It contains direct and indirect emotional speech (note the curses), feeling-action (making sorrow), and specified emotional action (weeping, kissing the ground, falling down and embracing the ground). There are ritualised elements of

supplication and self-abasement in Despensers's apostrophe to England, as if he were taking unwilling leave of a beloved lord. He weeps sorely during both the speech act of sorrow and that of anger; and the second curse, being specifically uttered "in presence" of his followers, has something more of the air of a formalised rejection than the first. Although falling to the ground, embracing it with outstretched arms, and kissing it three times are highly ritualised actions which may seem very self-consciously performed, there is no real distinction to be made here between the "genuine" and the performative: no sense that feeling precedes action or speech and must be mediated through them. This is feeling-making united with speech and action: we are told that he "made sorrow", and then the exact movements and words with which he made it. Despensers is an active subject in emotion creation and participation: it is not merely something that happens to him. Nor does this feeling begin inside and move outward: internal and external happen at the same time. Internal movement of the body works together with its actions and speech to feel, generate, and categorise emotion—as well as giving it its social effect.

Vocal expression and feeling action both exist on a range from formless to highly structured. All of these have the capacity to organise and enact emotional experience on both a personal and social level. From a narrative point of view, they identify and characterise the emotion and at the same time engage directly with the readers, potentially enlisting them in a form of affective reading. To what extent can we compare them to emotives?

Reddy's emotives are primarily verbal: whether pronounced aloud or articulated in thought alone, they rely on the power of language to name a thing and give it shape. In the societies of which he writes it may be true that speech has a unique role in identifying and classifying emotional experience, but in these medieval texts that role is shared equally with action. It is possible to argue that emotion scripts could, in some cases, be sufficiently structured and recognised to count as emotives. Certain kinds of action carry sufficient symbolic weight to have an equal power to language in this regard: an embodied or gestural expression of emotion need not, in that case, be considered to be pre-verbal, but as a different kind of articulation. Speech and action might equally work to achieve both the personal and social effects of feeling. However, Reddy's term is very well defined and its boundaries are clearly delineated. It is culturally contingent, yes, but it works to describe a specific phenomenon that exists within the kinds of world that he observes. The term "naming practices" is more appropriate here, because it encourages exploration in the relevant cultural context. In this context, we find that emotives might have social as well as personal effect (that

is, they can be both communicative *and* naming practices)—but we also find that we must reconsider the word “communicate”.

In these texts, communication almost invariably involves contagion. Expressing feeling creates feeling: not only in oneself, but in others. Scheer’s description of communicative social practices does not include emotional contagion. She focusses on the success or failure of transmitting the “message”: on the “socially agreed-upon signs” for giving that message, and the cultural structures that dictate what counts as “success” and under what circumstances questions of sincerity are valued or arise at all. For Scheer, emotional contagion is classed under mobilising emotions: that is, any kind of sympathetic or antipathetic emotional response in the “recipient” of the message is considered as *their own* practice. The medieval feeling body, however, is capable of *directly* mobilising emotion in itself and in others, rather than simply inspiring others to do their own mobilisation. We will see more examples of this in the following chapter, where gaze and countenance directly affect and effect the feelings of others. It must be flagged here, however, because chronicles consistently speak of communication in these terms. Emotional communication does more than *show* somebody a feeling: it *transmits* it and creates a corresponding feeling in them, whether it be the same emotion (feudal anger passed on from the lord to his followers) or an antagonistic one (rage in one person creating fear in another).

Emotives, Scheer suggests, are only one kind of naming practice. If we consider naming practices more broadly we might also consider the “naming” of the physical sensations or social structures associated with emotions, or even the grammatical constructions that shape their relationship to the subject. These must also be culturally acquired categories: emotional practices, in short. “My heart swells” does the same kind of work as “I feel angry”. We may posit that terms like “I make dole”, or even entire emotion scripts (once they are standardised and learned as part of one’s cultural “vocabulary”) would have a similar function—not identical to emotives, being more discursive and less essentialised, but still capable of organising and shaping emotional experience.⁵³

Third-person naming acts are not emotives, but they are also naming practices: “his heart swells” and “she feels angry” have a communicative and instructive role when it comes to learning how to feel. McNamer’s texts instruct: they employ second-person injunctions,

⁵³ Stephanie Trigg has made a similar argument for certain proverbial analogies and expressions about emotion: that, although the proverbial expression “does not function like an ‘emotive’ in any direct sense, it similarly draws attention to the active role of language in shaping both the feeling, and the representation of the feeling” (“Weeping like a beaten child”, 31–32).

telling the reader exactly what and how to feel, to bridge the gap between self-analysis and detached observation. Chronicles demonstrate and typify, usually in the third person, but often with instruction implied by modelling and praising the reactions the right emotional response within the text. “Every noble person who was there leaped to his feet and swore an oath”—or, “surely there could be heart so hard that it would not have pitied her”—these, I suggest, have an educational force not only through demonstration but also through emotional contagion, naming and communicating emotional practices in the same moment.

“If naming emotions makes them available to experience, then charting changes in naming means writing a history of feeling in the fullest sense” (Scheer 214). This applies most obviously to the words by which we label emotions—in Chapter 10, for example, I will show that *dol/gref* is more closely associated with anger than our modern “grief”. But there is also real historical value in, for example, looking more closely at the language used to describe the sensations of emotion within the physical body, or at the logic behind feudal love being named as the opposite to feudal anger. I would go further and suggest that studies of naming practices in the Middle Ages should also consider tropes and inherited structures such as emotion scripts, which carry name-like meaning for categorising and recording emotion. Moreover, the medieval idealisation of emotional contagion means that *naming* and *communicating* practices are more closely aligned than we might nowadays expect.

Chapter 9. The complete body

Feeling socially

In the previous chapter I laid the foundations for the concept of the late-medieval feeling body, comprised of both internal and external motion working together to “do” the feeling in the same way, from heart to speech acts. The feeling body, however, does not function independently of its social context. If naming and communicative practices are very closely aligned, so too are the acts of feeling and revealing. This chapter will consider two elements that are more consciously communicative and social in these texts: the gaze, and the countenance. Speech and feeling action do not depend on witnesses: they appear performative and they may have social effect, but they can also operate on the subject alone without the participation of others. Gaze and countenance, by contrast, are inherently social in their practice. They depend on the presence and participation of others: they are invoked in the narrative not to tell us what the subject is feeling, but to consider the ways in which feeling is conducted and created between different social subjects.

Countenance and cheer

I say “countenance” rather than “face” because the face itself is remarkable by its absence in chronicles and other medieval narrative. Flushing and pallor are part of the feeling body—they are often mentioned and bear a direct relationship to the act of feeling—but facial expressions are almost never invoked. Save for changes of colour we see nothing that might be classed as an emotional face: nobody grimaces or frowns; smiles and laughs are indistinguishable and almost never occur; nobody looks another person in the face to read their feelings. There is one smile in all of Froissart’s *Chroniques*, and the possibility of one in *Les Voeux du Héron* (SHF 2–297, *Voeux* 360–66). We glimpse something like a metaphorical frown in Harcourt’s desire to “place[re] faciem tiranni Francorum”, translated by David Preest as “to take the frown off the French tyrant’s face” (Geoffrey le Baker 69). The *Middle English* and *Anglo-Norman Dictionaries* suggest that this paucity of facial expression is not unique to chronicles. Concordance lists for words like “louren” and “sousrire” are scanty. There is little movement seen in the face, no focus on particular muscles and their communicative

significance—certainly no such volumes to be read in the face as one finds in nineteenth-century novels. On the rare occasions where the face is mentioned specifically, it is usually either as a metonym for person or presence (“before the king’s face”), or in so purely literal a manner that it has nothing to do with emotion and communication. *Visage* occurs only three times in Froissart’s *Chroniques* and refers purely to the physical face, not to the face as an expressive medium. In the Battle of Sluys, for example, the English army changes position to avoid the sun’s glare on their “visage” (SHF 1–114). More symbolically, Lancaster in the *Brut* turns “his visage toward þe crois” before his execution—a meaningful gesture of the head and body, but hardly an expressive face (219).

There is no stable practice of locating emotions in the face, isolated from the rest of the body. Instead, the face merges into social engagement and self-representation. In the place of facial expression—both the physical and lexical place—we find the word *chiere*, or occasionally *contenance* or *semblaunt*. While the primary literal meaning of *chiere* is “face”, and *contenance* and *semblaunt* are often used to translate Latin *vultus* and *faciem*, all three words have a broader meaning than the anatomical face, encompassing comportment, dress, and whole-body emotional expression. This elision of the face into so broad a concept associates it with social accomplishment and self-representation, but simultaneously renders the face itself almost invisible. *Chiere* is a part of the feeling body, in that it participates in the construction of feeling and may be trusted by witnesses and readers. It is, however, more closely aligned with the interpersonal aspects of feeling than with interior bodily experience. *Chiere* is only invoked when the author is considering the role of conscious self-representation to others, and therefore only comes into being in the context of social interaction. It affects and is affected by the feeling bodies around it; and, being a more consciously acquired and exercised skill, it is very closely aligned to class and social accomplishment.

Froissart offers the largest sample group for the range of meanings encompassed by *chiere*. Froissart often uses “faire bonne/grant chiere” as a feeling action: so, “le roy lui fist grant chiere” when Enguerrand de Coucy returns to France. Once again, feeling *is* behaviour; but now face and demeanour are comprehended in their representation, rather than voice and action, and the behaviour is necessarily a social one. *Chiere* has a broader application than feeling-action. In the adjectival phrase “de bonne/liee chiere” it becomes not a single act but a state or continuous behaviour, by which one may be described or identified: an aspect of character or social accomplishment, as much as of emotion.

All of these meanings are in play in the episode of Edward III's love for the Countess of Salisbury (SHF 1–158). Stylistically, this episode approaches very near to courtly romance; and it is perhaps for this reason that the word *chiere* appears so often, invoking the courtly perfections of the idealised beloved. When the Countess of Salisbury sees Edward III “pensif” instead of gay she goes to him “a chiere liee” and encourages him to “faire bonne chiere et feste”. Her face, presumably, is as smiling and gracious as she would have his be, but this description should conjure more in the imagination than smiles. She, “so richly dressed and adorned that everybody marvelled at her”; she, who draws everybody's admiration (and the king's love) with her “great beauty and *noblesse*” as she moves about the castle performing the duty of hostess and noble lady “as she knew very well how to do”; she embodies in her form the pattern of courtly perfection, in behaviour and aspect. His royal body, by contrast, ought to function as the emotional centre of the community: but in his indulgence of the individualised and hidden emotions of the lover, he has walled himself off from his companions. She urges the king not to put “a good face” on it and *feign* happiness but to *make* it, to unite his royal body and emotions with his people in celebration.

The range of meaning of *chiere* here is complicated by the insistent repetition of “chiere sires/dame” as a form of address between the two potential lovers. The two homonyms, distinct in etymology, nevertheless draw almost close enough in meaning in this episode to constitute wordplay. The degree to which king and countess ought to be *chiere* to each other and to make *chiere* with each other, is the delicate question at hand. They must negotiate between the ostensibly public *chiere* of lord and vassal, and the transgressive potential of private feeling.

Froissart's use of *chiere* encompasses a tantalising array of concepts to do with social practices, almost exclusively positive. This is more or less consistent across other French texts. The English *chere* is not confined to positive affects: so, in the *Brut*, Edward II speaks “wiþ simple chere, and saide: ‘allas, allas!’”, and Gawain's “chere chawngide” from battle fury to tears of mourning (*Brut* 253, *Morte Arthure* 2964). Mannyng is as likely to use it to speak of a negative affect as a positive one: “ay glad of chere” (2.7186), “faire in chere” (1.3974), praying “with soft wordes in symple chere” (1.1366); but “sory chere” (1.7096), “fulle mornande was his chere” (2.2297), “heuy chere” (2.8223 and 2.8340). *Contenance* in either language may also be positive or negative, and, though not so broad in its application, it covers a similar semantic range to the “demeanour/behaviour” meanings of *chiere*.

We see cheer and countenance in construction in Book III of Froissart, a conscious “practising” of a new emotional style (SHF 2–449). The Duchess of Hainault is training up her

niece, Isabella of Bavaria, to French courtly standards, hoping to marry her to the young Charles VI. Being “moult saige”, the Duchess sets up a regular course of instruction in “maniere et... contenance” and at the same time replaces her “abit” and “estat”, as Isabella’s own clothes and jewels and habiliments are too simple for French tastes. Dress and manners continue to work together when Isabella is brought before the young king. First she is “paree et ordonnee” as befits her, then she is led before him by three duchesses, and kneels very low at his feet. He raises her up, looks at her, desires her; and it is at once clear to the whole court that this young lady will be queen.

This is the story of a woman learning the behavioural and emotional repertoire appropriate for a new environment: in other words, somebody consciously adapting and expanding their emotional style according to instruction from external authority. The emphasis of the Duchess and of the narrative is on the modification of her outside appearance: her *contenance*, in this case, is made up of all the graces of a perfect courtly self-representation, from manners to jewellery. This instruction is necessary despite the fact that the young woman is by nature “propre et pourveue de sens et de dottrine”, for these “natural” qualities, important though they be, cannot be enough to decisively attract the king in the short time that they will have, unless she can also prove herself capable of correctly performing the emotional style of the court (SHF 2–449). “Nature” is valued here only when hastily acquired practice reveals its perfection.

Although this conception of *contenance* clearly encompasses more than the physical face, it remains exclusively visual. It concerns only that which is perceived by the gaze of onlookers: Isabella’s voice is not required. We are told at the outset that Isabella knows no French, and the ability to communicate with her prospective husband is considered by the Duchess as of minor importance. The voice, so central to Henry Higgins’ Pygmalion project, is explicitly excluded from the Galatea of the Duchess of Hainault. From the moment when the king takes Isabella by the hand and raises her up, the king’s reaction to her appearance is the focus of attention from both the narrator and the onlookers: he *regards* her closely; with that *look* pleasure and love enter his heart, because he *sees* that she is young and beautiful, and he has a great desire to “veoir et de l’avoir”. The onlookers know how to read the intensity of his gaze, and correctly deduce that since the king cannot avert his eyes this lady is to be their queen.

Unlike the Countess of Salisbury, that which is written on Isabella’s body is the social work of another woman, though she may learn to own it herself in time. In both cases, however, a woman’s *chiere* has an effect beyond her own body, reaching out to alter or create

feeling in others. The Duchess's program is successful: she has assumed correctly that the king will fall in love with the girl who can present the proper courtly *contenance*, in dress and manner. As the narrative focus has been on the construction of this whole, we must assume that it is this final result that captivates the king's gaze. He looks upon the whole body and behaviour, not necessarily upon the face. There is no mention of what we would call the face, either for its beauty or for its expressive potential. For Isabella, the performance of the correct emotional style must be exactly that: a conscious and self-conscious act of what to others has been assimilated into their own feeling body.

This is one of the few moments in the whole of the *Chroniques* (or indeed of any chronicle) in which we are made aware of a tension between external performance and what must be felt or thought within. It is not explicitly acknowledged by the narrative, but is brought to our attention by the reaction of the court. To them, the perfect exterior *contenance* that Isabella presents is proof of a unity of internal and behavioural qualities as accomplished as those of the Countess of Salisbury. Significantly, it is just at this moment—after Isabella's introduction to the king—that we glimpse the possibility of an expressive, mobile face. The king's attentions being noted by the court, all the lords and ladies begin to talk amongst themselves—amongst whom the young lady stands perfectly silent “et ne mouvoit oeul ne bouche”, because she still knows no French. While the other lords and ladies are animated, Isabella does not move a feature of her face. Although as readers we know that this silence and immobility are born of Isabella's ignorance of the language—that is, from a *failure* of social engagement—they are read by the court as further signs of her beauty and perfection, of a *contenance* accomplished beyond the usual degree. This silent, stately girl, inert in the midst of a laughing court and her own finery, is simultaneously a picture of loneliness and of social success—depending on the perspective. Charles VI, seeing only the second image, decides at once that he wants no other for a wife, and hurries the marriage forward. The possibility of a difference between internal and external remains as invisible to the courtiers as it usually is to the readers in these narratives.

This might seem just the moment for the author to intervene, to tell us what Isabella *does* feel, since—for once—her own social behaviour is inadequate to the task. But Froissart is as conspicuously silent on Isabella's feelings as she could be herself. There is no mention of her feelings at all throughout this scene—in fact, the first we hear of them is when we are told that the newlyweds pass their wedding night together in great delight (“deduit”), “as you can well imagine” (SHF 2–454). From a modern perspective we might very well not imagine that: we would see no guarantee that Isabella would enjoy that first night at all. Presumably, since

they are performing the acts of “delight” it follows that their feelings are in accord with it: they literally *make* love. But we are left to suppose it: during the court scene Isabella remains (e)motionless. She cannot produce her own feelings. She has been wiped blank: speechless, motionless, incapable of naming or mobilising her feelings, with an author who refuses to interpret for her. Even here, where we are made sensible of the tensions between interior feeling and performance, it is not possible for Froissart to speak of them as distinct from each other. But his very silence, the focus on her immobile face, invites us to try to read that face.

The invisible face

What, then, is the place of the face itself in expressive *chiere*? It seems to be entirely negative. That is, it only appears to emphasise a *failure* of communication, or of functional social engagement. The cluster of references to the faces of Gaveston and Edward II (discussed in more detail in the final chapter) occur at the moment when Edward II’s refusal to engage with his barons in favour of Gaveston is at its most crucial and socially disruptive. Isabella’s potentially mobile face is invoked here only to be denied—since, on the surface, her *chiere* is perfect—but the glimpse of it that we have, by its very rarity, serves to highlight the unusual tension in an imperfectly unified feeling body. This is no mere coincidence: the same pattern is evident as early as the romances of Chrétien de Troyes. Emotional faces appear very rarely in those texts, and then only in moments in which somebody is hiding or faking emotion. Their appearance signals some unusual discrepancy between the visible and invisible parts of the feeling body, and always requires an act of interpretation on the part of onlookers within the text.

The idea of facial expression as distortion is a recurring one in the Middle Ages. Although there is a relative abundance of expressive faces in visual arts they are overwhelmingly negatively coded. They tend to be found only on vices and devils, on passionate characters whose wild movements and flying hair enhance the impression of disturbance and contortion. Consider the wildly distorted grins and grimaces of devils, wild men, fools, monkeys, the tormentors of saints, and other “monsters” such as racial others.⁵⁴ Ira, as we saw in Chapter 3, is usually depicted with a twisted, leering mouth, a reddened face,

⁵⁴ See Debra Hassig. Lester Little and Jennifer O’Reilly, as I mentioned earlier, detail the characteristics of Ira and associated figures in the visual tradition.

burning eyes, wild or torn hair, distorted features, a bulbous nose. The difference between serene, elegant virtue and contorted passionate vice in visual culture is marked enough that Willibald Sauerländer, in his introduction to the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art's volume on medieval sculptures of the face, felt justified in saying that the Middle Ages despised and even feared passion altogether:

The passionate physiognomy was regarded simply as sinful... [According to Alcuin], "The face should be orderly, the lips should not be distorted, no immeasured opening should extend the mouth, nor should the eyebrows be raised or cast down." ... Ironically, it was this very absence of any system of physiognomy, and a concomitant fear of the passions, that gave rise in the Middle Ages to the veritable explosion of distorted and inflamed heads, faces, and masks as appears in no other period of Western art. (4)

Emotion shown in the face is, in medieval visual culture, a deviation from the ideal. Instances of smiling or positive emotions are very rare, and rather difficult to interpret. Anger, despair, envy, sorrow, lust, hatred, all come to look like a distortion of this placid ideal. Moreover, particularly in visual culture where a single image must represent the entire being in one instant, the emotion shown on the face is not a passing thing, but a reflection of the inner being. On the one hand there is idealisation, serenity, a lack of individuation – on the other, disfigurement, disturbance. In art and narrative, the immobile, invisible face is normative: emotion in the face is overwhelmingly negatively coded.

Translated into narrative culture, this tendency takes the form of an almost complete invisibility of the face. When faces are mentioned (as distinct from *chiere*), it is usually only to mention their beauty, without any particular individuality or mobility. If a face is actually described it is usually grotesque: the giant of St Michael's Mount in the alliterative *Morte*, Yvain's monstrous cowherd, the Green Knight, the images outside the garden in the *Roman de la Rose*. These faces are non-normative: bizarre spectacles, like gargoyles and green men. There is no normative face to be seen; or rather, the normative face is so by its invisibility. The immediate negation of the possibility of Isabella's expressive face emphasises its rarity: we only see it when it is *not* expressive, and that is taken by onlookers as ideal.

The expressive face, in the modern sense has no part in the feeling body of these texts. Here is no raised eyebrow, no quirk at the corner of the mouth, no scowl, no smirk that smooths out into wide-eyed innocence: no face that is expressive in its own movements, distinct from *contenance* and *chiere*. *Chiere* has social and feeling force. It is a successful conduit between the internal movements of the feeling body and the movements of society: it

enables them to make the feeling together, whether in unity (shared joy, for example) or in opposition (anger provoking fear). The *face* only appears at moments of isolation, of internalisation, when people are obliged to deduce the subject's feelings from the outside, or when the subject is brutish and distorted. We are left with the apparent contradiction that the face must be united with the feeling body but that any direct facial expression of emotion is aberrant. The mention of the heart may be taken as an unproblematic metonym for the blood, for the body, for the thought and soul, so why not the face? Perhaps precisely because the face is so difficult to control: social feeling and socially significant behaviours require a level of conscious accomplishment which thereby becomes "proof" of one's noble nature. There is no language of minute facial expression, no learned art of valuing the study of the highly personalised nuances it may reveal. Discovery and revelation are less culturally valued than that which is socially generated, which is brought forth and enacted by a unified feeling body in a manner comprehensible and accessible to others. It follows that the only moments in which we see the face *per se* are the moments in which somebody is trying to access inner secrets, to read that which is being denied to social interaction. Almost without exception, this is textually coded as unnatural and highly disturbing. The privileging of the face must come later, with the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with a preference for the contained expression and controlled manners, with the notion of having to seek out real feeling—that is, with a sincerity culture.

Stephanie Trigg has written about one remarkable exception in the later fourteenth-century: Geoffrey Chaucer's use of a trope that she has dubbed "the speaking face" ("Chaucer's Silent Discourse"). This trope involves facial expression being translated by the narrative voice into direct speech, usually introduced by a phrase such as "as if to say" (or, for Chaucer, "ascaunces"). When Troilus first notices Criseyde, for example, he is pleased by her "moving" and her "cheer" ...

Which somdel deignous was, for she let falle
 Hire look a lite aside in swich manere,
 Ascaunces, "What, may I nat stonden here?"

(*Troilus and Criseyde* I.288–92)

Trigg notices the exceptionality of Chaucer's use of the trope in this period: he is the first English-language author to use it, and adapts it from French- and Italian-language authors whom he translates. Elsewhere Trigg traces it in the works of Jane Austen, where it seems more naturally to belong: ladies exchanging looks of shared meaning rather than speak openly in front of the gentlemen, lovers who cannot speak aloud but whose feelings can be

read in their “speaking” looks, if one knows how to interpret correctly (“Faces that speak”). In both Chaucer and Austen, however, the speaking face requires an act of interpretation, the mastery of a subtle and consciously employed social skill. The unaccomplished and insensitive Robert Ferrars does not understand Elinor Dashwood’s indignant stare, nor can Mrs Allen read Catherine Morland’s silent appeal that she step in to excuse Catherine from an awkward social situation (“Faces that Speak”, 191–92). Chaucer’s speaking faces are hedged with uncertainty: the phrase by which they are introduced emphasises that the viewer must, to a certain extent, guess at the emotion and the message (see particularly the examples Trigg discusses on pp. 47–49). In the context of the emotional norms of the fourteenth century, the necessity for such an act of interpretation seems unusual and uncomfortable.⁵⁵ There is no such dissonance in the drawing rooms of Austen’s world, where the skills in question are part of a normative emotional practice, although not, of course, universally mastered. Chaucer’s use of the trope is exceptional in his period, because it *does* allow for a form of expression in the face, but it also functions within the context of his period: faces may obscure and destabilise meaning, even while they reveal it.

Gaze

Most of the communicative effect in Chaucer’s speaking face is conveyed not through muscular changes of expression in the face but through the eyes: a glance down and aside, or a gaze fixed on the viewer. In the quotation from *Troilus and Criseyde* above, Criseyde’s “cheer”, which Troilus admires so much, is not her face so much as her social behaviour: her “moving”, her “deignous” attitude, and especially the way she lets her look fall to one side “as if to say, ‘What, may I not stand here?’”. In chroniclers, too, the eyes are an exception to the rule of the non-expressive face. They “prove” the rule, however, in both senses: they put it to the test, and they confirm it. They are expressive not in their physical appearance, but in their social action. The word *eye* appears less often than words meaning *gaze* (as noun or verb); and the narrative focus is not on a portrait-like impression of how this person’s eye appears as on their effect on the social world around them. In other words, the gaze directly reaches out and effects emotional change. We have already seen, in Chapter 2, moments in which a

⁵⁵ Elina Gertsman has also discussed the ambiguity of facial expression in visual representations, especially of the smile.

king might glare horribly in his anger. Arthur's glaring eyes are described in the alliterative *Morte Arthure*—"fulle brymly for breth [they] brynte as the gledys" (117). His gaze reaches out to the viewed object, engaging with it or altering it: it does not belong entirely to the body in which it originates.

Froissart's use of *regarder* is a useful case study for the action and effect of the emotional eye. Its basic meanings in his work range broadly across three categories: "thinking about x", "looking at x", and "conveying something to x with a look". In almost every occurrence, however, more than one of these meanings is in play.

1. They *regarda* counsel that the city of Cambrai was strong and well supplied, and that it would take a long time to conquer it, and in fact that they could not be certain of victory. (SHF 1-78)
2. As the prince and his men advanced on the enemy, he *regarda* to his right and saw Sir Robert de Duras lying there dead... (SHF 1-386)
3. The king [*of France*], seeing that he was trapped and that resistance was useless, *regarda* the said knight and said to him, "To whom shall I surrender myself? Where is my cousin, the prince of Wales?" (SHF 1-392)
4. Because he *regarda* and considered that the prince of Wales was of great and noble birth and could uphold it well, being a valiant man... (SHF 1-501)
5. The prince took their letters and opened them, then he read them closely, and *regarda* how pitiably King Peter had written to him about his hardships and his poverty. (SHF 1-549)
6. And then the king of England *regarda devers* the church of Dame de Chartres, and he made vows and rendered himself devotedly to Our Lady... (SHF 1-474)
7. The king was silent and *regarda* very fiercely at the people from at the people of Calais, on account of the great losses that they had inflicted on him at sea in the past. The six burghers fell to their knees before him... The king fell silent for a moment and *regarda* the good lady his wife, who was heavily pregnant and wept tenderly on her knees. His heart began to soften... (SHF 1-312)
8. He was led with no dignities before the prince, who *regarda* him angrily. The kindest word he could say to him was that they should strike off his head, by the faith he owed to God and St George, and he had them take him out of his presence. [*Later, the prince sees people interceding on bishop's behalf:*] As soon as the prince's carriage came

near them he *regarda* them very willingly, and he was softened and appeased *regardant* his anger. (SHF 1–666)

The first example has nothing to do with the eyes, but only the mind: they consider the defences and provisioning of Cambrai and draw a conclusion about the risks of besieging it. They look upon it in their imagination, they employ information drawn from visual reports. The next two examples are, on the surface, purely about looking: at a corpse and at a knight. The fourth explicitly combines looking at a person with considering them, while in the fifth—and, in a more metaphysical sense, the sixth—the viewed object stands in for the person who is in the viewer’s mind. But already here we can see that the act of regarding is having a powerful emotional and spiritual effect on the viewer.

Once this is acknowledged it becomes clear that even the earlier examples are not so simple as they appear. This is not simply a turning of the eyes in a particular direction, but of an intellectual, emotional, or spiritual engagement with the person(s) looked upon. Cambrai is considered in detail and its status acknowledged. The prince and his men do not simply see the corpse of Robert de Duras: they recognise him, and are struck and moved by the sight. Jean II, defeated at the Battle of Poitiers and crowded in dangerously by men of low degree, fixes his eyes upon the only knight he can find and cries to him “Where is my cousin the Prince of Wales?”, appealing with that look and those words to their shared bond of knighthood to the exclusion of the rabble. In all these examples, it seems to me, there is some potent sense of recognition, of a connection established, and of a pivotal moment of decision brought about by that regard. In the final two examples that connection is used by the lord to wound his enemy with his own fury; and in each, the lord then *regards* a supplicant, and the sight of them moves him to gentler emotions. The gaze is both act and active, with the power to reshape both viewer and viewed. It encompasses attention, recognition, empathy, feeling, decision, action—not necessarily eliding them, but linking them as parts of a single process.

Characterising the feeling body

How can we characterise the normative medieval feeling body, then, as it appears in these texts? Firstly, it is **an emotional agent**: emotions do not happen to it, but are produced by it. Emotional agency is attributed to it on a lexical level and by phrasing and semantics—*I anger [myself] at him*, rather than *I become angry* or *Anger arises within me*—as well as by narrative discourse. Nor is this work of emotional production an unconscious act, because, secondly, the

feeling body is **complete**: an embodied self within a community, rather than a passionate body working on a reasoned mind, or an individual representing internal feelings to a group. There is no distinction between feeling and will, or between interior experience and outward performance, as, ideally, the actions of the *complete* self work to achieve and categorise the right emotion. Thirdly, it is **consistent and continuous**: no single part of this body works independently of the others, and the same vocabulary and sentence structures are usually used of—say—the blood and the skin, or the moving heart and the spread of a feeling through a nation, or the effect of a glare and of a physical blow.

The literal meaning of the word *emotion* implies something born within, *moving out* from some secret centre of the subject to be communicated to or hidden from the world. This *ex motio* model is foreign to the understanding of emotion within these texts. As Sarah McNamer suggests, the word *feeling* is a more appropriate word, not only as being contemporary to the language and time period of medieval England, but also in the ambiguity of its gerundive form: it is both noun and verb (“Feeling” 247). *Feeling* implies activity; and while emotion in these texts might not *move out*, it does involve active motion, within the subject and between subjects. *Doing* is involved on every level, from heart and blood to national community: feeling is generated in practice. It is an act of engagement with the various parts of the socially positioned subject: experienced internally, yes, but also in gesture, word, and action, and in engaging with and acting on other people.

These emotional practices are conceptualised and learned in relation to the community. This is a basic precept of Scheer’s model and applies to emotional practices in general. In these texts, however, as we begin to understand the emotional norms of the world they represent, it is particularly apt. Feeling, in this world, does not begin in some hidden place within and move outward: rather, it is produced more or less consciously by the socialised, acculturated body. And this is not limited to the physical body of the individual. As we will see, the community is conceptualised as a body in its own right, with individual humans either functioning as parts of the whole, or representing—embodying—the society they represent within their own body, in a very literal way.

Chapter 10. Angry dole

The body wounded

Although emotion may be described as situated within the heart or mind or soul, or as stirring or rousing the body internally, the interior of the body is not the primary site in which emotion is worked out. The priority is often given to the interaction of the feeling body with the community. Speech, behaviour, countenance, and gaze may function to move feeling within the social body and therefore to position the individual feeling body within the social world and in relation to the feelings of others. In most cases—or at least, in the normative model of the feeling body—there is no meaningful boundary between inside and outside, or between feeling and communication. Feeling is generated in movement, spoken of as movement or temperature changes, movements of communities and bodies and internal organs. Embodied emotion in a social context moreover leaks and flows between bodies: internal disturbance disturbs others. Given this essential unity, and the medieval habit of symbolic thought, any part of the feeling body may represent the whole, metonymically rather than metaphorically. Similarly, a whole community may be imagined as a feeling body, or the physical body of a lord mapped onto the metaphysical body of the community that he represents.

Community bodies

The emotional vocabulary of the *Vita Edwardi II*—especially as regards anger—recalls the language of turbulence and disruption characteristic of heart and blood, but applies it to the community of England rather than to an individual body. It depicts anger consistently as a stirring disruptive movement within both the body and the community, creating a conceptual continuity between individual and social body. Anger is consistently associated with movement in this text: stirring, rousing, growing, and sometimes severing. The barons' indignation against Gaveston is “excitata” (28–29); people are regularly “commotus”; dissension is “orta” between the king and the barons (10–11) or the archbishop (72–73), and the garden metaphor is taken further when the chronicler speaks of a “seminarium ire et inuidie” (26–27). Anger stirs and disturbs; and “pax” is its opposite, “perturbata” by the fact that the king and his barons are not “unanimis”—that is, they do not form a single united

feeling subject between them (70–71). The notions of movement and separation are invoked curiously in the chronicler's adaptation of a verse from Genesis:

Reuera quicquid dolose actum est in curia regis processit ex consiliariis eius, set consilium eorum est inefficax et machinacio peritura. Maledictus furor eorum quia pertinax, et indignatio eorum quia diuidentur tandem a curia et dispergentur in ignominia. Iustum est enim ut suos auctores teneat peccata, ne maleficia remaneant impunita.

Indeed whatever wickedness was perpetrated in the king's court proceeded from his counsellors, but their advice is futile and their plots will fail. Cursed be their anger because it is stubborn, and their wrath because they shall at length be separated from the court and scattered in disgrace. For it is right that sins should bind those who commit them, so that evildoing may not go unpunished. (72–75)

Maledictus furor eorum quia pertinax et indignatio illorum quia dura dividam eos in Iacob et dispergam illos in Israhel. (*Vulgate Bible*, Gen. 49:7)

Cursed be their fury, because it was stubborn: and their wrath, because it was cruel: I will divide them in Jacob, and will scatter them in Israel. (*King James Bible*, Gen. 49:7)

The basic imagery, therefore, is not original to the chronicler, but the small change he makes is telling. Rather than cursing each feeling (*furor* and *indignatio*) for their qualities, then promising the destruction of the counsellors, he curses *indignatio* specifically because it will result in their destruction; and here the promised division and scattering are specifically a social disruption, a sundering from the community in which they have been powerful, as opposed to the Vulgate's rather vague threat. Lest we miss the direct connection between anger and the breaking of social bonds, the chronicler adds a firm moral to assure us that the punishment fits the crime: they will be cursed with their own sin when it returns to enact its own nature upon them. Here we have the opposite of a unified feeling body: the community ought to be one, but in its current unnatural state of affairs it is divided against itself.

The *Vita Edwardi II* gives one model of how a community may be conceptualised as a single feeling body. However, the most common and coherent conceptualisation of a collective is that of its incarnation in the body royal, or, by extension, in the body of any leader. More than a metaphor, this seems to be a generally held conceptual model for social structure and social interaction, especially when it comes to the generation of feeling. The language of

wounding and affront reveals how closely entwined are the feelings of the prince's physical with his metaphysical body: that is, the institution, land, and people whom he represents.

This is far from being the only text in which the prince's body functions (or ought to function) as a symbol of unified and successful community. Consider Froissart: his version of Edward III has full command of the symbolism of his body and uses it to hearten and strengthen his community around himself: turning a fall and a bloodied nose into a good omen, or riding up and down in front of the army holding a white baton to hearten them before battle (SHF 1–256 and 1–274).

I have discussed incidents of emotional contagion in Sections A and B. By this point, however, it seems clear that people engaging in group performances of emotional contagion (such as barons sharing a leader's feudal anger, or pleading with him to have mercy) are not merely mimicking or responding to his emotion, but participating in its social generation. In a social and literary context where *chiere* is emotion, face, and behaviour, and gaze may both convey and enact emotion, such emotional leadership must be considered less as communication and more as a shared bodily experience. Emotional contagion is more resonant in a society in which social emotion is more fully practiced than individualised emotion. Leader and followers often merge into one emotional unit, even midway through a single emotion event.

See, for example, Philippe VI's reaction to the bungling of the Genovese crossbowmen in the Battle of Crécy:

Then the King of France in great anger spoke and commanded: "This rabble hinder us to no purpose." And then his men at arms began to strike and slash amongst [the Genovese], so that most of them fell and never rose again. (SHF 1–278).

This is, functionally, a typical tripartite emotion event: it contains feeling, speech, and action, in that order. The subject, however, shifts from the individual to the social body: the king feels "grant corroux" and makes the speech, but he and his "gens d'armes" perform the action as one. He is a representative and a spokesperson of his knights, or his knights are an extension of him: he does not (and ought not) function as an entirely discrete individual.

Dol and gref: injuries to the feeling body

Feeling, however, goes both ways. Not only does the leader direct and inspire the act of feeling in his followers, but he feels injury to them or his lands as if it were a physical injury in his own body. The usual response to this is *deuil/dol* or *gref*—words which are usually read nowadays as if they were more or less equivalent to their modern meanings, but which in most instances are more closely aligned to anger than to sorrow.

The French/Anglo-Norman *deuil/duel* (or *douleur/dolur*) often appears in connection with anger (“ire et doel” or “courroucez et doulez” are common constructions), and especially with feudal anger. In Middle English and Latin texts, *dol* is almost exclusively reserved for sorrow, but English *gref* and *grever* function in the same way as the French *deuil*.⁵⁶ Angry kings, lords, even knights, are often said to feel *deuil/gref*—not as an adjunct to the primary emotion but as a part of it, like the “furor” that also commonly accompanies anger (or any other strong emotion). The associations of these words with pain and wounding locate the emotion and its cause firmly within the physical body, while at the same time blurring the distinction between that and the metaphysical body.

We have already seen this effect in passing in the chronicle of Jordan Fantosme, discussed in Chapter 2. Henry II, confronted with the treachery of his son, is both *grevez* and *irez*, and he immediately speaks of his *deuil* and his anger: “I was never so *adulez* in all my life. I am so filled with *rage* that I am nearly crazy” (vv. 128–29). This *deuil* cannot be simply sorrow at the loss of his son: Louis VII, in his parallel scene, is also almost enraged with *deuil* (“a poi de duel n’esrage”), and he has no such personal loss to lament (v. 34). In Robert Mannyng’s chronicle, the sons of these two kings feel *gref* during a quarrel on crusade. The dominant affect of Richard II and Philippe II throughout the encounter is anger: they accuse each other of treachery, bite at their lips, hurl insults and threats, and refuse to trust each other, until finally their barons must intervene so that the kings might return to “luf & pes” instead of being “wroth” (2.3859–60). In the midst of this, we find expressions such as “Richard gan him greue” and “Pan spak Philip ogrefe”: this is a sense of grievance, not grief (2.3818, 2.3831).

The association between anger and this form of *deuil/gref* is strong enough that they may be conventionally paired together (e.g., “estoient gravement grevez et corrucez” *Anonimale* 154), or—as in the cases above—*deuil/gref* may be used as if it is functionally

⁵⁶ Latin *dol* does seem to remain more closely aligned to sorrow, including as the root of forms like *condolere*.

synonymous with anger in a given case. The hero of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is “agreued for greme” [anger] and “grone[s] for gref and grame” (2370, 2502). His king “greue[s]” in response to the taunts of the Green Knight: “Be blod schot for scham into his schyre face / and lere; / He wex as wroth as wynde”—as do all his followers—and he responds with hasty words and gestures of anger, snatching up the axe to take on the stranger’s insult to himself and his court (316–31). This is not a quick movement from sorrow to anger—or through “four feelings in quick succession”, as Sarah McNamer reads it (“Feeling” 252)—but the practice of a single feeling: the flush of colour, the waxing wroth and being “greued”, the angry speech, the impetuous rush of movement, the court’s participation in the feeling.

The Gawain of the alliterative *Morte Arthure* has on multiple occasions a similar response to enemies’ taunts: he is “greuede, and grych[es] fulle sore” and strikes out at his opponent; he is so “greuyde” at the insulting words of Sir Gayous that he rushes at him and strikes off his head (2557–58, 1352–54). This sense of active resentment of an injury means that *deuil/gref* is particularly likely to appear in cases of feudal anger or battle rage. In the *Morte*, the Emperor of Rome—who is claiming that Britain is historically a tributary state of his empire, and must therefore treat the king as a rebellious vassal—is described as “angerde” in one line and “sore greuede” in the next (265–66). Later, Arthur is warned that an even less rightful “lord”—the cannibal giant—will be “greuyde” if not approached with the exaggerated, grovelling deference of the most abject subject or petitioner (1019–24).

Robert Mannyng of Brunne often uses transitive *greven* to stand in for “to anger” in a feudal sense: one character is warned that if he pursues his present course and flouts his royal brother, that brother will feel *gref*; and so indeed he does (1.2863, 1.3206). Even God may be *greved* in this sense: William II is warned that “God is þe turned grym; / ouþer in word or ded has þou greued him” (2.2282–83). The second extant manuscript for this section of the chronicle reads here “3e haue y wraped him”—a scribal substitution somewhere along the line that must surely be attributed to the almost identical meanings of *greven* and *wrathen* in this context. The primary meaning of *deuil/gref*, then, is not “grief” in the modern sense of “sorrow” so much as it is an injury or a response to injury—whether that injury be physical (wounds) or social (insults). We do not have a modern English word that fits its range of applications in medieval texts, although “injure” comes close; but in any context the word chosen to translate it should convey a sense of being wronged, of hurt and affront.

This is not to deny that there does exist a concept of *deuil/gref* which is equated with *tristesse/sorwe*, rather than *ire/wrath*, and opposed to *joie/gladness* instead of *amur/luf*.

However, sorrowful *deuil* is far rarer—at least in historical writing—than angry *deuil*. Of the three instances that the *AND* cites as meaning “grief,” none involves what I would consider to be sorrowful *deuil*. One is among the quotes from Jordan Fantosme cited above (“a poi de duel n’esrage”), and the other two both pair it with *ire* (“Houunk pus n’out del ne ire” *Le Lai de Cor* 459, “Tant ad al quer doel e ire” *Vie de saint Grégoire* 553)⁵⁷. The *DMF* is more detailed, with separate categories for physical pain, “affliction/chagrin”, pain which is “mêlée de courroux, colère”, and pain caused by somebody’s death (in addition to “that which causes pain” and “garments worn as a token of mourning”). However, the necessity of such categorisation for the purpose of a dictionary entry enforces a rather artificial distinction. In many of the examples cited by the *DMF* the only clear difference is the cause of the emotion, not its nature; and the question as to whether sorrow or anger is the dominant element in any given instance must be a subjective judgement.

The line between physical and emotional *deuil* seems to be of even less importance, such that each is regularly described and (apparently) experienced as if it were the other. There are cases in which *deuil/gref* does clearly mean literal physical pain or sickness. In Mannyng’s chronicle, for example, Merlin promises Aurelius that the magic of the stones of the Giants’ Ring will cure the “pyne” of those who are “greued of grete pinges”; an army rests because it is weary and the great heat grieves them; sickness grieves people sore; and *gref* is a common response to the aggressive infliction of injury and pain (1.8700, 1.14573, 2.1591 and 2.4069, 2.1591 and 2.4608). Even more often, however, the distinction between injuring and angering somebody seems to be of little importance. In Gawain’s confrontation with Sir Priamus, in the alliterative *Morte*, the literal signification of the verb shifts fluidly between physical and emotional blows. Gawain is “greued” by the words of his opponent and strikes out at him (2557). He wounds Priamus, who groans at the “greefe” of the injury and wounds Gawain with his magical sword, then taunts Gawain, saying that his wound will never be staunched (2562). When Gawain protests that his opponent “greues me bot lyttill”, it is an open question whether he means that Priamus has hardly hurt him, that he is unperturbed by Priamus’ taunts, or both (2579). He retorts his indifference to Priamus’ assault, both physical and verbal.

Greven is often used in Middle English descriptions of battle, and it can be impossible to tell whether it means “wounded”, “killed”, “gave pain to”, “grieved [x] by killing their men”, or simply “gave [x] a hard fight” (e.g. Mannyng 1.13546, *Morte* 1463). The giant of Mont St-

⁵⁷ *The Anglo-Norman Text of “Le Lai du Cor”*, ed. C. T. Erickson, ANTS 24, London, 1973.

P. Meyer, “La Vie de saint Grégoire le Grand par Frère Angier”, *Romania* 12 (1883), 145-208.

Michel strikes at Arthur “ffor grefe of the gude kynge, that hyme with grame gretez” (*Morte* 1077; cf. the same formula 1471 and 3007); Arthur says that the giant has “greued” him sorely and that he has not had such a fight for fifteen years (1173–1174). By extension, *greven* as a transitive verb can mean “to make war upon” or to perform any warlike act: “Wille 3e gyf me leue / þe robbours on þe se to greue?” (Mannyng 1.5820–21). We saw in Chapter 2 how feudal anger can be synonymous with the practice of war: the same may be true of *gref*, at least in this sense. And consequently, a people or community may feel themselves *greved* in the event of an attack on the “body” or integrity of that people: at Hengist’s invasion, the Britons are “greued” and prepare themselves to repel him and set him to flight; the Scots “estoient grandement grevez et corucez” (Mannyng 1.7708, *Anonimalle* 154). They are not mourning their dead here, not *grieving*. Being *greved*, they make anger: they make war.

A communal “body” experiences *gref* as a knight in battle resents injury to his own body. However, when the narrative focuses not on the people but on their leader—that is, on the person who embodies them—he reacts in exactly the same way. He *feels* the injury as if he were wounded in his physical body, instead of the metaphysical. The young King David of Scotland feels “grant dueil” at seeing his countries plundered and his people complaining; at similar news, the Duke of Anjou “fut moult courroucié et dolent” (*SHF* 1–152, *SHF* 1–625). Affront is still conflated with wounding, and an assault on the body of the individual is conflated with the body of the social group that it represents. This idea of the lord’s body being injured by an attack on his people goes beyond the semantics of *deuil* and *gref*. Henry II sends messengers to William of Scotland rebuking him as a rebellious vassal for his part in the alliance against him, contrasting the love he expected from him to the “damage” he has received instead (*Fantosme, laisse* 33). Though the primary meaning of the Latin *dolere* is *to grieve*, Edward II “uehementer doluit” when he hears of the loss of his castles. He weeps—and then he attacks, an action of *gref* (*VEII* 86). Edward III’s emotional reaction to the pain of his men is called “discomfort” in the *Brut*, a word otherwise used in that text exclusively to connote military defeats, conflating the physical, the emotional, and the tactical senses at once (225). Froissart repeatedly attributes Edward III’s anger at the people of Calais to the loss of his men in besieging the town, and his vengeance against Caen earlier in the same campaign has the same motivation.

In this context, *deuil* and *gref* must be read as words encompassing the sense of anger generated as a response to a literalised emotional “wounding” of the body: either a physical body, or the figurative body of lands and followers which is contiguous with the physical body. “Sorrow” is a very inadequate translation. King Arthur is *greved* by the words of the

Green Knight because they constitute an assault on/affront to himself and the world of Camelot that is embodied in him; and he prepares to defend it with that body. Henry II is enraged and dizzy with *gref* that his son could so injure the dignity of his state, daring to offer the ultimate insult in the form of rebellion. Kantorowicz's model of the king's two distinct bodies does not apply here. The lordly or royal body is united with its metaphysical aspects—the institutions, lands, and people which it represents—not divided from them. Perhaps it was the very fact that they had become so inseparable that made it necessary for early modern lawyers, faced with the task of redefining monarchy, to divide them with delicate legal surgery.

There is some evidence to suggest that *deuil/gref* may be one of the rare emotions within these texts that is gendered. There are a few instances in which it clearly does mean only sorrow, with no implications of injury or anger—and most of these occurrences concern female emotions. Queen Isabella conducts herself “grantment de doel et de dolour” like a woman who has lost her husband, and Arthur must tell a weeping Guenevere to “[g]refe the noghte” when he leaves her to go to war (*Anonimalle* 120, *Morte* 705). This raises the possibility that feminine *deuil/gref* is of a different character to the masculine emotion: less capable of the aggressive action associated with anger, of resenting affronts to dignity and possessions, of the fierce physiological response that involves flushed cheeks, a swelling heart, and sudden motion. I would hypothesise that female *deuil* must be confined to sorrow, whereas masculine *deuil* may and should involve angry retaliation—even when it is a response to loss or death, such as Bernier's grief for his mother in *Raoul de Cambrai*, or Gawain's response to the death of companions in the field in the alliterative *Morte*. The rarity of both female emotion and sorrowful *deuil*, unfortunately, gives too small a sample group for any certainty.

There is one instance in Froissart, however, of a woman feeling *deuil* like that of a prince.

Now I will return to the Countess of Montfort, who had the courage of a man and the heart of a lion. She was in the city of Rennes when she heard that her husband had been captured, as you have heard. At the news she was *dolente et courroucee* as you may expect, because she thought it very likely that he would be put to death in prison. And however great her *deuil*, she did not behave like an afflicted woman, but like a man strong and hardy, in valiantly heartening her friends and soldiers. (*SHF* 1–150)

She then proceeds to take command of Montfort's forces and fight on in his name and the name of their young son. Under exceptional circumstances, an exceptional woman changes the *deuil* of an afflicted woman for the angry *deuil* of the lord—but only on behalf of the two men who might rightly wield that power and move that feeling, who are incapacitated by youth and imprisonment. In so doing she proves her *cuer* to be that of a lion and her *courage* that of a man, and she is equal not only to the military duties of lordship but to the emotional leadership of *reconfortant* Montfort's (her) people, mobilising them to reunite into the single emotional body that they ought to be. Froissart's insistence on the rarity of this kind of *deuil* for a woman seems to confirm my tentative hypothesis. If angry *deuil* presupposes the ability to embody some institution greater than oneself—a role rarely held by a woman—this may explain why a woman is usually capable only of lamenting, except under exceptional circumstances in which she is functioning temporarily as a lord.⁵⁸

What, then, does *deuil/gref* feel like—or, to phrase the same question in a way more appropriate to the medieval feeling body, what script does one follow to make *gref*? There is a rush of blood and of heat (anger, shame, pain, grief); a weapon may be seized upon, or another similar violent and sudden motion made; there may be an impulse to revenge or to feudal anger, often verbalised; and any followers present will react with the same feeling.

With this he laughs so loud that the lord grieved [*greued*];
 The blood shot for shame in his shining white face
 So fair;
 He waxed as wroth as wind,
 So did all that were there.
 The king, as keen by kind
 Then strode that stout man nearer,

And said, "Horseman, by heaven, thine asking is foolish..."

(SGGK 316–23)

The role of the good prince in *feeling* the *deuil* of his lands and people offers another insight into the normative conceptualisation of feudal society. The relationship between lord and vassal is not merely an exchange of protection for service. We saw in Section B that it is built on an ideal of active love; and the role of *deuil* suggests that the bond goes deeper yet, in that

⁵⁸ It is possible that this model of *deuil* might be available to writers talking of the wrath of Mary or female saints when their area of protection or prerogative is encroached upon, or saints whose altar, relic, or name has been disrespected. I have found no examples of this, but it might be worth investigation in texts with a more hagiographic focus.

he feels his followers' pain as his followers feel with him. These familiar, internalised scripts, learned from chronicles and from social example and therefore embedded in the precious continuity of genealogy and history, not only demonstrate that emotional unity but work to create it. Engaging in practices like the correct script for *gref* allows the formation a single social body, which—under ideal circumstances—feels and acts as one.

In the earlier chapters of this dissertation I focussed particularly on emotion scripts, which are, in effect, mobilising practices: the chronicle offers demonstrations or direct instructions of how to go about doing a feeling. More generally, however, there is one particular category of mobilisation that these texts model, as has become increasingly clear over the last few chapters. Emotional contagion, and the participation in a communal feeling body which it implies, is so fundamental a part of the dominant emotional style that it need hardly ever be “recommended” outright. *Deuil/gref* carries with it an emotional script—when *greved* one responds with certain sensations, one does certain things—but it is deeply rooted in a sense of the elision of the physical body with the social one, including one's reputation and one's community. Feeling is a social action. Scheer mentions emotional contagion as a communicative practice, but in these texts, it falls clearly into the category of mobilisation.

Besides recording and teaching these mobilising practices, some chronicles do seem at times to put them into effect, actively mobilising sympathetic emotions in the reader by means of that contagion. These are not instructional manuals in the same sense that Sarah McNamer's texts explicitly teach compassion, but it would be possible for a reader to read and re-read episodes like that of the burghers of Calais, or the death of the son of the Count of Foix, or the jeering disdain of Robert Bruce, with the deliberate intention of rehearsing not only what to feel but how to generate and experience that feeling. Chronicles by this means would not only share existing values and behaviours but participate in generating and sustaining them; and that role is even greater when we turn from mobilising practices to consider emotional regulation.

Chapter 11. Difference and deviation

Mismanaged bodies

Chronicle depictions of emotional contagion offer an affirming, enticing image to the reader of personal engagement in the social meaning-making of group feeling within the text. But we have already seen in Chapter 7 how chroniclers may fumble and display anxiety where there is no clear precedent for the emotional style of the historical character they depict. In various ways, these incomprehensible behaviours are translated by chroniclers into the negative images of comprehensible and approved emotional practices, teaching not only “this is how you must understand the story of Edward II” but “this is not the way you ought to feel, and this is what happens if you do”. The latter regulatory function is shared by many forms of literature—from instruction manuals to high romance or the broadest fabliaux—but chronicles are unique in their ability to ground these examples in all the authoritative weight of the history of family and the realm.

Emotion-as-practice is learned, meaning that feelings are transferred between people intergenerationally or through socializing processes between adults. Historians can attempt to reconstruct the circulation and modification of emotional practices especially when there is contestation in this process, which could indicate that a certain emotional practice is no longer working for some people. Subversive performances, changes in ritual formulas, genres that fall out of favor can all be clues to follow. (Scheer 218)

The feeling body—porous, unified, and active in its generation of emotion—may be called normative: it is the dominant model of emotional practice within the world imagined by these texts. But not all historical events proceed according to a neat and comprehensible pattern, and not all characters in a chronicle conform to this model. Over the course of this project, my focus on moments and episodes of anger has exposed the tensions that arise when characters (and the chroniclers themselves) struggle with these incongruities. Whether one considers them as “subversive performances” or as failures to master the proper emotional practices, anger often arises from them, draws attention to them, and exacerbates the situation. This is where we find productive tensions: those moments of conflict that “contain explicit and implicit assumptions about how emotions work, how they should be lived out, and what they mean” (Scheer 218).

What happens, then, when a lord whose life forms part of the chronicler's subject cannot be portrayed as behaving according to this dominant emotional style—when the chronicler cannot make his actions conform to the *habitus* that they can comprehend within the terms set by their narrative? How do they respond to the challenge posed by—most obviously—the deviant royal body of Edward II? The importance of the relationship between the lordly body and that of the community explains why bodily transgressions on the part of princes may so readily capture the chronicler's imagination, or why failures at kingship are so often represented in embodied terms. His body becomes inaccessible; and worse, it fails to fulfil its most basic social duty, that of mirroring and moving the feeling body of the community. Each chronicler responds differently to such a challenge presented by a king within their text.

One episode in the *Vita Edwardi II* focuses on the idea of the face—which, as I have already noticed, can function to signal a disjuncture in what should be a unified feeling body. Here the face is the site of anxiety about failures of social engagement and the intersection between public and private. We glimpse the faces of Edward and Gaveston during the period of Gaveston's rise—not once, but several times in rapid succession. For the most part, they are seen in a rather abstract manner: we are told that Gaveston's "uultus" demands greater reverence than does that of the king, and that Gaveston alone receives "graciam et uultus hillarem regis... et fauorem". Grace, favour, and the king's friendly countenance are semantically equated. Gaveston has exclusive access to them: to Edward's feudal love. In both these cases, *vultus* is probably closer in meaning to *contenance* than the physical "face". However, within a few lines, we find mention of the king's "faciem hillarem": the same adjective of emotion, but this time displayed explicitly in the "facies"—and of Gaveston having grace "in oculis regum". Both *facies* and *oculis* refer more specifically to the anatomical face than does *vultus*; and although these usages are more or less metaphorical, they do rely for that metaphor on the idea of emotions being conveyed and exchanged by looking at the face (28–29). On the following page, however, we find this description of Gaveston's pride:

... nor it is surprising if he in his pride should be acceptable to neither God nor man. For, scornfully rolling his eyes upwards [*oculos distorquens in fastum*] in pride and in insult, he looked down upon all with overbearing and disdainful countenance [*pomposa et superciliosa facie*]... And the haughtiness which he affected would certainly have been unbearable enough in a king's son. (30–31)

There is an increasing focus throughout this passage on the physical face and its display of emotion, culminating in the vivid image of Gaveston's face distorted and twisted up in his

pride and scorn, staring down at the world. Edward's face is turned away from where it should look, and towards Gaveston instead; Gaveston keeps his eyes haughtily raised above his station and, simultaneously, looks down on his superiors. There are echoes here of the distorted, monstrous face of gargoyles and vices; but this imagery also reaffirms the idea of the emotional face as disturbingly individualised, failing to engage in functional social meaning-making.

We have already seen how the *Vita Edwardi II* codes negative emotion in terms of disturbance, disruption, and (ultimately) division, within the individual body and society as a whole. This figuring depends heavily on the ideal of a seamless unity within both "bodies". When this unity fails it results in a malfunction of both communication and community. Like the face of Isabella of Bavaria, the faces of Gaveston and Edward II are mentioned here as capable of emotional expression only to point out the failure of any emotional engagement with those who see them. The reference to the king's "*faciem hillarem*" being denied to the other barons implies the hypothetical possibility of the face's integration into social engagement, but its realisation is denied. It remains a symbol of access to the king and his feelings, one that is hardly ever mentioned except where that access is problematic or denied. Edward's face is twisted away from its rightful object, and Gaveston's is devoted to a disruptive disdain of his betters. Edward's averted *chiere* severs any possibility of emotional communication between himself and his barons, and this in turn divides the community.

The chronicler of the A section of the *Annales Paulini* is less analytical than that of the *Vita Edwardi II*, but he handles his story dramatically, to pointed effect. Only a few pages long, this chronicle is a more unified narrative than it initially appears. Chroniclers (at least, chroniclers of recent events) cannot easily re-order the events of their narrative, as the sequence is imposed on them by time; but this London-based chronicler tells a story structured around the disastrous mismanagement of public events, using that structure to criticise Edward II's failures of emotional leadership. This text is often quoted piecemeal for a few lurid phrases that seem to hint with fascinated disgust at the sexual relationship between Edward II and Piers Gaveston. The author is certainly preoccupied with the idea of the king's body and who is permitted to approach it, but Edward's sex life is not the primary target of its critique. *What* Edward does is not the problem so much as the *how* of it: that is, while he performs many of the actions of a king (holding grand public events, being wedded and crowned, accepting counsel) he does them in such a way as to isolate his barons and his people, keeping his emotions to a closed circuit of himself and Gaveston rather than engaging with communal emotion.

We have met this chronicler already, putting the most vicious of his criticisms in the mouth of Robert Bruce. Even within a few years of Edward II's accession, however, he is using the same technique with "the common people": *populum* or *vulgus*, with the latter voicing the more extreme criticisms. Three failed or subverted tournaments in rapid succession bring a crescendo of "popular" indignation and the chronicler's own invective, including describing Gaveston as "raised from the dust" then, barely a hundred words later, "raised from shit". Here is the apex of the diatribe:

In the excess of his love, the king called Piers his brother; but the common people truly called him the king's idol, whom he feared to anger as he would a father, and whom he studied to please as he would a teacher. There were many different kinds of graces [*gratia*] which belonged by royal prerogative to himself and not to others, and whose enactment he bestowed on Piers. So that any among the earls or magnates that he needed the king's particular grant [*gratiam*] to do this business or that, the king sent him to Piers; and whatever he ordained that they should receive, so it was, and the king submitted to it. Thus all the people were indignant, to see two kings rule together over one realm: that is how they expressed it, and so it was. (259)

Even the magnates' relationships with the king have been rerouted via Gaveston. From a practical point of view this affects the day-to-day business of management; symbolically, it is even more abhorrent, because the splitting of the king into two bodies has severed any emotional relationship with the king.

Being undifferentiated and unexamined, these emotions are not in themselves the focus of attention, of authorial approval or disapproval. They are, in narrative terms, purely a result of and reaction to the king's behaviour, and their strength is proportionate to Edward's outrages. When we hear that all the people are "indignatus" at having "two kings in one realm", this is a gauge of the king's unfitness rather than a careful examination of the feelings of every man and woman on the street. Remember, too, that *indignare* has its linguistic roots in the language of honour and shame: at this point—certainly in this text, which leans heavily on that word and its derivatives—the senses of "having one's honour reduced" and "being angry about it" are both in play. Popular anger rises as an effect of Edward's poor emotional leadership, like a natural phenomenon. It is, once again, a sign that something has gone badly wrong in the relationship; but this time, with the king unwilling to acknowledge it or negotiate on the matter, no resolution can be achieved.

The frustrations implicit in this passage are borne out elsewhere in the text. This is an author who views kingship in terms of pomp and ceremony, of public access; and so the story of Edward II's failure as a king is told through his repeated failure to perform the public functions of kingship appropriately. Even the barons cannot receive *gratia* directly from his person, in its emotional or bureaucratic aspect. In the chronicle's opening paragraphs we see Edward I's magnificent funeral ceremonies and the mass for the illustrious dead spoken by a prestigious Spanish bishop, both of which function to reinforce communal bonds through their magnificence and lustre. Describing the mass, the chronicler explicitly links the glorious starry (heavenly) effect of all the candles—"fulgor radiantium luminarium quasi caelum stellatum"—to the "jocundita[s]" stirred in the souls of those present (256). Edward II's reign, however, is a litany of ceremonial occasions or traditions disrespected. He recalls Gaveston and, "like [the Biblical] Rehoboam," adheres to the counsel of his young friends rather than engaging with the venerable English barons (257); the bishop of Lichfield, arriving (it is implied) to do some ceremonial duty over Edward I's body, is arrested over a grudge on Gaveston's part (257).

Next, Edward's wedding to Isabella turns from lavish affirmation to public disaster on multiple levels. In itself it is a good thing—although, as it was organised by Edward I and brought about by the pope (we are told), the chronicler gives no credit for it to the present king. The occasion begins gloriously, and the number of illustrious attendees is listed with relish. It goes sour when Edward sends all the magnificent gifts from his new in-laws to Piers Gaveston (258). The tournaments that he holds exacerbate tensions between the barons (primarily due to Gaveston's behaviour and the king's approbation of it) to such an extent that a third one has to be cancelled for fear of Gaveston's life (258–59).

This culminates in the disastrous coronation, from the travesty of Gaveston's ostentatious dress and his position carrying the relics of Edward the Confessor "with his filthy hands" ("manibus inquinatis") to the disorganised shambles of the banquet and the deadly crush of the crowd outside the church (261–262). The whole episode begins to read not only as a practical result of Edward's bad kingship, but as a divine sign of it. Material consequences follow, with the fury of the French ambassadors, the death "sine viatico" of a knight crushed by the crowd, and division amongst the barons and clergy. Finally we see the boycotting of a tournament that Edward arranges for the barons, after he has been persuaded to exile Gaveston again. This ought to have been a conciliatory gesture, a hope of return to the glories and unity of Edward I's day; but nobody has any wish to participate in it.

The final criticisms are put in the mouth of the king of the Scots as he prepares to invade. I mentioned this before when I was discussing shaming speech, but let me repeat it: he “claimed to fear the bones of the dead king more than he feared the one who lived, and [said that] it would have been a greater military glory to win half a foot of land from King Edward who was gone than to win a kingdom from him who was left” (265). Here this chronicle ends, with the damage of just two short years apparently irremediable. Edward II’s body has no social efficacy—even the remnants of that of his father have more force—and therefore, the body of the realm is violated by invasion.

Is it an overstatement to draw a moral equation between the mismanaged body of the king and the violated body of the realm? If the text were a novel, rather than a chronicle, would it be a more plausible interpretation? After all, Robert Bruce *did* attack the north of England at this point in the “narrative”: the chronicler’s agency over the sequencing of events has certain limitations. But then, the same argument might be made for any retelling of a known story, or the translation of a novel to the screen or stage. The comments and actions attributed to Robert Bruce do more than repeat the chronicler’s stylistic and moral choices up to this point: they vindicate them, and prove the consequences of Edward II’s failures of emotional leadership.

The episode of Edward III’s attraction to the Countess of Salisbury also reveals concerns about the royal body’s potential failures of social engagement. Here we have another instance of *regarder* causing a physical and emotional change in another: “the king kept on *regarding* the gentle lady, so ardently that she became quite *honyeuse et esbahie*” (SHF 1–157). We see the same concern carried through in the necessity of concealment of his feelings from his men: Edward cannot be read; and the overt necessity of being read is in itself the problem. Before he confesses his feelings to her, the Countess sees sadness in him but cannot understand the cause. After this conference between king and countess, his men (not being privy to it) repeat the misunderstanding. This is an emotion in which they cannot participate, which concerns the king’s body alone: “some other matter *me touche* and presses on my heart that you do not know / cannot imagine [*autre... que vous ne penséz*]” (SHF 1–158). There is a warning here, the possibility of disruption and severance. Here as elsewhere in the text there is a strong narrative focus on the royal body; but where that body would usually symbolise and unite his people, Edward’s bodily gestures in this episode are all highly individual, non-communicative and incapable of mobilising the social body. He leans in the window to support himself, he turns his eyes on the lady even though he does not dare to look at her (*regarder* again), he cannot touch food or drink: he suffers alone (SHF 1–159).

Edward III's love is valorised in terms appropriate to romance by the narrative voice, but the Countess's shame forbids us to overlook the danger of adulterous feelings. She charges him not to dishonour the feudal bond between the king and her husband "who is such a *vaillant* knight, and has served you so well"; and she claims that, were she to give in, she would deserve no better from the king himself than that he should personally "justicier et desmembrer" her body (SHF 1–158). The threatened severance of feudal bonds (not to mention the possibility of rape) is transfigured graphically onto the dismemberment of the female body—but by speaking so, by evoking the logical extreme result of his feelings and proposed actions, she provokes him in turn to shame and prevents any such outcome.

The *Anonimale* chronicler takes a more extreme approach. Responding, apparently, to the same concerns which Edward II's reign prompted for the author of the *Vita Edwardi II*, he characterises all internal feeling in terms so negative as to be almost pathological. To name a character's emotion, for this chronicler, is to criticise that character; and hearts conceal feeling and nurture vengeance. Positive feeling, on the other hand, is only revealed to the readers through social interaction—speech and action—not through the narrator naming the emotion or describing how it feels.

In this chronicle, Edward III and other socially functional characters have no internal processes at all: in describing them, the chronicler speaks almost entirely of actions and speech acts, rather than of internal thoughts and feelings. Typically, thought and motivation seem not to matter, or are so transparent as to not be worth mention:

But soon news reached sir William Melton archbishop of the city, and sir John Hotham, who was then the king's chancellor, and immediately they assembled all the force that they could gather and raise for themselves. (98–99)

This clerk [*Thomas Newbiggin*] accused the good people of having spoken with the said sir Roger [*Mortimer*] about maintaining and supporting him to go abroad, and of having aided and abetted his escape from the Tower of London, from which accusation the good people cleared themselves by every manner of legal procedure before the king's justices, so that the clerk was held to be a liar and put in prison. (116–17)

The king [*Edward III*] with the advice of his men kindly [*bonement*] granted the truce and ordered his forces to stop their assault and that no Englishman should harm or injure those who were in the town. Therefore those inside the town [*Berwick*] had a respite from the assault and they kept the peace a while, but soon after they broke the said truce like men who were false and full of lies [*faux et pleins*]

de mencionges], for before the end of the said truce they armed themselves against to attack the English and to defend the town against them. For this reason king Edward of England again ordered his men to prepare engines and other equipment to make an assault on the said town and to take it quickly by force. (160–61)

Here is a complete unity of thought and emotion with action, to the point where any possibility of internal processes has disappeared almost entirely from the narrative, because the character's actions tell us all that we need to know.

The primary subject of the negative kind of emotionality is, as ever, Edward II himself. His feelings are internalised, divorced from external society. Excepting an occasional mention of Hugh Despenser or another minor character of whom the chronicler disapproves, no other character is described with internal processes at all. But Edward II feels and thinks and desires: “he was greatly *coroucee et irre*, and he secretly contemplated in his heard all the time how to revenge himself” (86–87); he “received [Gaveston] joyously despite the Ordinances” (84–85); he “loved him dearly as much as he *savoie et poeit* above all others” (92); “he abandoned the siege and went to London *mult dolent*” (98). Moreover, the word *voler* and its variant forms occur over and over again in reference to Edward II, sometimes three times in a single sentence, reinforcing his very literal wilfulness. This king's mind simply cannot be read in his actions, but must be described independently. In fact, as the chronicler told us in his first paragraph, Edward II is so easily swayed by his own will that he cannot be trusted to hold one course for long enough to act: “And when they had come to Portsmouth the king changed his mind [*la volente... chaungea*] and would not let them cross, so that each company returned to its own region without achieving anything” (118). What might under other circumstances be narrated as a deliberate change of policy, or the misfortune of contrary winds, is here a symptom of a king whose internal processes are no longer contiguous with his behaviour. His actions are so erratic as to draw attention to the feelings and desires that lie behind them, and the illusion of unity has been broken: the chronicler now narrates everything from that perspective. The three types of narrative emotional expression that are in most narratives united—internal processes, speech, and action—become distinct in the hands of the *Anonimalle* chronicler, to characterise as dysfunctional any emotion that exists only within the body and not as a social action.

Anxieties of history-making

Edward II's personality and the events of his reign provided an interpretative challenge to any chronicler. In Chapter 3 we saw two other chroniclers who found contrasting ways to narrate the king's emotional isolation: Geoffrey le Baker, apologist and quasi-hagiographer for the king, and the *Anonimalle* chronicler, scathing in his critique of Edward's dysfunctional emotionality. The *Anonimalle* chronicler pathologises the king's emotional life by emphasising its private, internalised nature: anger and vengeance repeatedly seethe within his heart, cutting him off from the wise, loving advice of men like Thomas of Lancaster, and the author consistently opposes the king's "prive quoyer" and "prive conseil" to the "commun profit" of the land. By contrast, his son Edward III—the "good" leader, in the chronicler's view—never has any emotion attributed to him. He merely acts, in such a way that his men are strengthened and heartened. He "conforta" his men well and nobly, and they pursue their fleeing enemies "coraiousement" (162 and 168, emphasis mine). In other words, Edward III's heart exists only publicly, in the context of a communal emotion that lends strength to his followers.

Although each of these chroniclers situates his ideas of emotion slightly differently, they share the same concerns: anxiety about stability under a dysfunctional royal body, derived from the disjuncture between the king's behaviour the dominant emotional style of the community. The *Annales Paulini* compares Edward's emotional leadership to the very literal public and visual performance of kingship that the chronicler witnessed at Westminster in the age of Edward I. The *Anonimalle* compares him to his son, and by implication to the heroic expectations of romance, or the feudal ideals worked out in epics and political narratives. Both find him wanting, and centre their critique of his leadership on his emotional isolationism. Geoffrey le Baker, although he is magnifying Edward II instead of accusing him, does not deny that this emotional divide exists: instead, he subsumes it into a virtue by shifting the genre expectations of his narrative. The *Vita Edwardi II* speaks of his failures to engage with the barons or the *populus*, and the ill feeling that spread through the body of the kingdom in result. Although their conclusions about the king's character and the arguments they use to prove it are very different, all four chroniclers are responding to the same fundamental concerns raised by Edward II's life and reign. Their preoccupation with emotional leadership acknowledges it as a serious subject of anxiety: emotional unity between the king and his barons is fundamental. Their concern manifests particularly in talk of concealment, of a lack of access from outside to within: Edward III's selfish emotions being

hidden from his men and requiring interpretation, Edward II denying his real face or heart to those around him. The division of the feeling body into its component parts—heart, face, feeling, gesture, action, social engagement—is both metaphor and cause of fracture in the body of the community.

At the end of Chapter 9 I proposed a model of the medieval feeling body as it is conceived in these texts: three main points, covering its chief characteristics. These were that it is an emotional agent, being active rather than passive in the production of emotion; that it is complete in its agency, with no meaningful distinction made between internal organs, whole-body movement, and social presence; and that the same vocabulary for sensation and feeling is used for all parts of that body, on all levels. I will conclude by adding three consequences, which have become clear over the final two chapters.

Firstly, **sincerity is not a relevant category**. The fact that many of the expressions and scripts of emotion that I have discussed throughout this dissertation are conventionalised, even ritualised and rehearsed, does not mean that the feelings they show are insincere. I have noted several times that behavioural signs and speech have the same truth value as an authorial statement that “this character feels angry”: we can now see that the reason for this is that the behaviours are imagined not as representing (and potentially faking) an emotion, but as helping to produce it. Feeling does not precede behaviour or exist independently of it: the behaviour is an aspect of the feeling.

Secondly, this model of emotionality lays a heavy emphasis on social interaction and community cohesion for the production and working out of emotion. **Emotional leadership and contagion** are not only important but vital: the ability to successfully inspire the right emotions in other people, the participation in shared emotions, and the perception of oneself as part of a communal “feeling body”, are essential skills that underlie all other learned emotional practices.

Thirdly, the obvious corollary: **detachment creates dissonance**. A failure to master these skills leads to imperfect or incomplete emotional practices, and an inability to adopt the correct emotional style for the occasion (or for the genre). The most valorised characters are those who are most accomplished at emotional leadership and participation in the feeling-making of their community body. Internalised or hidden emotion, though not universally disapproved, is viewed with deep suspicion by default. A failure to choose to recognise the correct emotional style or to successfully carry out the appropriate emotion script—say, shamed anger in response to provocative speech—has grave social and personal

consequences; and failures of emotional leadership can disorder and wound the body of the community or the realm.

Chronicles are vehicles of tradition: even those which only narrate relatively recent events have their roots in others which reach back “time out of mind”. Many are, as physical objects, continuations of older chronicles, written on leaves that follow the more venerable material. Those that are not depend nevertheless on these older traditions for some of their style, and for their extra authority over some other forms of narrative. When I have spoken of “community” throughout this dissertation I have usually meant a community in the “present”: people existing in more or less the same historical moment as each other, whatever that moment may be. But feudal bonds exist not only between lord and vassal, husband and wife, ally and ally, but between present and past. Genealogy, as Matthew Giancarlo points out, is a strong preoccupation of chronicles, as it is of similar genres such as romances, because it is an essential ingredient to the conception of self in late-medieval society—or at least, those parts of it whose families are likely to be represented in historical record. One would ideally maintain the values and emotional styles of that community as well as of the present one: behave in a way that would do you honour in the eyes of your great-grandfather, and emulate the lost perfection of Camelot. Continuity is essential, and historiography, more than most narrative genres, carries with it the weight and authority of maintaining that continuity.

It carries, too, the anxieties of continuity: more than even the most elegaic of tales of the fall of Camelot, chronicles are disapproving or disturbed by any sense of breaking with tradition, or of failures to live up to the perfections of older days. “Time out of mind”—“a tempore a quo non extitit memoria”—is the phrase used by the Fineshade chronicler to “date” certain treasures placed in Westminster by the ancestors of Edward II (f. 86r l. 26). That wistful, self-contradicting connection to the past is mentioned when it is severed: when the new king takes those treasures out, and gives them to Gaveston. A tiny incident, in a catalogue of similar examples of Edward II’s betrayals of the past, in one among many chronicles that include similar catalogues: those lost treasures carry more than their own weight in symbolism. For the want of a goblet, England is doomed.

Anxieties about the failures of the present to match up to the past are not unique to the reign of Edward II, nor to the Middle Ages. His reign merely offered one particular set of problems for chroniclers to interpret; and they responded by concentrating on dissonances of emotional style. Scripts and practices and ideals were already available in the tradition of chronicles and other narrative genres to show how one ought to participate in the emotional community of past and present. Fourteenth-century chroniclers employed that familiar

vocabulary of emotional practices to bring the weight of chronicle *auctoritas* into play. Protesting, apologetic, regretful, vitriolic, or fearful, each in his own way delineates and regulates the boundaries of long-established emotional styles for the benefit of present and future readers. In the process they shore up and reshape that intergenerational continuity whose loss they mourn—as perhaps chroniclers have always mourned, “a tempore a quo non extitit memoria”.

Coda

Whether or not medieval people were conscious of individualised, interior forms of subjectivity has been hotly debated over the last twenty years. One of the most important contributions of the history of emotions is an understanding that there are different ways of valuing forms of feeling, and of experiencing the self in relation to the social world. On the evidence of late-medieval narrative, I suggest that interior forms of subjectivity were less cultivated and valued in the development of medieval emotionality than those centred on social belonging. Nevertheless, the prototypical *habitus* was also deeply embodied: the feeling body moves within the community, and by its nature engages with others in the production of feeling.

In a society structured around relationships, anger is a particularly useful lens through which to view emotional norms. It has a crucial role in negotiating those relationships, and can be a positive or destructive force within that network. There are elaborately ritualised and recognised scripts around anger—its commencement, its progression, its conclusion—and yet it may also at times appear as formless and savage and dysfunctional as the wild-haired Ira who accomplishes nothing except to fall on her own sword. Anger has many different faces, from the seething mutinous anger of a rebellious subject, to the flash of shamed anger that stirs a knight to violent action (but not here and now), or the *dol* of prince whose horse or land has suffered an enemy's blow. Each kind of anger serves a different function and is subject to different kinds of regulatory discussion—and may be used to mobilise different emotional responses in the reader. Behind any depiction of anger in a chronicle lies a discursive relationship between the historical event in question (or at least, what the chronicler knows about it), literary and historiographical precedent for depicting similar emotion events, and the style of story that the chronicler wants to tell.

By reading anger events in chronicles side by side with anger events in similar narrative genres, we can begin to appreciate the rich texture of the material with which the chronicler works. I have, I believe, unpicked enough of it (or at least laid back the pile) to expose some of the wealth of referential material and assumed knowledge that make up its threads. From this perspective, we can appreciate the subtler undercurrents in a familiar story like that of the burghers of Calais. When, for example, we are familiar with the script of shamed anger, we can see the glaring omission in Walter of Guisborough's account of Edward I's verbal abuse of his son: the old king's anger is no more remarkable than his son's failure to

respond. If we can recognise emotion scripts as they occur (and still more when the author deviates from or subverts a script), we have a powerful toolkit for understanding a society's emotional practices and how they were produced, debated, and regulated, and employed.

Emotion scripts are particularly relevant in studying medieval literature, because this is a society and a textual tradition that consciously values repetition, reference, metaphor, synecdoche, and other rhetorical or imaginative techniques that find meaning in one thing by figuring it onto or against another. Fast forward a few hundred years and they would draw accusations of cliché, dusty old metaphors, a lack of life. Nowadays, a cliché is something that has been repeated so often that it has lost all imaginative force: too much reference has rendered it meaningless, rather than adding to its richness. Would it be impossible, then, to use the study of emotion scripts for any other period than that of late-medieval England?

Impossible, no—although one must account for cultural and stylistic differences, most emotional practices do run by scripts. From that delightful or tiresome old stock phrase, “their eyes met across a crowded room”, to the highly predictable structure of a superhero's confrontation with their nemesis in the climax of an action movie, the overwhelming majority of our storytelling nowadays (fictional or otherwise) follows predictable scripts, with very little effort to disguise them. That much is obvious—the main difference is the medieval preference for *not* disguising them, for preferencing that direct link with what has been already said and known. Even today, however, the layers of disguise are rarely very deep. For a story trope or an emotion script to be satisfying, or even meaningful, we must recognise it more or less consciously: while we experience it as readers/viewers we should be predicting it, engaging with it, with some idea in our head about how it should play out.

The same might be said for personal experience of emotion. Emotions do not occur in a single instance, with no context before or after. They occur in a series of instances and impressions, with the (acculturated) body and mind involved at every moment in evaluating, mediating, engaging with, and affecting the process. I have used stories as a metaphor for emotions, here and there: that is, I have suggested that we learn stories and tropes in the same way that we (less consciously) learn emotional styles and practices. This is halfway between an analogy and a direct description: stories are an integral aspect of how we learn and process and recall the world around us, particularly as it relates to other humans and a sense of self. Emotional practices are processed and learned and produced not only in the same way as stories are, but *as stories*: we learn and store emotions as contextualised meaningful scripts, with conscious or unconscious reference to our experience of the world.

Rob Boddice, in his recent summary of the field of the history of emotions, made one particular criticism of Barbara Rosenwein that stuck with me: that though she links experience and expression, saying that we understand our true feelings by means of words, in her work the “dyad of true feelings and expressed emotion” remains implicit (Boddice 79). I find that expression not only categorises emotions but shapes them—and that, in medieval chronicles and in everyday life, “expression” does not mean only the choice of a single word, but actions, events, remembered references, in sequence and in context. Emotions are complex, composed of many elements, possessing a narrative structure, needing to be worked out in sequence and in relation to a physical or social body. In short: emotions are, or are experienced and learned as, stories.

We know that the brain is plastic, and that repeated patterns of thought physically change the brain and literally shape the pathways for future thought. We still struggle to apply this conceptually when it comes to emotions history, and indeed to the humanities in general. But stories do exactly this, stories and their shapes: stories are one of the primary vehicles by which we process and retain patterns of information, and patterns of meaning. We rehearse familiar stories (scripts, tropes, emotional practices) over and over with characters on the page, or in the spoken word. I suggest we need to think about emotions simply (and complexly) as stories, giving a greater role to storytelling when we think about emotional practice in history.

Appendix

Anger events

This appendix contains a selection of anger events from a few of my key texts. Its purpose is to illustrate the list of anger signs offered in Chapter 1: to offer a general sample of how they work in practice, including their comparative frequencies and the difference between fully dramatised instances and brief allusions. To this end I have included a slightly simplified version of that list here, and referenced the signs individually to the left of the quotations. By their nature, some occur only in a single line and therefore correspond exactly with the position at which I have labelled them (e.g., a reference to 'heart' will bear the label 1.c), whereas others will extend over several lines or more (such as a scene of counsel, or the moment in which a relationship turns from love to anger).

This selection also illustrates a few of the potential ambiguities of these signs: for example, some signs may be associated with multiple emotions (pallor with anger, fear, and sorrow, laughter with mockery and joy, authorial naming of emotion with any emotion at all). In these cases I have labelled them whether or not they indicate anger, to demonstrate that ambiguity; but I have not labelled signs such as kneeling or kissing which do not typically belong to anger events.

There are also some instances here where the emotion sign or script has been subverted, implied, or invoked then avoided: these are indicated by labelling them in italics. Most will include an explanatory note.

Note that I have silently inserted paragraph breaks into many of the translations, and sometimes into the original text if it is prose, in order to keep text and translation aligned, or to break up large blocks of prose.

Appendix Contents

List of emotion signs	190
<i>Annales Paulini</i>	192
<i>Anonimalle</i> chronicle	194
Geoffrey le Baker's chronicle	197
<i>Brut</i> (Middle English prose version)	203
<i>Chanson de Roland</i>	209
Jordan Fantosme's chronicle	213
Fineshade chronicle	216
Froissart's chronicle	217
Walter of Guisborough's chronicle	225
Geoffrey of Monmouth's chronicle	226
Alliterative <i>Morte Arthure</i>	229
<i>Raoul de Cambrai</i>	232
<i>Vita Edwardi II</i>	237
<i>Voeux du Héron</i>	242

List of emotion signs

1. Internal signs

- a) Authorial naming of emotions
- b) Blood
- c) Heart
- d) A feeling of madness

2. Affect and action

- a) The face:
 - i) Distortion, especially of the mouth
 - ii) Changing colour
 - iii) Glaring eyes
 - iv) Wild hair
 - v) Tears
- b) Sweating, trembling, swelling
- c) Hasty movement:
 - i) Wild or uncontrolled motion

- ii) Leaping to one's feet
 - iii) Rushing from one place to another without stopping
 - iv) Throwing objects (other than at a person)
- d) Loss of sens:
 - i) Madness
 - ii) Fainting
- e) Violence against self:
 - i) Tearing at one's hair or face
 - ii) Rending one's clothes
 - iii) Suicide or other self-harm
- f) Violence against others (actual or threatened):
 - i) Destruction of enemy's possessions or lands, especially by fire
 - ii) Displacement of aggression onto an object
 - iii) Throwing objects at somebody
 - iv) Damaging their clothes, armour, or horse
 - v) Drawing or gripping a weapon
 - vi) Striking somebody
 - vii) Killing or seriously wounding somebody
 - viii) Capturing somebody
- g) Withdrawal of love
 - i) Banishment
 - ii) War
 - iii) Legal proceedings

3. Speech and voice

- a) Tone:
 - i) Loud, clear, "high/haut"
 - ii) Initial speechlessness
- b) Declaration:
 - i) Statement of anger
 - ii) Recital of grievances
 - iii) Petition for redress of grievances
- c) Threatening speech:
 - i) Vows of violence / war
 - ii) Maledictions
- d) Provocative speech:
 - i) Appeals to / denial of honour
 - ii) Jeers and taunts
- e) Wordless group speech
 - i) Murmur
 - ii) Clamour

4. Reactions to anger

- a) Communal emotion / sympathy: others share the anger

- b) Command of room / fear in reaction: others are intimidated by the anger
- c) Counsel scene: determines the correct amount of anger
- d) Plea for clemency or restraint

5. Symbols and analogies associated with anger

- a) Fire and heat
- b) The colour red (including visible blood)
- c) Certain animals
 - i) Lions
 - ii) Boars
 - iii) Wolves
 - iv) Leopards
 - v) Dogs
- d) Demons, pagans, foreigners, peasants, etc.

Annales Paulini (A section)

The full *Annales Paulini* covers the period 1307–41, and is written by a series of chroniclers. In the manuscript, the *AP* is a continuation of a version of Roger of Wendover's *Flores Historiarum* to 1306, which Stubbs does not include in his edition. I consider only the section called the A section by Antonia Gransden, covering the years 1307–09 (*Historical Writing* 28–29). It was written in London and probably at St. Paul's by a single chronicler, within a very few years of the events narrated.

Text is from pp. 255–66 of William Stubbs' Rolls Series edition. There are no available translations. Page references are to Stubbs' edition, and translations are mine.

The end of Edward I's reign (255).

1.a	Sub illo quoque tempore cernens rex	In that time the king of England [Edward
2	Angliæ quod filius suus, princeps Walliæ, adamaret quendam Vasconiensem militem ultra modum, ex quo multa incommode conjecturabat ipse rex post mortem suam regno posse contingere, ex consilio comitum et baronum suorum	I], realising that his son the prince of Wales had an excessive love for a certain Gascon knight, and considering that great misfortunes might befall the realm after his own death as a result, by the counsel of his lords and barons the king had this knight banished from his realm for life.
4.c	compulit rex ipsum militem abjurare quoad viveret regnum suum. Huic autem militi Petrus de Gavastone nomen erat.	This knight's name was Piers Gaveston.
2.g.i		

Note: Edward I shows no behavioural signs of anger, only those that belong to the structure of politics and narrative. He proceeds from calm observation ("cernens") and foresight ("conjecturabit"), through consultation with his barons, to firm action. This is not narrated as an emotion event on Edward I's part—he does not even "fear" that evil will come to the realm,

but “considers” it. His actions are framed as proceeding from policy and counsel, in response to the dangerously excessive feelings of his son (“adamaret... ultra modum”). Contrast his anger in the Fineshade chronicle and the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough.

*With his father dead, Edward II has recalled Gaveston,
who shocks and angers everybody with his arrogant behaviour (258–59).*

1.a	Porro Petrus de Gaveston, dictus comes Cornubiæ, de pulvere elevatus, cœpit Anglicos detestari...	Soon Piers Gaveston, so-called Earl of Cornwall, raised up from dust, began to be detested by the English...
1.a	He wins two tournaments through trickery, hinc crevit major indignatio comitum et baronum.	which gave rise to much anger amongst the earls and barons...
<i>A third tournament is announced.</i>		
1.a	[Gaveston,] metuens eo ire, suggessit regi mortem suam inibi a comitibus machinari, et rex statim prohibuit torniamentum.	[Gaveston,] fearing to attend, told the king that the earls were planning to kill him there, so the king immediately banned the tournament.
1.a 3.e.i 4.a	Iccirco magis odium contra eum et murmur in populo resonabat. Et quanto crevit odium populi ex vitæ merito contra elevatum de stercore, tanto ferventius augebat regis dilectio erga Petrum.	Because of this, even greater hatred and murmur against him began to resound among the people. And the more that hatred deservedly thrived amongst his people against the man who had been raised up from shit, the more fervent grew the king’s love for Piers. In the excess of his love, the king called Piers his brother; but the common people truly called him the king’s idol...
1.a	Rex vocavit Petrum, præ amore nimio, fratrem suum; vulgus vero eum regis ydolum vocitabat...	Thus all the people were indignant, to see two kings rule together over one realm: that is how they expressed it, and so it was.
1.a	Unde indignatus est populus universus, duos reges in uno regno, istum verbaliter, istum realiter conregnare.	

Notes: Here the chronicler begins to commit himself to an opinion: criticism of Gaveston and of the king’s conduct has so far been mostly voiced by groups (“populus” / “comites et barones”), and the chronicler’s agreement has been implied. Over the course of these two pages the narrative voice explicitly begins to agree. Note the increasingly lack of restraint, shown especially graphically by the change from “pulvere” to “stercore” to describe Gaveston’s (supposedly) humble origins. Note also the language used to describe group feeling—“murmur”, “reson[are]”, “cre[scere]”—suggestive of sound and movement. “Crescere” may also refer to growth as of a plant. It is used twice in this passage, and I have translated it as “grow” and “thrive”. So far in this chronicle emotions, especially strong emotions, have belonged almost exclusively to groups—and, of course, to Edward II. Here the growth of his feelings for Gaveston is explicitly tracked against the growth of (justified) anger in the populace. It is hardly a flattering comparison.

*At the combined coronation and wedding of Edward II,
Gaveston dresses so ostentatiously as to outshine the king (262)...*

1.a	... non regis sed gloriam propriam quærens, et quasi Anglos contempnens...	... seeking not the king’s glory but his own, as if in contempt of the English...
2.f.vii	Quapropter indignatus comes unus voluit interimere eum palam. Cui alius sanior	As a result, one indignant earl wanted to slaughter him publicly. To him, a wiser

3.c.i/ii	respondebat; “Non in die festo, ne forte fiat tumultus in populo et dedecus in convivio. Sed expectare vincere nobis erit.”	earl responded: “Not on a feast day: let not the tumult among the people nor the shame upon these festivities grow stronger. We should instead wait for our time to triumph.”
1.a, 2.c.iii, 2.f.viii 3.e.i	Karolus et Lodowicus patruī reginā, cernentes quod rex plus exerceret Petri triclinium quam reginā, cum indignatione ad Franciam remigarunt. In omnem igitur terram exiit rumor iste, quod rex plus amaret hominem magum et maleficum quam sponsam suam elegantissimam dominam et pulcherrimam mulierem.	Charles and Louis, brothers of the queen’s father, seeing that the king spent more time at table with Piers than with the queen, returned to France with great indication. Across all the land, therefore, this murmur arose: that the king loved an evil sorcerer more than he did his bride, who was a most elegant woman and very beautiful wife.

Note: The chronicler says that the king “exerceret” (exercised) the Gaveston’s “triclinium” more than that of the queen, which I translate neutrally as “spent more time at table with”. There is probably some degree of euphemism here. In classical Latin, a triclinium is a dining couch for three people. It is rare in medieval usage, and does not translate well into the setting of a medieval banquet: should we think of it in terms of being a person’s partner at board? *MED* attests two fifteenth-century instances of “tricline” used to mean a dining room, suggesting that the word may have retained its association with shared meals and lost the specific number, and possibly the connection with furniture. Here, “exerceret” suggests that a specific item of furniture is intended, possibly with sexual undertones. It is also not quite clear whether the preference that Charles and Louis see is general or specific to the occasion: do they see that he spends more time with Gaveston during the banquet, or do they perceive that he will always prefer Gaveston’s “couch”?

*Robert Bruce attacks the north of England,
despising the English and their king (265).*

5.d 3.d.ii 1.a	Hic tyrannus, inter multas blasphemias quas evomit in vituperium regis Angliā, dicebat seipsum plus timere ossa regis mortui quam regem vivum; et major magnificentia belli esset, cuiquam regnare volenti, adquirere spatium semipedis de terra a rege Edwardo dum viveret, quam a rege superstite unum regnum.	This tyrant [Robert Bruce], amongst the many blasphemies which he vomited forth in his abuse of the king of England, claimed to fear the bones of the dead king [Edward I] more than he feared the one who lived [Edward II]; and that it would have been a greater military glory to win half a foot of land from King Edward who was gone than to win a kingdom from him who was left.
----------------------	--	--

Anonimale chronicle

A variant of the French Prose Brut for the years 1307–33, attested in a single (probably autograph) manuscript from St Mary’s Abbey, York. Exists as part of a longer Brut manuscript, but the section in question was probably written probably shortly after the events narrated.

Text and translation are from Childs and Taylor's facing-page edition. In this and other texts with a facing-page translation edition, I give the citation in the format (80–81): 80 is the edited text and 81 the translation, rather than the text beginning on page 80 and continuing to 81. Be aware that this means the reference will look far longer than it is if it lies over a page break: 80–83 would not be four pages long, but may be only a single paragraph that happens to fall over the page break from 80 to 82.

Edward II succeeds to the throne (80–81).

	Après cestui bone roi Edward regna Edward son ficz. Edward de Carnervan fust appelle, beaus homme et fort de corps et de membre, mes il forslisna de les tetches et de la manere son pere, qar il ne fist force de chivalerie ne pruesce, mes tantoullement de sa volente demene.	After this good king, Edward, his son Edward reigned. He was called Edward of Caernarvan, a handsome man and strong in body and limb, but he fell short of the qualities and the style of his father, for he was concerned not with deeds of chivalry or prowess but only with his own desires.
1.a, 1.c	Cestui roi Edward fu si chaungeable de corage et de quoe, qe ceo qil granta une jour pur commun profist de la terre il le voleit dedir une autre jour. Et auxi fust il homme de grante vengeance, qar quant il comenca de regner tost apres grande descord et grande estrif sourdirent	This king Edward was so fickle in purpose and feelings that what he granted one day for the common profit of the land he would want to retract on another. Also he was a man bent on vengeance, for soon after he began to reign great discord and conflict arose
2.g 4.a	entre li et une sire Walter de Langetoun, qi fust evesqe de Cestre et tresorere le roi son pere, pur ceo qe le dit evesqe li accusa quant il estoit princes de Gales dascunes trespas et meffaitz, des queux le bone roi son pere li reprova et chastia par droit et reson.	between himself and a certain sir Walter Langton, who was bishop of Chester and had been treasurer of the king, his father, because the said bishop had accused him, when he was prince of Wales, of various evil deeds and wrongdoings for which the good king, his father, had reproved and rightly and reasonably punished him. This king
2.g	Cesti roi aima cherelement de coer ascuns gentz qi son piere sovent foith li defendi la compaignie de eux...	loved with all his heart certain people whose company his father had frequently forbidden him...

Note: This is the chronicler's first description of Edward II on his accession, and it sets the tone for narration throughout his reign. Note the emphasis on his emotionality and his failure to make the right bonds of love.

The king hears that the barons have waylaid and killed Gaveston (86–87).

1.a 1.c 3.b.ii	Quant le roi avoit oi et entendu coment sire Piers de Gavestoun estoit mis a mort par les grantz de la terre, il estoit durement coroucee et irre, et pensa privement touz jours en son quoe de sei venger de ceuz qi feurent assentaunz a sa mort quant il verroit temps.	When the king heard and understood how sir Piers Gaveston had been put to death by the lords of the country he was greatly angered and annoyed and he secretly contemplated in his heart all the time how to revenge himself when he should see the opportunity on those who had assented to his death.
----------------------	--	--

The beginnings of civil war (102–03).

1.c, 1.a	... la grossure del coer le roi surmonta durement de vengeance faire sour la partie qe lui contraria, ne pur quant il les	... the king's heart was bursting with desire for vengeance on the party which was opposing him, although he had
2.g	avoir fet chartres de pees...	granted them charters of peace...
3.b.iii	Et le gentil counte de Lancastre manda amiablement au roi par sez lettres, qil cessat de la persecucion qil comenca affaire sur sez lieges gentz a reson. Et le	And the noble earl of Lancaster told the king in a friendly way, by his letters, that in justice he should stop persecuting his liege people. And the king held in
3.c.i/ii	roi tint en despit quantqe le gentil counte et autres grantz li avorent mande, mes toutz jours pensa de sei venger de eux...	contempt what the gentle earl and other lords had told him, but every day thought of revenging himself on them.

Note: There are several subverted or failed anger signs here. The first is that the feelings of Edward II's heart do not match the legal status of the relationship, as attested by peace charters. The second is the necessity for Lancaster to make petition instead of, as (ostensibly) the most powerful baron in the land, being able to advise the king directly. The third is Edward II's lack of decisive action or speech: he does not vow violence, make a curse, or formally move to resolve the relationship by a show of anger or love, but waits and hopes for a chance of revenge—just as Isabella does in several of the extracts from Geoffrey le Baker below.

After the defeat and capture of the Earl of Lancaster (106–107).

2.f.viii	... le roi li maunda tanqe a Pountfreit le quel lieu le dit counte amast plus qe nul autre ville de la terre. Et illuques le roi fust entre le chastel le dit counte, et ove li Hugh li encontra et li le denga par	... the king sent him to Pontefract, a place the said earl loved more than any other town in the land. And there the king had entered the said earl's castle and, sir Hugh being with him, met the
3.d.ii	malicious paroles et despitouses en my	earl and contemptuously insulted him to
1.a	son visage en despit de li.	his face with malicious and arrogant words.

The collapse of a stage at a tournament (146–47).

1.a, 4.d	La quele sodeine aventure fust par my la defaute des carpenters. Et le roi de sa franche volente et graciouse grace et par my la priere la dame la roigne pardona le	This sudden accident was due to the fault of the carpenters. The king of his free will and gracious mercy and through the prayers of the lady the
3.b	trespas, et fist crier pees par tut, et amour, et qe nul deveroit de rien estre abaie ne affraie.	queen pardoned the fault, and had peace and love proclaimed everywhere, and that no one should be in any way scared or afraid. And the king ordered the
4.a	Et le roi comanda la roigne... monter son palefray en hast et chivaucher sus et jus el renk ove bele semblaunt, a conforter le poeple,	queen... to mount her palfrey quickly and to ride up and down the lines with a good countenance to reassure the people. The staging which fell so
	et le hurdiz, qe si sodoignement cheist, fust reparaille de nuyt et fet assetz fort,	suddenly was repaired at night and was made strong enough so that the next day

issint qe lendemain feu le jeu contenu
noblement.

the game was continued in a noble
manner.

Note: Instead of proclaiming his anger, Edward III proclaims peace and love, and has Philippa help him unite his people in feeling.

Under siege, the nobility of Berwick try to cede the town to the English (154–55).

1.a Et quant la communalte de Berewyk
2.c.iii avoit aperceu coment les juvencels de la
2.f dite ville voleient avere rendu la ville au
roi Dengleterre et a sire Edward de
Baillol sanz lour congie et lour assent, ils
estoint grandement grevez et corucez,
et hastivement mouterent les murs de
la dite ville et noblement la defenderent
encountre les Engleis.

When the commonalty of Berwick had
perceived how the young men of the
said town wanted to give the town to the
king of England and to sir Edward Balliol
without their leave and assent, they
were greatly aggrieved and angered and
quickly mounted the walls of the said
town and honourably defended it
against the English.

Note: Here the “grevez et corucez” reaction is felt not by a single lord but by a community body in response to injury and threat.

Geoffrey le Baker's chronicle

Covers the years 1303–56. Composed c. 1350 with additions to 1360. The Latin text is that of E. Maunde Thompson's 1889 edition. That edition is the source text for the translation by David Preest, who includes page references to Thompson's edition in his English text. My citations here are given in the format (1; 2–3), where '1' is the Latin text and '2–3' the English. In the body of my thesis I reference the translation unless I am explicitly citing the Latin.

Gaveston's successful military leadership against the Scots (4; 3–4).

... de quo valencium dicere testimonium
quod, ipso in partibus Scocie ducatu
milicie presidente,
2.f.i Scotos valde terruit et repulit a predis et
2.d.i aliis vesaniis magnanimitas Anglorum;
1.a quo per invidiam felices successus ipsius
odiencium de medio subtracto,
5.a incanduit et invaluit in ministros regis
2.f.i Anglie castris Scocie deputatos versuta
Scotorum vigilancia.

Those in a position to speak about him
testify that, while Gaveston was in
command of the army in Scottish lands,
the heroism of the English greatly scared
the Scots and stopped them from
plundering and other acts of madness.
But when Gaveston was taken from their
midst through the envy of those who
hated his happy successes, the cunning
Scots were wide awake once more and,
white hot with rage, launched attacks on
the governors, whom the English king
had put in command of the castles of
Scotland.

Note: It was actually Ireland that Gaveston was sent to govern, and where he had these successes. The Scots fit this anecdote better, however: the depiction of them in chronicles as

raging, furious enemies on the borders of civilisation was a familiar one. Their anger here is othering anger: they are not angry at the fact that Gaveston has been recalled, but because it is their evil nature to behave like this.

Queen Isabella's hatred for the Despensers as they gain ascendancy (17; 16–17).

1.a	Ad hoc contra seipsos in universum nefas rapidissimam iram femineam regine concitabant, eo quod, illorum avaro consilio et ordinatione familia consortis regie minorata, sibi certi redditus cum precisione fuerant taxati, parciori annona quam solebat victure.	In addition to this, the Despensers very quickly aroused the feminine anger of the queen against themselves. She was very ready to commit any crime against them, when they lessened the household of the royal consort through their greedy decisions and orders, fixed within precise limits the amount of money she was allowed, and said she would be living upon smaller supplies of food than before.
5.d	Unde avaricia insatiabilis feminina concupitis frustrata, aut certe prodigalitas muliebris artata, quarum alteri solet semper ille sexus indulgere, non solum contra Dispensatores, set et contra	So, now that a woman's insatiable greed had been frustrated of its desires, or at any rate a wife's excessive spending had been checked (and the female sex is always indulging in the one or other of these), the queen blazed up in anger not
5.a	maritum, plus illos quam illam consiliis	only against the Despensers but also
1.a	imitatum, exarsit in iras.	against her husband, who in his decisions was copying them more than herself.
3.b.ii	Iam luget Francorum sanguinem regale, immo regis filiam atque successive regum... unicum sororem, regi set avaro maritarem; promissam fore reginam, set in condicionem ancillarem conversam, Dispensatorum, quos plus quam odio	Her lament was that she, who was of the royal blood of France, or, more than that, the daughter of a king and the only sister of three successive kings... now found herself married to a king who was a miser. The promise had been that she would be queen, but she had become no better than a maidservant, receiving her wages from the Despensers, whom she
1.a	perfecto oderat, stipendiarium.	hated with a more than perfect hatred.

Note: Here “woman” becomes a category very like “devil” or “pagan”—a creature moved by its nature to an unreasoning, othering anger. She can take no violent or formal action against the Despensers but nurses hatred internally, and similarly, her recital of grievances is hidden rather than declared aloud.

Isabella and her son delay returning from France, while Isabella plots against the Despensers (20; 19–20).

Commovebatur Anglia de regine mora ad regis displicenciam extra regnum filium suum detinentis, quibusdam asserentibus quod inviti detinebantur, aliis conicientibus quod illicitis complexibus R[ogeri] de Mortuo mari delinita, cum	The English were worried that the queen delayed in France and to the displeasure of the king was keeping their son outside the kingdom. Some declared that the two of them were being detained against their wills. Others guessed that she had found comfort in the unlawful embraces of Roger Mortimer, and was just as
--	---

	ipso et aliis profugis Anglorum quos in Francia reperivit, noluit redire;	unwilling to return to England as was Mortimer and the other English exiles whom she found in France. But all the time, while these and other different reasons for her delay were being put forward, some of them false and others half true, the bishops of Lincoln and Hereford, who knew of the plot for whose completion the enraged virago was waiting, kept hidden the secrets of their hearts.
1.a, 5.d	set has et alias causas diversas quibusdam falsas, quibusdam vero semiplenas pretendentibus, episcopi Lincolniensis et Herefordensis, conscii negotii cuius finem expectavit irata virago, consciencie secretum dissimularunt.	
1.a 4.c	Vindicta muliebris anni dispendio iam excogitata, calicem propinandum suorum amatorum consultu finaliter preparavit.	The queen had now spent a year plotting her revenge, and finally on the advice of her lovers she prepared to drink its cup.

Edward II is persuaded to abdicate (27; 26).

3.b 1.c 2.a.v 2, 3	Istis et aliis importunis promissis atque minis inflexum piissimum cor regale, non sine singultibus, lacrimis et suspiriis, monitis episcoporum condescendit, paracior pro Christo vitam finire, quam suorum filiorum exheredacionem aut regni diuturnam perturbacionem oculis viventis corporis videre, sciens quod bonus pastor animam suam ponit pro ovibus suis.	By these and other bullying threats and promises the pious heart of the king was won over, and, not without sobs, tears and sighs, he climbed down and took the bishops' advice. Knowing that a good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep, he was more ready to end his life as a follower of Christ than to look with the eyes of a living body upon the disinheritance of his sons or a lengthy civil war in his kingdom.
-----------------------------	--	--

Note: Taking on the role of Patientia or of a martyr, Edward II does *not* respond with angry behaviour or speech.

Edward II, in captivity, laments the loss of his wife's love (29; 28).

1.a 1.a 4.a 1.c 1.a 5.c.i 4.c 5.d	Amor languentis, in ceteris adversis paciencia, comitem custodem et omnes illorum familiares ad miseracionem tantam provocarunt, quod generosi militis amorem languidum uxoris sue cordi duriori incude adamantine non dimiserunt nunciare. Unde, non amore mota set furore commota ... Talibus et aliis cogitatibus angustiata, truculenta leena [<i>sic</i>], recurrens ad consilium sui magistri, sacerdotis Baal illius Herefordensis...	This love shown by the despondent Edward and his patience in adversity awoke such pity in the earl his guardian and in both their households that they did not omit to send messages of the despairing love of the noble lord for his wife to a heart that was harder than an adamantine anvil. For the queen was stirred not to love by these messages but to anger... The fierce lioness again sought advice from her master, that priest of Baal the bishop of Hereford...
--	--	---

Note: Geoffrey le Baker adds more othering categories: the Bishop of Hereford is now likened to the "wicked" priests of Baal.

Edward III and his friends stage a coup and successfully capture Roger Mortimer (46; 41).

?5.a	Speculator predictus torticibus accensis duxit dominum suum regem per quoddam iter secretum subterraneum, quod incipit a remotis extra castrum et terminatur ad medium coquine vel aule turris principalis, ubi fuit ospitata regina. De medio igitur fundo et tramite	With lighted torches the keeper led his master the king into the castle by a secret underground passage, which began from far outside the castle and ended in the middle of the kitchen or of the hall of the main tower where the queen was lodged. Springing from the depths of the
2.c.iii	subterraneo prosilientes, regis amici ad cameram regine, quam per Dei gratiam	underground pathway, the friends of the king armed with drawn swords made for
2.f.v	invenerunt apertam, armati strictis ensibus proficiscebantur, rege etiam armato extra hostium camere, ne a matre sua videretur, expectante. Ingressi	the queen's bedroom, which by the grace of God they found open. They left the king outside the door so that his mother should not see him and entered the room.
2.f.vii	occiderunt Hugonem de Turpintone militem, resistenciam eiis inferre conantem, domino Iohanne de Neville de Horneby ictum dirigente.	They killed the knight Hugh Turpington who tried to stop them, the blow being dealt by lord John de Neville of Hornby.
	Deinde invenerunt reginam matrem quasi paratam ad lecti soporem, et comitem Marchie quem volebant; et captum secum	Then they found the queen mother apparently prepared for bed and sleep and the earl of March, the man they wanted. They seized him and took him
2.f.viii	abducebant in aulam, clamante regina: "Beal fitz, beal fitz, eiez pitie de gentil Mortymer." Suspectam enim habuit filii	away into the hall, with the queen crying aloud, "Dear boy, dear boy, have pity on gentle Mortimer." For she suspected that
4.d	presenciam, quam oculo non percepit.	her son was there, even if she could not see him.

Collapse of staging at a tournament (48; 43).

	... et ante finem mensis Aprilis rediit, et fuit apud Derteford solempne torneamentum. Et parum ante festum sancti Michaelis Londoniis in Chepe pulcherrima hastiludia fuerunt, ubi domina regina Philippa cum magna dominarum comitiva de tentoriis, unde militares actus specularentur, noviter edificatis, ceciderunt, set illese.	Before the end of the month of April... there was an impressive tournament at Dartford. And a little before the feast of St Michael there were the most handsome tournaments at Cheapside in London, attended by the lady queen Philippa and a large retinue of her maidservants. The canopied tents, which had been newly set up for the spectators of the tournament, collapsed, though without doing any harm.
2.f-g	Carpentarios proinde puniri non permisit	The pious queen did not allow the
1.a	ilia piissima regina, set ab iracundia	carpenters to be punished, but by her
4.d	regem et amicos regis precibus et genuflexionibus ita revocavit, quod in sui	prayers and genuflexions so recalled the
4.a	amorem omnes eius pietatem considerantes regina misericors concitavit.	king and his friends from their anger that by this act of mercy she caused everyone to love her, as they thought about her goodness.

1336: the start of the Hundred Years War. The French envoys return to King Philip (whom Geoffrey le Baker always calls 'the tyrant' or 'the usurper', not 'the king').

They report that Edward III means to resume war with the Scots, disregarding the "threatening letters" that Philip has sent asking him to keep peace with them. (58; 51)

3.c 1.a 2.g.ii	Congratulabatur tirannus nunciatis, non reminiscens treugarum quas pro sui gracia rex Anglie cum Scotis sibi dispendiosas confirmavit, set, ruminans quod suas literas comminatorias parvipendebat, gavisus est occasionem se invenisse qua contra suum consanguineum et regni Francie, cui incubuit, verum heredem vexillum liliatum posset explicare.	The tyrant congratulated them on their report. For he put out of his mind the truces which to please him the king of England had made with the Scots to his own disadvantage. Instead he ruminated on the lack of attention paid to his threatening letter, and rejoiced that he had found a pretext for unfurling his fleur-de-lys banner against his kinsman and the true heir to the kingdom of France which he himself had usurped.
2.b, 1.a 2.g.ii	Inflatus igitur tirannus spiritu furoris et superbie, concitavit Gallos contra Anglicos; unde guerra terribilis fuit suscitata, quam ipse, de prelio navali et campestri pluries fugatus, post occisionem et capturam	So, puffed up by anger and pride, the tyrant roused the French to war against the English. This was the beginning of that terrible war, which the tyrant himself could not bring to an end, even when he had been often routed in battles on sea and on land, and when the kings of Bohemia, Scotland and France had been killed or captured and much blood had been spilt by those who were redeemed by the blood of Christ.
2.f	regum Boemie, Scocie, et Francie et multam Christi sanguine redemptorum sanguinis effusionem, non potuit terminare.	

*Behaviour of the two armies and rulers before the battle of Crécy:
the English are disciplined and pious, the French are unruly and self-indulgent.*

This foreshadows the English victory. (81–82; 72)

5.d	Ad vesperum diei Veneris sequentis, rege super litus de Summe residente, venit super ripam, quam antea peragrarunt, Philippus de Valesio tirannus Francorum, et cum ipso reges Boemie et Malogrie, cum exercitu innumerabili in acies octo magnas diviso.	On the evening of the Friday following, with the king in his quarters on the bank of the Somme, there appeared, on the bank already crossed by the English, Philip de Valois, the tyrant of the French, and with him the kings of Bohemia and Majorca, at the head of an army beyond counting divided into eight great battle-arrays.
3.e.ii	Gallici regem et Anglicos superbe exclamaverunt, militibus utrinque in vado et super litus more guerre hastiludiantibus. Rex misit tiranno offerens pacificum et indempnem transitum per vadum ad eligendum sibi locum aptum bello;	The French shouted boastful cries against the king and his Englishmen, as knights on both sides jostled in the ford and on the banks, as was the custom in war. The king sent an envoy to the tyrant, offering him a peaceful and unharmed passage across the ford so that he might make his own choice of a site suitable for a battle.
3.c.i 4.b, 2.f	set formidolosus iste Philippus, qui se antea minabatur insequiturum regem, noluit tunc bellum, set quasi ad alium locum aquam transiturus divertebat, et rex ipsum expectabat per totam noctem.	But this Philip, who previously had threatened to pursue the king, was now full of fear and refused to fight then, but turned aside as if to cross the river at another place.

In crastino, scilicet die Sabbati, rex
promovit suum exercitum ad campum de
Cressi, ubi obviavit eii exercitus tyranni.
Igitur rex semper ad prelium
preparatus...

He arranged his troops, then...

omnia Deo et Virgini beate commendavit,
observato quod sui omnes pedites
insultum hostilem expectabant, dextrariis
et cursariis cum victualibus venacioni
hostium fugitivorum reservatis.

On the next day, a Saturday, the king
moved his army to the fields of Crécy,
where he was met by the army of the
tyrant. The king as always was ready for
battle...

When he had seen that all his men were
awaiting the enemy's attack as
infantrymen, with the warhorses and
coursers and their food being kept in
reserve for hunting down enemy
fugitives, the king entrusted everything
to God and to the blessed Virgin.

The Count of Eu returns to France from his captivity in England.

The French king resents his admiration for Edward III. (113–14; 98)

Itemque comes de Ew in laudes regias
profudit habunde, adnumerans solacia et
beneficia que in Anglia recepit a rege
tempore sue captivitatis, recensens cum
aliis quam longe fuit ab optimo rege
invidia relegata, quando ipsi in Anglia
captivo hastiludianti, ubi eciam rex
hastiludiavit, non invidebat campi
graciam acclamari.

Laudibus prefetis quantumcumque citra
condignum predicatis invidebat
coronatus Francorum, et per
1.a indignacionem, ex invidia, noverca
iusticie, spurio partu progenitam,
predictarum laudum precones impie
iussit decapitari,

2.g fingens comitem cum sua regia uxore
2.f.vii nimiam habuisse familiaritatem,
atque suum fratrem lese regie magestatis
Francie fuisse reum, quando suam
causam duellarem regis Anglie examini
commisit.

2.f.vii Post predictum fratricidium, uxorem
2.g suam, filiam nobilis regis Boemie, in
prelio de Cressi dudum occisi, fame torsit
usque ad mortem.

Also the count of Eu showered lavish
praises on the English king, enumerating
the comforts and kindnesses which he
had received from the king at the time of
his captivity in England. Amongst other
things he recalled the extent to which
that best of kings had banished envy from
his heart. For at a tournament in which
both he himself, a prisoner in England,
and the English king were taking part, the
king had not begrudged him being
acclaimed the victor in the tournament.
But the crowned head of France was
envious of such praises, even though they
were completely and fully deserved.
Consumed with the wrath, which is the
bastard offspring of envy, the stepmother
of justice, he wickedly ordered the two
speakers of these praises to be beheaded.
He pretended that the count of Eu had
enjoyed too close a familiarity with his
wife, the queen, and that his brother had
been guilty of lèse-majesté against France
when he had entrusted his duelling
dispute to the judgment of the king of
England.

After thus killing his brother, he tortured
his wife by starving her to death,
although she was the daughter of the
noble king of Bohemia, who had recently
been killed in the battle of Crécy.

Edward the Black Prince hears that one of the French generals is successfully stirring up Aquitaine against the English and harming English supporters (128; 110). It is said that by these means the Count of Armagnac...

		... had done more harm to the country and loyal supporters of the king of England than others of the kingdom of France. Having heard this report, the anger of the furious prince glowed white-hot against this pursuer of a war in Aquitaine, and with the agreement of the council of his lords he dispatched his troops to ravage the countship of Armagnac. They speedily set out and the prince first received the surrender of the forts of county of Juliers, and then, by his ravaging of Armagnac, gave great comfort to the loyal lords of Gascony, who before the arrival of this noble prince had suffered similar treatment at the hands of those violent neighbours of theirs.
2.f.i	... plus ceteris de regno Francie patrie et fidelibus regis Anglie iniessit nocumenti,	
1.a,	incanduit ira principis tremendi contra	
5.a	prefatum guerre Dexitane persecutorem;	
4.c	et ob hoc, annuente procerum consultu, princeps exercitum destinavit in demolicionem comitatus Arminacensis. Igitur incitata profeccione, primo recepit dedicionem fortalicionum patrie	
2.f.i	Iuliacensis, et extunc depopulans Armeniacensem valde confortavit fideles de Vasconia, qui consimilia perpassi ab illis truculentis viciniis ante tam nobilis principis adventum.	

Brut (Middle English prose version)

English translation, dating from the second half of the fourteenth century, of the longer Anglo-Norman prose Brut. Text taken from Brie's 1906 EETS edition. The sections of the Anglo-Norman text relating to the events later in Edward II's reign were probably written before 1350, but after 1330.

	<i>King Leir's third daughter, Cordeile, refuses to flatter her father as her sisters have: she says that she loves him as much as is her duty, and as much as he is worth (17)</i>	
3.d.ii	The kyng here fader wende þat she hade	The king her father thought that she had
1.a	scornede him, and bicom wonder	scorned him, and became marvellously
3.b,	wroth, and swore by heuen and erþe þat	angry, and swore by Heaven and Earth
3.c,	she shulde neuer haue goode of him; but	that she should never have anything from
2.g	his dougtres þat louede him so miche	him; but that his daughters who loved
	shulde be wel auauncede and mariede.	him should have good promotions and
		marriages.
	and þe ferste dougter he mariede to	And he married the first daughter to
	Mangles, King of Scotlande; And þe	Mangles, King of Scotland, and the second
	secunde he mariede to Hanemos, Erl of	to Hanemos, Earl of Cornwall.
	Cornewaile; and so þai ordeynede and	And they arranged and said between
	speke bituene ham þat þai shulde	themselves that they should divide the
	departe þe reaune bituene ham too, after	realm between the two of them after the
	þe deþ of Leir her fader, So þat Cordeil	death of Leir their father, so that Cordeile
	his zongest doughter shulde noþing haue	his youngest daughter should have no
	of his lande.	part of his land.

*Uther and Igraine (66). He falls in love with her at a banquet,
although she is the wife of his liegeman, the Earl of Cornwall.*

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>1.a,
2.c.iii

2.g</p> | <p>... he made towarde here nyce semblant
in lokyng and leizhyng. so at þe last þe
Erl perseuede þe priue lokyng and
Laughing, and þe loue bituene ham, and
arose vp fram þe table al in wrap, and tok
his wif, and callede to him his kny3tes,
and went pens al in wrap, wiþouten
takyng Leue of þe Kyng. þe kyng anone
sent after him þat he shulde come
a3eyne, & go nou3t pens in despite of
him; and þe Erl wolde nou3t come
a3eyne in no maner wise.</p> | <p>... he made a fine show with much looking
and laughing to her. So at last the earl
perceived the secret looks and laughter
and the love between them, and he rose
up from the table in great wrath and took
his wife with him, and summoned his
knights, and left the place in great wrath
without taking leave of the king.
The king immediately sent after him to
order him to come back, and not to go
from there in contempt of him; and the
earl would not come back in any way at
all.</p> |
| <p>1.a
2.g.ii</p> | <p>Wherefor þe kyng was ful wroþ, & in
wrap him defiede as his dedelich enemy.
and þe Erl went pens into Cornewaile
wiþ his wif, into þe castel of Tyntagell.</p> | <p>As a result the king was entirely angry,
and in wrath he renounced him as his
deadly enemy. And the earl went from
there into Cornwall with his wife, to the
castle of Tintagel.</p> |
| <p>2.f</p> | <p>and þe kyng lete ordeyne a grete host, &
come into Cornewaile forto destroie þe
erl, if he my3t.</p> | <p>And the king had a great army assembled
and came into Cornwall to destroy the
earl if he could.</p> |

*While Arthur is fighting the Emperor of Rome,
Mordred marries Guenevere and seizes the land (89).*

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>1.a</p> | <p>When þis tydynges come to Kyng
Arthure þere þat he was in Burgoyne, he
was ful sore annoiede, and toke al
Fraunce to Hoel forto kepe, wiþ
haluendele his men, & praiede him þat he
wolde hit kepe til þat he comen a3eyne,</p> | <p>When these tidings came to King Arthur
where he was in Burgundy, he was
furiously angry, and gave all of France
into Hoel's keeping with a half of his men
and asked him to keep it until Arthur
should come back,</p> |
| <p>2.f
3.c.i
2.g</p> | <p>ffor him-self wolde wende into Britaigne
and avenge him oppon Mordrede þat
was his traitoure...</p> | <p>for he himself would go into Britain and
avenge himself upon Mordred who was a
traitor to him...</p> |

Henry II's sons rebel against him (150).

- | | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| <p>2.g.ii</p> | <p>And anone after, Henry, þe new Kyng,
biganne forto make werr oppon Henry,
Kyng, his fader, & eke oppon his breþern.
And so oppon a tyme þe Kyng of Fraunce
and al þe Kynges sones, & ek þe Kyng of
Scotland & þe gretest lordes of England,
were arisen a3eynes Henry þe fader; & at
last, as God wolde, he conquerede his
enemys; and þe Kyng of Fraunce & he
were accorded.</p> | <p>And soon after that, [Young] Henry, the
new king, began to make war upon King
Henry his father, and also upon his
brothers. And there came the time when
the King of France, and all King [Henry]'s
sons, and also the King of Scotland and
the greatest lords of England, rose up
against Henry the father. And at last,
according to God's will, he conquered his
enemies, and he and the King of France
were brought into accord with each
other. And then King Henry the father
sent particularly to the King of France
and prayed him from the heart that he</p> |
| <p>2.g</p> | <p>and þo sent Kyng Henr[i], þe fader
specialy vnto þe Kyng of Fraunce, and
praede him hertly, for his loue, þat he</p> | |

- wolde sende to him by lettre þe names of ham þat bigonne þe werr oppon him. And þe Kyng of France sent azeyn to him by lettre þe names of ham þat bigon þe werr: ferst was lohn his sone, and Richard his broþer, & Henry his sone, þe newe Kyng.
- 1.a, Po was Henry þe Kyng wonder wroþ, &
3.b cursede þe tyme þat euer he ham bigate.
2.g, And while þe werre durede, Henry his
3.c.ii sone, þe newe kyng, deide, sore repentyng his mysdede; and moste
1.a sorw made of eny man for cause of Seynt Thomas dep of Kaunterbery; & prayede
1.a, his fader, wiþ miche sorwe of hert, mercy
4.b of his trespassse; and his fader for3af it
2.g him, & hade of him grete pite...
- would, for his love, send him in writing the names of those who had begun the war against him. The King of France sent back to him in writing their names who had begun the war: the first was John his son, and Richard [John]'s brother, and Henry [the King]'s son, the new king. Then King Henry was marvellously angry, and he cursed the time that he ever begot them. And while the war was still going on his son Young King Henry died, sorely repenting his misdeed, and made more sorrow than any man on account of the death of St Thomas of Canterbury; and he prayed of his father, with much sorrow of heart, mercy for his treachery; and his father forgave him for it, and had great pity for him.

Wars with Scotland (193).

- When þis tydyng was comen to Kyng Edward, þat William Walis hade ordeynede soche a stronge power, and þat al Scotland to him was entendant, and redy to quelle Englisshemen & destroye his lande, he was sore annoied, and sent anone by his lettres to [various of his captains] þat þai shulde take power, and wende into Northumberlond, & so forþ into Scotland, forto kepe the contres.
- 2.f.vii
2.f.i,
1.a
2.g
2.f.i
- When King Edward [I] heard this news—that William Wallace had gathered such a great army, and that all Scotland heeded him and was ready to kill Englishmen and destroy the King's land—he was very angry, and immediately sent letters to [his captains] ordering them to gather troops and go into Northumberland and thence into Scotland, to defend those lands.

On being recalled from exile, Gaveston insults the barons, who respond by killing him (206–07).

- 2.g.i Wherfore Piers of Gauaston come azeyne into Engeland; and when he was comen azeyn into þis lande, he despisede þe grettest lordes of þis lande, and callede Sir Robert Clare Erl of Gloucestre, 'Horessone,' and þe Erl of Lyncoln, Sir Henry þe Lacy, 'Broste bely,' and Sir Guy of Warryk, 'blanke [MS variants: *blac*, *Blake*] hounde of Arderne.'
- 1.a And also he callede þe noble Erl and gentil, Thomas of Lancastre, 'Cherl,' and meny othere shames and scorn ham saide, & by meny opere grete lordes of Engeland, wherfore þai were towardes him ful angri and sore annoiede.
- 3.d.ii And in þe same tyme deide þe Erl of Lyncoln; but he charged, or he was dede,
- 1.a So Piers Gaveston came back into England, and when he had returned into this land, he scorned the greatest lords of the land, and called Sir Robert Clare Earl of Gloucester "Whoreson", and the Earl of Lincoln, Sir Henry Lacy, "Burst-belly", and Sir Guy of Warwick, "White [/Black] Hound of Arden". And also he called the good and noble Earl Thomas of Lancaster "churl", and spoke many other shames and scorn to them, and also to many other great lords of England, so that they were toward him very insulted and angry.
- 1.a Around that time the Earl of Lincoln died; but before he was dead, he charged his

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>3.c.i Thomas of Lancastre, erl, þat was his sone-in-lawe, þat he schulde mayntene his querell aʒeyns þe same Piers of Gaueston, oppon his benison. And so hit was ordeynede, þrouʒ helpe of þe Erle of Lancastr and of þe Erl of Warrwyk, þat</p> <p>2.f.vii þe forsaide Piers was biheuedede at Gauersiche bisides Warwik, þe xix day of Iun, in þe ʒere of grace MⁱCCC & xij;</p> <p>1.a wherefore þe Kyng was sore annoiede,</p> <p>3.c.ii and prayede God þat he might see þat day to bene avengede of þe dep̄ of þe forsaide Piers.</p> | <p>son in law, Thomas Earl of Lancaster, that, upon his blessing, [Lancaster] should maintain [Lincoln's] quarrel against the same Piers Gaveston.</p> <p>And so it was ordained, by the work of the Earl of Lancaster and the Earl of Warwick, that the aforesaid Piers was beheaded at Gaversiche beside Warwick, the 19th day of June in the year of grace 1312; at which the king was furiously angry, and prayed God that he might live to see the day when he could be avenged for the death of the aforesaid Piers.</p> |
|--|---|

Note: Here Gaveston's death comes as a direct result of the barons' reaction to his jeering speech. The dying instructions of the venerated old Earl of Lincoln (whose estate Lancaster inherited) emphasise that their anger is proper, judicial, and appropriate.

Hugh Despenser and his son are exiled (214).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1.a And Sir Hughe þe fader went to Douer, and made miche sorwe, and felle adoun by the see bank, & clipped acros wiþ his</p> <p>2.a.v Armes, and sore wepyng, saide: "now, farewele Engeland! & gode Engeland, to Gode y þe bitak!" and þries cussede þe grounde, and wende neuer haue comen aʒein, and Wepying ful sore, cursede þe</p> <p>2.g.i tyme þat euer he bigate Sir Hugh his</p> <p>3.b.i sone, and saide "for him he hade loste</p> <p>3.b.ii Engeland"; and in presence of ham þat</p> <p>3.c.ii were him aboute, he ʒaf him his curse, and went ouer the see to his landes.</p> | <p>And Sir Hugh the Elder went to Dover and made much sorrow, and fell down on the sea shore, and embraced the earth with his arms spread wide, and weeping sore, he said, "now, farewell, England! And, good England, I entrust thee to God!" and he kissed the ground three times, and thought that he should never return, and weeping very sorely, he cursed the time that he ever begot Sir Hugh his son, and he said that "for him he had lost England". And in the presence of them that were around him he gave him his curse, and he went over the sea to his lands.</p> |
|---|---|

Civil wars: Edward II relieves Tickhill Castle, besieged by his barons (215–16).

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>3.c.i And when þe Kyng [Edward II] herde telle þat his castell was bisegede, he suore, by God and by his crowne, þat þe sege schulde be remevede, and assemblede an huge power of peple, and</p> <p>2.g.ii went þiderward forto rescue þe castell; and his power encessede fram day to day.</p> | <p>And when the King [Edward II] heard tell that his castle was besieged, he swore, by God and by his crown, that the siege should be removed, and he assembled a huge power of people, and set out to rescue the castle, and the numbers of his army increased from day to day.</p> |
|--|--|

Sir Robert Holland fights on the side of the king, though Lancaster had raised him up (216).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>2.g. When þe gode Erl Thomas wist þat he was so bitraiede he was sore abasshede,</p> <p>1.a and saide to him-self: "O almyghty god!"</p> | <p>When the good Earl Thomas [of Lancaster] realised that he was so betrayed he was very dismayed, and he</p> |
|---|---|

- | | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 3.b.ii
1.c | quod he, "how might Robert Holonde
fynde in his hert me to bitraye, siþens þat
y haue Louede him so miche?" | said to himself, "Oh almighty God," said
he, "how could Robert Holland find it in
his heart to betray me, when I have loved
him so much?" |
|---------------|---|--|

*After the defeat at Burton-upon-Trent, the rebellious barons confer:
most think they should travel north
to find a defensible position in one of Lancaster's castles (217).*

- | | | |
|------------|---|--|
| 4.c
2.c | but when þe gode Erl Thomas þis herde,
he ansuerede in þis maner, and saide:
"Lordes," quod he, "if we gone toward þe
north, men wil seyn þat we gon toward
þe Scottes; and so we shul be holde
traitoures..." | But when the good Earl Thomas heard
this, he answered in this way, saying:
"Lords," said he, "if we go northward men
will say that we go toward the Scots, and
they will believe us traitors..." |
|------------|---|--|

He refuses to go further north than Pontefract.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 2.c.ii,
1.a
2.f.v
3.c.i

1.a | And when Sire Roger Clifford herde þis,
he aros vp anone in wrap, and drow his
suorde, & swore by Almyghty God and by
his holy names, but if þat he wolde go
wiþ ham, he shulde be dede, and þat he
wolde slee him þere. Pe noble Erl
Thomas of Lancastre was sore adrade,
and saide: "faire sires, y wil go wiþ þow
whider-so-euer 3e me lede." Po went þai
togederes into þe North... | And when Sir Roger Clifford heard this he
leapt up at once in anger and drew his
sword, and swore by Almighty God and
by his holy names that if he would not go
with them he would be dead, and that he
would slay him here. The noble Earl
Thomas of Lancaster was very frightened,
and said, "Fair sirs, I will go with thee
wheresoeuer you lead me." Then they
went together into the North. |
|---|--|---|

*Battle of Boroughbridge: Harclay captures Lancaster in a church,
and routs the remaining baronial force (219–20).*

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| ?3.d.ii
5.c.iii
3.a.i

3.c.i

2.c.i
5.d
2.f.iv
2.f.viii

1.a | And Sir Andrew [Harclay] a3ein criede
oppon Sir Thomas company, 3ellynge as
a wolfe, and saide: "3elde 3ow, traitour
taken! 3elde 3ow!" and wiþ an hye voice
saide: "beþ ware, sires, þat no man of
3ow be so hardy, oppon lif and lyme, to
misdo Thomas body of Lancaster." And
wiþ þat worde, þe gode Erl Thomas went
into a chapel, and saide, knelyng doun
oppon his knees, and turned his visage
toward þe crois, and saide: "almyghti
God! to þe y me 3elde, and holliche put
me into þi mercy."
And wiþ þat, þe vileins ribaudes lepton
about him, on euery side þat Gentil Erl,
as tiraunt3 and Woode turmentures, and
despoiled him of his Armure, & cloþede
him in a robbe of Ray, þat was his sqyers
liueray, and fourþ lade him vnto York by
water. þere might men see miche sorwe
and care, for þe gentil knyghtes fledden
on euery side, and þe ribaudes and | And Sir Andrew [Harclay] raised the cry
again upon Sir Thomas [of Lancaster's]
company, yelling like a wolf, and said,
"Yield yourself a captured traitor! Yield
yourself!" and with a loud voice he said:
"take care, sirs, that no man of you be so
daring, by his life and limb, to harm the
body of Thomas of Lancaster." And with
that word, the good Earl Thomas went
into a chapel and knelt down on his knees
and turned his face toward the cross and
said, "Almighty God! I yield myself to
thee, and put myself wholly into thy
mercy." And with that, the rude knaves
bounded in upon that noble Earl on every
side, like tyrants and mad torturers, and
despoiled him of his armour, and clothed
him in his squire's rough clothes, and led
him to York by water.
There might men see much sorrow and
care, for the noble knights fled on every
side, and the peasants and knaves chased |
|---|---|--|

- | | | |
|----------|--|--|
| 3.d.ii, | vileins egrely ham descried, and criede in | them down eagerly, crying loud, "Yield |
| 3.a.i | hye, "3elde 3ow, traitoures! 3elde 3ow!" | yourselves, traitors! Yield yourselves!" |
| 3.e.ii | And when 3ai were 3olden, 3ai were | And when they had yielded they were |
| 2.f.viii | robbed, and bonde as þeues. | robbed and bound as if they were |
| | | common thieves. |

Lancaster is mocked and "scourged" on the way to his execution (221).

- | | | |
|---------|---|---|
| 1.a | When [Lancaster] was taken & brouȝt to | When [Lancaster] was captured and |
| 3.d.ii | ȝork, meny of þe cite were ful glade, and | brought into York many in the city were |
| | oppon him criede wiþ hye voice, "A, sire | very glad, and shouted at him with loud |
| 3.c.ii | traitoure! 3e arne welcome, blessed be | voice, "Ah, Sir Traitor! You are welcome, |
| 2.f.iii | God! for now shal 3e haue þe reward þat | blessed be God! For now you shal have |
| | longetyme 3e haue diserued!" and caste | the reward that you have long deserved!" |
| | oppon him meny snoweballes, and meny | and they threw many snowballs at him, |
| 2, 3 | oper reproues dede him. But þe gentile | and scorned him in many other ways. But |
| | Erl þat soffrede, and saide neþer on ne | the noble Earl suffered that and said not |
| | opere. | one thing nor another. |

Edward II hears that Isabella and his son, while in France, are negotiating on their own behalf, beyond his authority (233).

- | | | |
|---------|--|--|
| 1.a | When Kyng Edward of Engelande herde | When King Edward of England heard this, |
| | [these things]... he bicomme wonder wroþ, | he became marvellously angry, and he |
| | and sent to his sone bi his letter, & to his | sent to his son and also to his wife in |
| | wif also, þat þai shulde come into | writing to say that they should return to |
| | Engeland wiþ al þe haste þat þai might. | England with all possible haste. |
| 1.a | The Quene Isabelle, & Sire Edward her | Queen Isabel and her son Sir Edward |
| | sone [later Edward III], were wonder | [later Edward III] were marvellously |
| | sory and drade of the Kyngus manace | sorry and fearful of the threats and anger |
| | and of his wroþ, and principally of the | of the king, and especially of the false |
| | false traitoures þe Spensers, boþe of þe | traitors the Despencers, both the father |
| | fader and of the sone, & at his | and the son; and they would not come at |
| | commandement þai wolde nouȝt come. | his command. |
| 1.a | Wherefore Kyng Edward was ful sore | At this King Edward was completely |
| 3.b.i | annoiede, and lete make a crie at London | angry, and he had a cry put out in London |
| 2.g | þat, if Quene Isabell and Edward her | that, if Queen Isabel and Edward her son |
| 2.g.iii | sone come nouȝt into Engeland, þat þai | did not come into England they should be |
| | shulde bene holden as enemys, boþe to | considered enemies to the realm and |
| | þe reaume & to þe croune; and for þat þai | crown; and because they would not come |
| 3.g.i | wolde nouȝt come into Engeland, boþ | back to England both mother and her son |
| | were exiled, þe moder and her sone. | were exiled. |

Three years after Edward III's accession, Mortimer is shown a letter from the Earl of Kent, brother of Edward II, claiming that the old king is still alive and trying to recruit barons to fight in his name against Isabella and Mortimer (265).

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| 1.a, 1.c | when Sir Roger þe Mortymer saw and | When Sir Roger Mortimer saw and |
| 2.b | vnderstode þe might and þe strengþ of | understood the power and strength of the |
| 1.c | the Lettre, anone for wroþ his hert gan | letter, his heart began at once to |
| | bolne, and euel hert bare toward Sir | [swell/boil/heat] in wrath, and he bore |
| | Edmund of Wodestok þat was Erl of | |

2.c.iii	Kent. and so, wiþ al þe haste þet he might, he went vnto Dame Isabel þe Quene, þat was þe Kyngus moder, and shewede her Sir Edmundus Lettr, Erl of Kent...	an evil heart toward Sir Edmund of Woodstock, Earl of Kent. And so, as quickly as he could, he went to Dame Isabel the Queen, mother of the king, and showed her Kent's letter...
---------	--	---

Roger Mortimer, who has been behaving as if he were the king, hears that the young Edward III and some of his close friends are seeking away to remove him from power (268–69).

1.a	And somme þat were of þe Kyngus Conseil louede þe Mortymer, and tolde him in priuete how þat þe Kyng and his conseil wer about fram day to day hym forto shende and vndo; Wherefore þe Mortymer was sore annoiede, and angry as þe Deuel azeynes ham þat wer of þe Kyngus Conseil, and saide þat he wolde on ham ben avenged, how-se-euer he toke on.	And some people who were in the king's confidence loved Mortimer, and they told him secretly how the King and his confidants sought from day to day to shame and undo him. At this Mortimer was very annoyed, and angry as the Devil at the men in the king's confidence, and said that he would be avenged on them, in any way that he might.
5.d	...	...
3.c.i	And þat tyme Hit felle so þat þe Mortymer, as a Deuel for wraþ, bolnede for wraþ þat he hade toward the Kynges men Edward...	And in that time it happened that Mortimer, like a devil in his wrath, [swelled/boiled/raged] in the wrath that he had toward the men of King Edward...
5.d, 2.b		
1.a		

Chanson de Roland

Late eleventh century, set during the reign of Charlemagne. Text from Bédier's edition, translation by Crosland. Citations given by *laisse*.

Roland suggests his stepfather Ganelon be the messenger to the Spanish king Marsilie (laisse 20).

1.a	E li quens Guenes en fut mult anguisables.	Count Ganelon was filled with anguish at these words.
2.c.iv	De sun col getet ses grandes pels de martre	He threw his large crimson cloak from his neck and stood there in his jerkin of silk. He had flashing eyes and a very proud countenance; he was noble of form and broad of chest.
(2.e.ii?)	E est remés en sun blialt de palie.	He was so good to look at that all his peers gazed at him. And he said to Roland: "Madman, why this anger?
2.a.iii	Vairs out les oeilz e mult fier lu visage; Gent out le cors e les costez out larges; Tant par fut bels tuit si per l'en esguardent.	Everyone knows that I am thy step-father and this is why thou has decreed that I should go to Marsilie. If God grant that I return thence, I will stir up such trouble for thee as will last all the rest of thy life."
2.d.i	Dist a Rollant: « Tut fol, pur quei t'esrages?...	
1.a		
3.b.ii	Ço set hom ben que jo sui tis parastres, Si as juget qu'a Marsiliun en alge.	
3.c.i	Se Deus ço dunet que jo de la repaire, Jo t'en muvra un si grant contraire	

- | | | |
|-------|---|--|
| | Ki durerat a trestut tun edage. » | |
| 2.d.i | Respunt Rollant: « Orgoill oi e folage.
Ço set hom ben n'ai cure de manace.
Mai saives hom il deit faire message:
Si li reis voelt, prez sui por vus le face! »
AOI | Roland replies: "This is nothing but pride and folly. Everyone knows that I care not for threats. But it needs a clever man to be a good messenger; if the king wishes it, I am ready to go instead of you." |

The quarrel escalates (laisse 22).

- | | | |
|----------|--|---|
| 3.d.ii | Quant ço veit Guenes qu'ore s'en rit
Rollant, | When Ganelon sees that now Roland is mocking him, his mortification is so great |
| 1.a, 2.b | Dunc ad tel doel pur poi d'ire ne fent; | that he nearly bursts with anger. His |
| 1.d | A ben petit que il ne pert le sens, | senses almost leave him, but he says to |
| 2.g | E dit al cunte: « Jo ne vus aim nient:
Sur mei avez turnet fals jugement.
Dreiz emperere, veiz me ci en present:
Ademplier voeill vostre comandement. | the count: "Indeed, I have no cause to love you; you have brought an unjust judgment on me. Just emperor, here am I; I desire to carry out your bidding." |

Note: Crosland's translation of "fent" here is adapted to our modern idiom "burst with rage": *fendre* would be more literally *to split open*.

Negotiating with Marsilie, Ganelon threatens him with Charlemagne's might (laisse 33–34).

- | | | |
|--------|---|---|
| 1.a | Li reis Marsilies en fut mult esfreed. | King Marsilie was dumbfounded at this |
| 2.f.v | Un algier tint, ki d'or fut enpenet; | speech; he was holding in his hand a dart |
| 2.f.vi | Ferir l'en volt, se n'en fust desturnet. AOI. | feathered with gold, and he would have struck him if he had not been prevented. |

Laisse 34

- | | | |
|--------|--|--|
| 2.a.ii | Li reis Marsilies ad la culur muee, | King Marsilie has changed colour and he |
| 2.f.v | De sun algeir ad la hanste crollee. | has seized the shaft of his weapon. When |
| 2.f.v | Quant le vit Guenes, mist la main a
l'espee,
Cuntre dous deie l'ad del furrel getee. | Ganelon saw this he put his hand to his sword and drew it from its sheath about two fingers' length. |

Note: Ganelon changes colour and threatens violence. His response is not entirely defensive: he is signalling his readiness to meet Marsilie in anger if necessary.

Negotiations continue (laisse 37).

- | | | |
|---------|--|---|
| 2.a.ii, | Marsilies fut esculurez de l'ire, | Marsilie was pale with anger as he broke |
| 1.a | Freint le seel, getet en ad la cire,
Guardet à bref, vit la raisun escrite:
« Carle me mandet, ki France ad en
baillie, | the seal and threw away the wax. He looks at the letter and sees what is written therein: "Charles, the ruler of France, bids me call to mind the grief and the anger which I caused him concerning |
| 2.b.ii | Que me remembre de la dolur e de l'ire,
Ço est de Basan e de sun frère Basilie
Dunt pris les chefs as puis de Haltoïe; | Basan and his brother Basilie, whose heads I took from them in the mountains of Hautoïe; if I wish to be quit with my |
| 1.a | Se de mun cors voeil aquiter la vie,
Dunc li envei mun uncle l'algalife; | life, I must send to him my uncle the Algalife; otherwise he will never be my |
| 3.c.i | Altrement ne m'amerat il mie. » | friend." Then the son of Marsilie began to |
| 4.c | | |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>2.d.i Après parlat ses filz envers Marsilies
 2.f.vii E dist al rei: « Guenes ad dit folie.
 Tant ad erret nen est dreiz que plus vivet.
 2.f.v Livrez le mei, jo en ferai la justise. »
 Quant l'oït Guenes, l'espee en ad branlie;
 Vait s'apuier suz le pin a la tige.</p> | <p> speak, and he said to the king: "Ganelon has spoken folly. He has gone too far and it is not right that he should live any longer. Hand him over to me and I will deal with him." When Ganelon heard this he brandished his sword and he went and leaned against the stem of the pine tree.</p> |
|--|--|

The French army, retreating north through the passes, must decide on a rearguard;

Ganelon's resentment leads him to suggest Roland (*laisse* 58).

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1.a Li empereres mult fierement chevalchet.
 « Seignurs barons, » dist li emperere
 Carles,
 « Veez les porz e les destreiz passages!
 Kar me jugez ki ert en la reregarde. »
 Guenes respunt: « Rollant, cist miens
 fillastre:
 N'avez baron de si grant vasselage. »
 2.a.iii Quant l'ot li reis, fierement le reguardet,
 5.d Si li ad dit: « Vos estes vifs diables.
 1.a El cors vos est entree mortel rage. »</p> | <p> The emperor rides proudly through his army... and thus he spake to them:
 "Sir barons, you see the defiles and the narrow passes!
 Choose out now who shall be in the rearguard." Ganelon replies: "It shall be Roland, my stepson; you have no baron so courageous as he."
 When the King heard it, he looked at him fiercely and said to him: "You are a living devil. Deadly rage has taken possession of you."</p> |
|--|---|

The Spanish army approaches the position of the French rearguard (laisse 88).

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1.a, Quant Rollant veit que la bataille serat,
 5.c Plus se fait fiers que leon ne leupart.</p> | <p> When Roland sees that the battle will take place he becomes fiercer than a lion or a leopard.</p> |
|--|--|

Oliver confronts a Spanish knight (laisse 94).

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Un duc i est, si ad num Falsaron;
 Icil er frere à rei Marsiliun.
 Il tint la tere Dathan e Abirun.
 Suz cet nen at plus encrisme felun.
 Entre les dous oilz mult out large le front,
 Grant demi pied mesurer i pout hom.
 1.a Asez ad doel quant vit mort sun nevold,
 Ist de la prese, si se met en bandun,
 3.a.i E si escriet l'enseigne paienor.
 3.d.ii Envers Franceis est mult cuntrarius:
 « Enquoi perdrat France dulce s'onur! »
 1.a Ot le Oliver, sin ad mult grant irur.
 2.c Le cheval brochet des oriez esperuns,
 2.f.vi Vait le ferir en guise de baron.
 2.f.iv L'escut li freint e l'osberc li derumt,
 2.f.vii El cors li met les pans del gunfanun,
 Pleine sa hanste l'abat mort des arçuns;
 Guardet a tere, veit gesir le glutun,</p> | <p> There was a duke there Falsaron by name—and he was king Marsilie's brother. He ruled the land of Dathan and Abiron and there is no viler traitor beneath the sky. So wide was the space between his two eyes that one might measure a good half foot. He is filled with grief when he sees his nephew dead; he advances out of the crowd and puts his horse to the gallop shouting the heathen battle-cry. Most insulting is he towards the French: "To-day fair France will lose her honour," he cries. Oliver hears him and he is very angry; he urges on his horse with his golden spurs and rides like a baron to strike him. He breaks his shield and rends his hauberk, he drives the flaps of his ensign right into his body and the length of his haft he hurls him</p> |
|--|--|

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>3.d.ii Si li ad dit par mult fiere raison:
« De voz manaces, culvert, jo n'ai essoign.
Ferez i, Francs, kar très ben les
veintrum!»
Munjoie escriet, ço est l'enseigne Carlun.
AOI.</p> | <p>from his saddle. Then he looks down and sees the villain lying on the ground, and says proudly to him: "I care not for your threats, son of a slave! Strike, Frenchmen, for we shall easily conquer them!" And he shouts "Montjoie," the battle-cry of Charles.</p> |
|--|--|

Charlemagne searches for the dead amongst the slaughtered French rearguard and Spanish army (205).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>5.b Quant l'empereres vait querre sun
nevold,
De tantes herbes el pré truvat les flors
Ki sunt vermeilles del sanc de noz
barons!</p> <p>1.a, Pitet en ad, ne poet muer n'en plurt.
2.a.v Desuz dous arbres parvenuz est...
Les colps Rollant conut en treis perruns;
Sur l'erbe verte veit gesir sun nevuld.</p> <p>1.a Nen est merveille se Karles ad irur.
2.c.iii Descent a pied, aled i est pleins curs.
...
2.d.ii, Sur lui se pasmet, tant par est anguissus.
1.a</p> | <p>When the emperor is searching for his nephew he finds the flowers of the field all vermilion with the blood of our barons. He is filled with pity for them, and he cannot restrain his tears.
He makes his way beneath two trees... and he recognizes the blows of Roland on the three blocks of stone.
And there on the green grass he sees his nephew lying. It is small wonder if Charles is filled with grief. He dismounted and ran quickly to him.... But he swooned on the body, his anguish was so great.</p> |
|---|--|

Note: Charlemagne's emotion at the sight of Roland's body is called *irur*, not sorrow or even *dol/gref*.

Charlemagne mourns Roland (laisse 207).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>2.d.ii Carles li reis se vint de pasmeisuns;
4.a Par les mains le tienent .IIII. de ses
barons.
Guardet a tere, vei gesir sun nevuld.</p> <p>2.a.ii Cors ad gaillard, perdue ad sa culur,
Turnez ses oilz, mult li sunt tenebros.</p> <p>1.a Carles le pleint par feid e par amur:
« Ami Rollant, Deus metet t'anme en
flors,
En pareïs, entre les gloriüs!
Cum en Espaigne venis a mal seignur!
1.a Jamais n'ert jorn de tei n'aie dular.
Cum decarrat ma force e ma baldur!
N'en avrai ja ki sustienget m'onur.
Suz ciel ne quid avoir ami un sul;
Se jo ai parenz, n'en i ad nul si proz. »</p> <p>2.e.i Trait ses crignels pleines ses mains
4.a, amsdous;
1.a Cent milie Franc en unt si grant dular
2.a.v N'en i ad cet ki durement ne plurt. AOI.</p> | <p>King Charles has recovered from his swoon and four of his barons hold him up in their arms. He looks down and sees his nephew lying there. His form is still fair, but he has lost his colour; his eyes have turned in his head and the light has gone out of them. Charles mourns for him in all fidelity and love: "Friend Roland, may God put thy soul among the flowers in paradise with the angels! To thy misfortune hast thou followed thy lord to Spain! Never will a day pass but I feel the pangs of sorrow for thee. How will my power and my strength be fallen! I shall have no one now to uphold my honour. I feel now that I have not a single friend beneath the sky, and if I have relatives there are none so valiant as thou." He tears out his hair by handfuls, and a hundred thousand Frenchmen are so grieved for him that there is not one who does not weep bitterly.</p> |
|---|---|

Jordan Fantosme's chronicle

Jordan Fantosme was probably a clerk at Winchester. The chronicle covers the years 1173–74, probably written in 1774. Text and translation are taken from Johnston's facing-page edition. Citations are given by verse for quotations specific to within a few lines, or by *laisse* otherwise.

Jordan Fantosme explains the matter of his chronicle (laisse 1, vv. 5–20).

	Gentil rei d'Engleterre a la char tres hardie, Al curuner de vostre fiz ne vus suvienge il mie Ke l'umage de ses meins le rei d'Aubanie	Noble king of England with the right bold countenance, do you not remember that when your son was crowned you made the king of Scotland do him homage, with his hand placed in your son's, without being false to his fealty to you?
2.g	Li feïstes presenter senz fei aver mentie?	
3.c.ii	Puis lur deïstes ambesdous: 'Deus les maldie [10] Ki de vus departirunt amur ne druerie! Encuntre tutes genz del mund en force e en aïe Od mun fiz seiez tenant, salve ma seignurie!'	Then you said to them both: 'May God's curse fall on any [10] who take their love and affection from you. [And you, William] stand by my son with your might and your aid against all the people in the world, save where my own overlordship is concerned!' Then between you and your son arose deadly ill will, which brought about the deaths of many a noble knight, unhorsed many a man, emptied many a saddle, shattered many a shield, and broke many a coat of mail.
2.g(ii)	Puis entre vus e vostre fiz mortel	
1.a	nasquid envie, Dunt maint gentil chevalier ad puis perdu la vie, Maint hume deschevalchié, mainte sele voidie, Maint bon escu estroé, mainte bruine faillie. Aprés icest curunement, e après ceste baillie, Surportastes a vostre fiz auques de seignurie, Tolistes lui ses volentés, n'en pot aver baillie.	After this crowning and after this transfer of power you took away from your son some of his authority, you thwarted his wishes so that he could not exercise power.
2.g.ii	[20] La crut guerre senz amur:	[20] Therein lay the seeds of a pitiless war. God's curse be on it!
3.c.ii	Damnesdeus la maldie!	

Henry II hears that his son has declared war on him (laissez 13–14, vv. 125–61).

1.a,	Quant ço oï le pere, greins en fud e irez,	When Henry, his father, heard this, he
2.g	E jure sun serrement—mar fud unques	was both saddened and angry, and he
3.c.i	pensez!— E dit a ses chevaliers: "Seignurs, or m'entendez! Unques mes en ma vie ne fui si adulez.	swore his oath—alas that his son ever thought of doing such a thing—and he said to his knights: 'My lords, now give heed to what I say! I was never so grieved in all my life. I am so filled with rage that I am nearly crazy.
3.b.i	El cors me tient la rage, a poi me sui	
1.a,	desvez:	
1.d		

- 3.b.ii [130] Les baruns de Bretaigne m'unt ja
cuntrariez;
A ceus que me hëent a mort se sunt
1.a abandunez,
Al rei Lowis de France e a mun fiz
ainznez,
2.f.i Ki me vunt deseritant de ço dunt sui
chasez.
Tolir me volt ma terre e fieus e heritez.
Ne sui pas si envielli, ço sevent gent
asez,
Ke deïve terre perdre, ne pur mes granz
hëez.
3.c.i Od la lune serie anuit eschilguaitiez,
Que Flameng ne terrien ne seient
enbuschiez.
Les baruns de Bretaine, vus le savez
asez,
[140] Tresqu'en Finebusterre sunt en
mes poestez;
Mes Raül de Feulgiere est vers mei
revelez—
Li cuens Hüge de Cestre en est sis afiez.
Ne larrai que nes veie pur fin or
esmerez,
Si trover les pöeie dedenz lur fermetez.
E puis que noz enemis sunt si aseurez,
Dunc les fait bon envair par granz
enemistiez.
Mielz valt engin de guerre sur gent
desmesurez
Ke malveis' asaillie, s'il sunt
descuragiez."
4.a Respunt sun barnage: "Pleins estes de
buntez.
[150] Trestuz voz enemis sunt en mal
an entrez.
Vostrë est la terre, si la defendez!
A tort vus guerreie li vostre engendrez."
- Laisse 14*
- 4.a, Atant es vus ces chevaliers descendez
2.c del paleis,
E vunt saisir ces armes igneus e
2.f.v demaneis,
2.g Vestir haubercs e bruines, lacier ces
healmes freis,
Prendre par les enarmes ces escuz
vianeis.
Dunc oïssiez Deu aramir li vielz Henri li
3.c.i reis:
'Mar m'avrunt entreacuntre li traitre es
chaumeis!'
De la vile sunt issuz chevaliers as
cunreis:
- [130] The barons of Brittany have
opposed me; they have joined forces with
those whose hatred of me is mortal, with
King Louis of France and with my eldest
son, who are stripping me of my rightful
possessions. He wants to take away my
lands, my fiefs, and my inheritance. I am
not so overcome with age nor so
burdened with years, as is well known of
many people, that I should lose my realm.

'Keep good watch this night in the clear
moonlight and see that no Flemings or
men of this region conceal themselves in
ambush. The barons of Brittany, [140]
right up to Finistère, are feudally subject
to me;

but Ralph de Fougères is in revolt against
me and Earl Hugh of Chester is in league
with him in this. For no amount of pure
refined gold shall I fail to look them out, if
I can come on them in their fastnesses.

And since our enemies are so cocksure of
themselves, it is a good policy to press in
on them with great hostilities. A siege-
engine is a better weapon against foes in
the full flush of insolence than a half-
hearted attack when they are not so full
of valour.'
- His barons reply: 'You are full of martial
fervour. [150] Luck has turned against
your enemies. The land is yours, defend it
well! Your son is in the wrong to make
war on you.'
- See now the knights coming down from
the castle, suddenly and swiftly seizing
arms, putting on hauberks and coats of
mail, lacing on their new helmets, and
taking their Vianese shields by the arm-
straps.

Then you could have heard King Henry
the Elder calling on God: 'It will do these
traitors no good to have met me in the
stubble-fields!'

The knights in their battle-array have
come forth from the town: [160] some

- 4.a [160] Meins de seisante mile e plus de sixty thousand of them and more than
seisante treis, sixty companies, and not one of them but
N'ad celui qui ne quide valeir un rei thinks himself the equal of a Welsh king.
waleis.

The French hear that one of their number has been captured (laisse 22, vv. 240–243).

- 4.b Espoënté sunt li Franceis de la fiere The French are alarmed by this dire
nouvelle: news: the heart of the boldest trembles
1.c, Le cuer al plus hardi en tremble e and misses a beat.
2.b chaele. But he who ever leads them all
4.a Mes icil les cunfortë ki trestuz les strengthens their resolution: *his* heart is
chaele; full of anger and his blood boils with
1.a–c Irrur ad en sun cuer, li sanc li estencele. rage.

*The messengers from Henry II deliver their message
to the King of Scotland (laisse 33–34, vv. 365–90).*

- 3.b.ii 'Ore, oiez sun mandement; nel tenez a 'Hear now his message and weigh it
2.d.i folage! carefully! He is very surprised that there
1.a Mult s'esmerveille de vus k'el cors vus is so much madness in you. He always
tient la rage. thought you a wise man, devoid of the
Il vus teneit a sages hum, ne mie folly of inexperience, and one who loved
d'enfantil age, him most dearly without offering him
2.g E celui quil plus amot senz muster nul any hurt.
damage.
... he will wait and see if you act towards
[376] Ainz verra se li ferrez amur e him as a loving kinsman should, and
2.g cusinage, whether you behave like a fool or like a
2.d.i Cument vus vus cuntendrez, cum fol u wise man.'
cume sage.' Then you should have heard the knights,
Dunc oïssiez ces chevaliers, la gent those young and untutored men,
juefne e salvage, swearing mighty oaths and making a
3.c.i Jurer riche serrement e afichier curage: show of boldness: [380] 'If you do not
3.d.i [380] 'Si vus cel rei ne guerreiez, ki par make war on this king who treats you
tel vus hansage, thus curtly, you are not fit to hold lands
Ne devez tenir terre ne nul seignurage, and overlordships, rather should you
Ainz devez al fiz Mahalt servir en serve Maud's son in bondage!'
servage!'

Laisse 34

- Ore ot li reis d'Escoce sa gent quil Now the king of Scotland hears his men
cuntrarie. upbraiding him. [Earl Waltheof is wiser
... and thinks that war would be foolish...]
[387] Si que li reis meismes suvent le and it comes about that the king himself
3.d.i cuntralie many times opposes him, lured on by
4.c Par l'enticement de ces qu'aiment la those who are given over to folly.
2.d.i folie.
2.g.ii E jure sun serrement: 'Deu le fiz Marie, He swears his oath: 'By God, the son of
[390] Ne remeindra la guerre pur Mary, [390] your cowardice will not
vostre cuardie!' prevent war being waged!'

Fineshade chronicle

This is a short, anonymous chronicle written in the small priory of Fineshade between 1322 and 1327, in direct response to the disruption of the civil wars of 1321–22 (Kilpatrick, “The Problematic Present”). Text is my transcription of the manuscript (Cotton Cleopatra D.IX ff. 84–90), and translation is mine. References are by line and folio to the manuscript, with cross-references to the pages of George L. Haskins’ 1939 transcription in *Speculum* bracketed. I prioritise my own transcription rather than the published one because Haskins is unreliable on a few details when it comes to expanding the author’s abbreviations, including one key pronoun in the first quotation (Kilpatrick, “Edward I’s Temper”). Note also that the British Library has refoliated the codex since Haskins’ transcription: his foliation for the chronicle portion of the manuscript begins on 83r, mine on 86r. He does give line numbers, which will match with mine.

The codex contains several other manuscripts bound together by Sir Robert Cotton; the Fineshade manuscript encompasses folios 84–90 (in modern foliation), and includes transcriptions of several documents relevant to the civil wars of 1321–22, addressed to Sir John Engayne, then patron of the Fineshade priory, besides the chronicle itself. The whole Fineshade manuscript seems to have been compiled by one or two hands at the priory shortly after that date, with some jottings added in at the priory in the following decade or two on the empty pages at the end.

Prince Edward asks his father, Edward I, to grant a county to Gaveston
(86r ll. 15–21; Haskins 75)

	Elapso vero aliquanto tempore adiit pro eo patrem suum & petiit sibi dari Cornubie comitatum. Quod rex ut audiuit	After some time had passed, the prince went to his father on his behalf, and requested that the earldom of Cornwall
1.a	grauiter mouebatur in animo &	be given to this Piers. When the King
2.f.ii	petitionem importunam ferens	heard this he was gravely moved in his
1.a,	indignanter ipsam ad terram deiecit	soul and, indignantly taking the
2.c.iv	pedibusque conculcauit dicens totam	importunate petition, he flung it to the
2.b.ii	regionem anglicanam per ipsum fore amittendam. Huius igitur petitionis occasione aliisque gestibus illicitis &	ground and crushed it with his feet, saying that his son would give away all the realm of England. And so, by the
1.a	inhonestis idem rex ira succensus	occasion of this petition and of other
2.g.i	predictum Petrum iussit exulem fieri absque aliqua gracia seu spe in postmodo redeundi. factumque est ita.	deeds both illicit and dishonest, that King, aflame with rage, commanded that the said Piers be exiled without grace or hope of return, and so it was done.

Note: Edward I is “moved in his soul” but he is not specifically said to be feeling anger. Similarly, he displaces his impulse to violence onto the petition, rather than his son, and even the recital of grievances (“saying that his son would give away all the realm of England”) seems a lament rather than a reason for anger. He is indignant at the petition and angry at Gaveston,

but the chronicler will not say that he is angry at his son. Compare Guisborough's account of the same incident (included below).

The barons move against the Despensers (87r ll. 5–12; Haskins 77)

1.c	Nunc vero post premissa mouentur corda magnatum contra predictum dominum Hugonem de consensu domini Regis parliamentum seu consilium statuerunt	Now indeed the hearts of the magnates were moved against the aforesaid Sir Hugh. And, with the consent of the lord King, they held a parliament or council to
2.g.iii	de extorsionibus iniuriis predictum dominum Hugonem factis ipsum instanter	examine the unjust extortions done by the said Sir Hugh, prosecuting him so
2.b.ii	accusantes in tantum ut exigentibus demeritis suis ac patris sui vterque	rigorously that when his crimes and those of his father were examined they had
2.g.i	regnum anglie euaceret. rege ad hoc consenciente & verba exilij in puplico pronunciante.	both to leave the realm of England, the King consenting to this and pronouncing the sentence publically.
	Quo facto magnates regni credebant quicquid actum fuerat ratum & stabilem fieri absque dolo. Tandem pater mutauit aerem & ad partes transmarinas se transtulit, filio in anglia sub alis domini regis latitante.	Once this was done, the magnates of the realm believed that the act was set and stable, with no trickery. After some time the father took a change of air and crossed the seas; but his son remained in England, hiding beneath the wings of the King.

Froissart's chronicle

Text is from the transcriptions provided by the Online Froissart Project, the basis for most of which is MSS Besançon 864–65. References are by SHF chapter, which is one of the several options that the OFP provides for searching within texts and usually the most convenient for intertextual cross-reference. Translations are mine.

The Countess of Montfort takes command of her husband's forces (SHF 1–150).

1.c, 5.c.i	Or vueil je retourner a la contesse de Montfort, qui bien avoit courage d'omme et cuer de lyon. Elle estoit en la cité de Rennes quant elle entendit que son seigneur estoit pris en la maniere que ouy avéz. Se elle en fut dolente et courroucée ce ne fait pas a demander, car elle pensoit mieulx que on le deust mettre a mort que en prison.	Now I will return to the Countess of Montfort, who had the courage of a man and the heart of a lion. She was in the city of Rennes when she heard that her husband had been captured, as you have heard.
1.a	Et combien qu'elle eust grant deuil, si ne fist elle pas comme desconfortee femme, mais comme homme fort et hardi, en reconfortant tous ses amis vaillament et ses souldoyers.	At that she felt <i>duel</i> and anger as you may expect, because she thought it very likely that he would be put to death in prison.
4.a, (2.f)		And however great her <i>duel</i> , she did not behave like an afflicted woman, but like a man strong and hardy, in valiantly heartening her friends and soldiers.

King David of Scotland reacts to the death of his people (SHF 1–152).

- | | | |
|-------|---|---|
| 1.a | Le jeune roy David ot grant deuil et grant pitié de son païs ainsi destruit, et il vit ses gens ainsi complaindre. Si fist la | Young King David [Bruce of Scotland] felt great <i>duel</i> and great pity at this destruction of his lands, and at hearing |
| 2.a.v | royne sa femme, qui en ploura asséz. | his people lament. So did the queen his wife, who wept a great deal about it. |

Note: Compare this to the previous extract. Here *duel* is gendered in a more typical fashion: the lord reacts with *duel* (and will take action), while the lady laments. The Countess of Salisbury takes on the masculine role, but only on behalf of her husband and son.

Battle of Crécy. The Genovese bowmen, hired to fight for the French side,

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| are undisciplined and get in the way of the cavalry. (SHF 1–278) | | |
| 1.a, 2.g | Car le roy de France par grant courroux commanda et dist: “Ceste ribaudaille nous empeschent sans raison.” Lors | Then the King of France in great anger spoke and commanded: “This rabble hinder us to no purpose.” And then his |
| 3.b.ii | veissiez gens d’armes airéz entr’eulx | men at arms began to strike and slash |
| 4.a | ferir et frapper sur eulx, et les pluseurs | amongst [the Genovese], so that most of |
| 2.f.vii | trebuchier qui oncque puis ne se leverent. | them fell and never rose again. |

Battle of Crécy SHF 1–280

- | | | |
|----------|--|---|
| 1.a, 1.c | Vous devez savoir que le roy de France ot grant angoisse au cuer quant il veoit ses gens ainsi descon fire par une | You must know that the King of France had great distress of heart at seeing his people so torn apart by such a small |
| 2.f.vii | poingnee de gens que les Anglois estoient. | number of men as the English were. |
| 4.c | Si en demanda conseil a messire Jehan de Haynault, qu’il lui respondist et dist: “Certes, sire, je ne vous faire conseilier. Le meilleur ce n’estoit que vous vous retrayssiéz a sauveté, car je n’y voy point de recouvrer. Il fera tantost tart: si pourriéz aussi bien chevauchier sur voz ennemis et estre perdu, que entre voz gens.” | He asked counsel of Sir John of Hainault, who replied, “Indeed, sire, I may not counsel you. The best for you to do would be to get yourself to safety, as I see no chance of recovering the battle. The day is getting late: you might as easily fall in with your enemies and be lost as among your own men.” |
| 2.b, 1.a | Le roy, qui tout fremissoit d’aÿr et de | The king, who quite trembled with anger |
| 3.a.ii | maltalent, ne respondit point adont, | and rage, did not reply at once, but rode |
| 2.c.iii | mais chevaucha encores plus avant, et lui sembla qu’il se vouloit adrecier vers son frere le conte d’Alençon, dont il veoit la banniere sur une petite montaigne. | on further, thinking to reach his brother the Count of Alençon, whose banners he could see on a small hill. |

He cannot get through, loses most of his men, and is almost lost himself.

King Philip arrives to attempt to relieve Calais, but cannot get through the English lines, and is obliged to make camp and negotiate with them

instead of attacking them (SHF 1–307).

1.a	Quant ceulx de Calais, qui s'appuioient a leurs murs, les virent premierement apparoir sur le mont de Sagattes, et bannieres et pennons venteler, ilz orent grant joye et cuidèrent certainement estre desassegiéz. Mais quant ilz virent	When those people of Calais who were leaning against the battlements first saw [the French troops] appear on the hill of Sangatte, banners and pennants flying, they felt great joy and were sure that the siege was to be broken. But
2.g	que on se logoit, ilz furent tous	when they saw that they were setting
1.a	courrouciéz et leur sembla ung petit signe.	up camp [instead of attacking the English], they were very angry and decided that it all meant nothing.

King Philip sends a message to Edward III, admitting that he cannot approach the English position and suggesting they meet at some place agreeable to both to do battle (SHF 1–309)

4.c	Le roy d'Angleterre, qui entendit bien ceste parolle, fut tantost conseillé et avisé de respondre et dist: "Seigneurs, j'ay bien entendu ce que vous me requerréz depar mon adversaire, qui tient mon heritage a tort, dont il me poise. Et si lui diréz depar moy que je suis cy en droit et ay demouré pres d'un an. Tout ce a il bien sceu, et y feust venuz plus tost s'il voulsist. Mais il m'a laissé cy si longuement demourer que j'ay despendu grossement du mien. Et y pense avoir tant fait que je seray temprement seigneur de Calais. Si ne suis mie	The king of England, hearing these words, took counsel and then responded accordingly: "Sirs, I understand well that you ask this of me on behalf of my enemy, who holds my inheritance wrongfully, as it seems to me. Tell him from me that I am here by right and have been here almost a year. He knew this quite well, and could have come here sooner if he had wished it. But he has let me stay camped here so long that I have spent a lot of money. And I believe that I shall very soon be the lord of Calais. I do not feel inclined to do anything for his convenience.
3.b.ii	conseillié de faire du tout a sa devise, ne a son aise. Si lui diréz que se il ne ses gens ne peuvent par la passer, si voient autour pour querre la voie."	Tell him that if his people cannot pass, they must seek out another approach."
3.c.i	Les messages du roy de France virent bien qu'ilz n'en porteroient autre chose.	The messengers of the French king saw well that there would be no other reply.
4.b		

Calais has surrendered. Rather than the whole city suffering the wrath of Edward III for the losses he has suffered during the prolonged siege, six representatives of the town have agreed to take the punishment for them all. Sir Walter Manny presents them to the king. (SHF 1–312)

3.a.ii	Le roy se tut tout coy et regarda moult fellement sur ceulx de Calais, pour les grans dommages que ou temps passé sur mer lui avoient fais. Ces six bourgeois se mistrent a genoulx devant le roy...	The King was silent and looked very fiercely at the people from Calais, on account of the great losses that they had inflicted on him at sea in the past. The six burghers fell to their knees before him...
1.a,		
2.a.iii		
3.b.ii		
4.d		<i>They plead for mercy.</i>

- 4.b Certes il n'y ot adonc en la place seigneur, chevalier ne vaillant homme qui se peust abstenir de plourer de grant pitié, ne qui peust en piece parler: et vraiment ce n'estoit point merveille car c'est pitié de veoir hommes de bien cheoir en tel dangier.
- 2.a.ii, 1.a 1.c 3.a.ii 1.a 2.f.vii 4.d, 2.a.v 4.c/d
- Le roy regarda sur eulx moult yreusement, car il avoit le cuer si dur et si espris qu'il ne pouoit parler de grant courroux. Et quant il parla, il commanda que on leur coppast les testes. Tous les barons et chevaliers qui la estoient en priant plouroient si a certes que plus pouoient au roy qu'il en vouldist avoir pitié et merci, mais il n'y vouloit entendre.
- Adonc parla messire Gaultier de Mauny et dist ainsi: "Ha, gentil sires, vueilliez refrener vostre courage. Vous avéz le nom de souveraine gentillesce et noblesce: or ne vueilliez doncques chose faire parquoy elle soit amendrie, ne que on peust parler sur vous en nulle villennie. Se vous n'avéz pitié de ces gens toutes, autres gens diront que ce seroit grant cruaulté se vous estes si dur que vous faciéz mourir ces honnestes bourgeois, qui de leur propre volenté se sont mis en vostre merci pour les autres sauver."
- 2.a.i 3.c.i 2.f.vii 3.b.ii 4.d 2.a.v 1.a 3.a.ii 2.a.v 2.c 1.a
- A ce point grigna le roy les dens et dist: "Messire Gaultier, souffrez vous, il ne sera autrement." Mais fist on venir le coppetestes, et dist encores le roy: "Ceulx de Calais ont tant fait mourir de mes gens qu'il convient ceulx mourir." Adonc fist la noble royne d'Angleterre grant humilité, qui estoit durement ençainte, et plouroit si tendrement de pitié que on ne la pouoit soustenir. Elle se getta a genoulx devant le roy son seigneur, et dist ainsi: "Ha gentil sires, puisque je rapassay la mer en grant peril comme vous sçavéz, je ne vous ay riens requis ne don demandé. Or vous requier je humblement et prie en propre don que pour le filz Sainte Marie et pour l'amour de moy, vous vueilliez avoir mercy de ces six bourgeois."
- Le roy attendit ung petit a parler et regarda la bonne dame sa femme, qui moult estoit ençainte et plouroit a genoulx tendrement. Et ce lui amolia le cuer, car envis l'eust courrouciee ou point ou elle estoit.
- Indeed, every lord, knight, and warrior who was there wept for pity and could not speak: and indeed it was no wonder because it was a great pity to see good men in such danger.
- The king looked on the burghers very angrily, for his heart at that moment was so hardened and so inflamed that he could not reply through his anger. And when he spoke, he ordered that their heads be cut off at once. All the lords and knights, weeping, earnestly begged him to have mercy, but he refused to listen.
- Then Sir Walter Manny spoke up: "Ah, noble sire, rein in your heart. You are known for sovereign gentillesse and noblesse: do not now do anything that will mar it, or to associate your name with villainy. If you will not have pity on these men, people will call it a great cruelty and will say that you a hard man to put such honest burghers to death, when they have willingly put themselves at your mercy to save others."
- At this the king ground his teeth, and said, "Sir Walter, you must bear it, for so it shall be." And he sent for the executioner, and said, "The people of Calais have caused the deaths of so many of my people that it is right that they should die."
- At that the noble queen of England humbled herself greatly, pregnant as she was, and weeping so tenderly in pity that nobody could remain unmoved. She threw herself to her knees before the king her lord and said: "Ah, my noble lord! Since I crossed the sea in great peril, as you know, I have asked for nothing. But now I pray and implore you with clasped hands, for the love of Our Lady's son and by your love for me, have mercy on these six burghers."
- The king fell silent for a moment and he looked on the good lady his wife, who was heavily pregnant and wept tenderly on her knees. His heart began to soften a little, for he did not wish to anger/distress her in her current state.

Si dist: “Ha dame, je amasse mieulx que vous feussiez autre part que cy. Vous me priéz si a certes que je ne vous ose escondire. Et combien qu’il se face envis depar moy, tenéz, je les vous donne. Si en faites vostre plaisir.”

La bonne dame dist: “Monseigneur, tres grans mercis.” Lors se leva la royne et fist lever ces six bourgeois, et leur fist oster leurs chevestres d’entours leurs colz et les emmena avecques elle en sa chambre, et les fist revestir et donner a disner tout aise, et puis donna a chascun six nobles et les fist conduire hors de l’ost a sauveté.

He said: “Ah, lady, I wish very much that you were anywhere else. You pray to me so that I can not help but heed you.

Though I do it against my will, I will give them to you. Take them and do with them as you please.”

The good lady said: “My lord, very great thanks.” She rose and had the burghers ride, and had the halters taken from their necks and had them led into her chambers, where they were dressed in new clothes and given an easy dinner.

Then she gave to each of them six nobles, and had them conducted through the army to safety.

Battle of Poitiers: Edward the Black Prince sees the body of Robert of Duras lying in the field and orders it to be carried to the man’s uncle, the Cardinal of Périgord, “with my compliments” (SHF 1–386).

- 3.b.ii Or vous diray qui mut le prince a ce faire. Les aucuns pourroient dire qu’il le fist par maniere de derision. On avoit ja informé le prince que les gens du cardinal estoient demouréz sur les
- 2.f champs et arméz contre lui, ce qu’il
- 2.g n’estoit mie appartenant ne droit fait d’armes; car gens d’église qui pour traittié de paix traveillent de l’un a l’autre ne se doivent point armer ne pour l’un ne pour l’autre. Et pour tant que ceulx l’avoient fait, estoit le prince courroucié sur le dit cardinal.
- 1.a, 2.g Et lui envoya vraiment son nepveu
- 2.vii monseigneur Robert de Duras, et vouloit au chastelain d’Amposte, qui la fut prins, faire copper la teste et l’eust fait sans faulte en son ayr, pour ce qu’il estoit de la famille du dit cardinal, se
- 4.c n’eust esté monseigneur Jehan Chandos qui le refrena par doulces parolles.

I will tell you now why the prince did this. Some would say that he acted in mockery. But he had been informed that some of the cardinal’s people had stayed on the battlefield to fight against him, which was quite improper according to all the rules of war, because people of the church who travel in peace to act as mediators between sides must not take up arms against one side or the other. It was because these had done so that the Prince was angry at the Cardinal.

And indeed he sent to him [the corpse of] his nephew Robert de Duras, and wanted to behead the Castellan of Amposta whom he had captured. And certainly he would have done so in his anger, because he was a member of the cardinal’s household, if Sir John Chandos had not restrained him with soft words.

Note: Here, as in some places elsewhere, Froissart provides the list of grievances in the narrative voice, rather than having the character recite them himself.

The Jacquerie (SHF 1–413).

	Car aucunes gens de villes champestres sans chief s'assemblerent en Beauvoisin et ne furent mie cent hommes les premiers. Et distrent que tous les nobles du royaume de France, chevalliers et escuiers honnissoient le royaume et que ce feroit grant bien qui tous les destruiroit. Et chascun dist: "Il dit voir.	Certain country people gathered without any leader in the Beauvais region, not more than a hundred of them at first. They said that all the nobles of the realm of France, the knights and the squires, were putting the realm to shame, and that it would be a good deed to destroy them all. And every one of them said: "That's the truth! Shame upon anybody who doesn't agree that the gentry should be destroyed."
3.b.ii	Honnis soit il par qui il demourra que tous les gentilzhommes ne soient destruis."	
3.d.i	Lors se recueillirent et s'en alerent sans autre conseil et sans nulle armeure fors que de bastons et de cousteaulx en la maison d'un chevalier qui pres de la demouroit, et briserent et tuerent le chevalier, la dame et leurs enfans grans et petis, et ardirent la maison.	They gathered together and set off, without any more counsel and armed only with cudgels and knives, to the house of a knight who lived nearby. And they broke and killed the knight, the lady, and their children, both large and small, and burned the house.
4.c	Secondement ilz alerent en ung autre fort chastel et firent pis asséz, car ilz pristrent le chevalier et le lierent a une estache et violerent sa femme et ses filles, voiant le chevalier, et puis tuerent la dame, qui estoit ençainte, et ses filles et ses enfans et le chevalier a grant martire. Et ardirent et abatirent le chastel.	Next they went to another strong castle and did even worse, because they took the knight and tied him to a stake and violated his wife and daughters before his eyes, then they killed the lady, who was pregnant, and the daughters and children and the knight, with great cruelty. And they burned and razed the castle.
2.f.v		
2.f.vi		
2.f.i		
2.f.vi		
2.f.vii		
2.f.viii		
2.f.i		
2.f.i		
	<i>They do the same things in many other places...</i>	
2.f.i	... Et roboient et ardoient tout telz manieres de gens, et occioient tous gentilzhommes et efforçoient et violioient toutes dames et pucelles comme chiens enragiez.	... And these men plundered and burned everything, killing all the nobles and raped and violated all the ladies and girls, like mad dogs.
2.f.vii		
5.c.v		

Note: This is not a petition, a request that grievances be addressed. If anything it resembles a subverted (perverted?) scene of feudal anger. The people gather to form a "court" (but one without a leader), there is a recital of grievances, a "war" is planned, everybody agrees, and they undertake it. But, as at the court of Scotland in Jordan Fantosme's chronicle (laisses 33–34, see above), the decision to go to war is provoked by an outburst of shaming speech in the onlookers, not by reasoned counsel, and the shared feelings are those of a group, not of a single leader. Froissart emphasises the lack of leadership and the lack of counsel—and, curiously enough, never says that they are *angry*. Although there are anger scripts and signs in play, Froissart does not credit them with any emotion that might explain their atrocious actions: the impression is that they do what they do for love of it, or because it is in their nature. This is othering anger, so very "other" that it seems incomprehensible and cannot be given the same name as the feelings that motivate his princes and knights.

Sack of Limoges (SHF 1–663 and 1–666).

	Quant les nouvelles vindrent au prince de Galles que la cité de Limoges estoit tournee françoise et que l'evesque du dit lieu, qui estoit son compere et en qui il avoit eu du temps passé grant fiance, avoit esté a tous les traittiéz et l'avoit	When news reached the Prince of Wales that Limoges had gone over to the French and that the Bishop of the place, who was the godfather of one of his children and in whom he had always placed the greatest trust, had been
3.b.ii		
2.g		

- | | | |
|-------|--|--|
| 1.a | aidié a rendre, si en fut durement courrouciéz, et en tint moins de bien et moins de compte des gens d'eglise, ou il adjoustoit au devant grant foy. Si jura l'ame de son pere, que oncques ne parjura, que il ne tendroit jamaiz a aultre chose si la raroit et auroit fait aux trahistres comparer le fait chierement... | concerned in all the negotiations and had been a party to the surrender, he was furiously angry, and lost much of his esteem for churchmen, in whom he had previously had great faith. He swore on the soul of his father—an oath which he never broke—that he would attend to no other business until he had won the city back and had made the traitors pay dearly for their disloyalty... |
| 3.c.i | | |

Limoges is taken (SHF 1–666).

- | | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| 1.a | Et la ot grant pitié, car hommes et | There were scenes of great pity, for men |
| 2.f.i/vii | femmes et enfans se gettoient a genoulz | and women and children flung |
| 4.d | devant le prince et crioient: "Merci, | themselves to their knees in front of the |
| 5.a | gentilz sires!" Mais il estoit enflamméz | prince and cried: Mercy, gentle sirs! But |
| | de ardeur que point n'y entendoit, ne | he was so inflamed with ardour that he |
| | nul ne nulle n'estoit ouy, maiz tout mis a | could not listen, nor would he heed any |
| | l'espee quanque on trouvoit et en | of them, but put all he could find to the |
| | controit, ceulx et celles qui point | sword, though they were not to blame. |
| | coupables n'en estoient. Je ne sçay | I do not know how they could have not |
| | comment ilz n'avoient pitié des povres | taken pity on those poor people who |
| | gens qui n'estoient mie tailliéz de fai re | were not important enough to have |
| | trahison: mais ceulx le comperioient et | committed treason, but they paid for it |
| 2.f.i | compererent plus que les grans | more dearly than did their great |
| | maistres qui l'avoient fait. | masters. |
| 1.c | Il n'est si dur cuer que s'il feust adont en | There is no heart so hard that, had it |
| | la cité de Limoges et il lui souvenir de | been in the city of Limoges and |
| 2.a.v | Dieu qui n'en plourast tendrement du | remembered God, it would not have |
| | grant meschief qui y estoit. Car plus de | wept tenderly at the great mischief that |
| | IIIM personnes, hommes, femmes et | there was. For more than 3000 people, |
| 2.f.vii | enfans y furent decolléz et occis celle | men and women and children, were |
| | journee. Dieu en ait les ames, car ilz | beheaded and killed that day. May God |
| | furent bien martiriéz. | help their souls, for they were truly |
| | En entrant en la ville, une route | martyrs. When they entered the city, |
| | d'Anglois s'en alerent devers le palais de | some of the English went toward the |
| 2.f.viii | l'evesque. Si fut la trouvéz et pris aux | Bishop's palace. He was discovered and |
| | mains et admenéz sans conroy et | taken in hand and led with no dignities |
| 2.a.iii | ordonnance devant le prince, qui le | before the prince, who looked at him |
| 1.a | regarda felonusement, et la plus belle | angrily. The kindest word he could say |
| 3.a.ii | parole qui lui sceut dire ce fut qui lui | to him was that they should strike off his |
| 2.f.vii | feroit trancher la teste par la foy qu'il | head, by God and St George, and he had |
| 2.g | devoit a Dieu et a saint George, et le fist | them take him out of his presence. |
| | oster de sa presence. | |

Note: The sack of Limoges is motivated by anger against the Bishop, and the violence done to the city and its inhabitants therefore counts, from the Prince's point of view, as 2.f.i: destruction of the enemy's possessions or lands (an attack on his social body). However, Froissart rejects that and foregrounds 2.f.vii: killing or seriously wounding somebody. He keeps the physical bodies of the townspeople firmly in view, encourages the reader to feel pity for them, and mourns the fact that they are paying more dearly than their masters.

*The son of the Count of Foix has been staying with his uncle, the King of Navarre,
with whom his mother is staying. Before he returned to his father
his uncle took him aside and gave him a purse of powder,*

*telling him to find some opportunity to slip it into his father's food,
saying that it would make him fall in love with his wife again and take her back.
The Count hears just enough of this to suspect that his son is in on the conspiracy,
and one night at dinner, he sees the purse. (SHF 3–21)*

1.b / 2.b	... le conte giette ses yeux, qui estoit tout enfourné de son fait, et voit les pendans de la bourse au gipon de son filz. Le sanc li mua, et dist: "Gaston, vieng avant, je vueil parler a toy en l'oreille." Li enfant s'avança sur la table. Le conte ouvri lors son seing et desnoulla son gipon et prinst un coustel et coppa les pendans de la bourse, et li demoura en la main. Et puis dist a son filz: "Quele chose est ce en ceste bourse?"	The count looked that way at him and saw the strings of the purse hanging around the neck of his son. His blood trembled, and he said: "Gaston, come here. I want to say something in your ear." The child came up to the table. At once the count opened his vest and uncovered his tunic and took a knife and cut the strings of the purse, and took it in his hand. And he said to his son, "What is in this purse?"
3.a.ii 2.a.ii	Li enfes, qui fu tout surprins et esbahis, ne sonna mot, mais devint tout blanc de paour et tout esperdus, et commença fort a trembler, car il se sentoit forfait.	The child, all startled and confused, made no sound, but went completely white with fear and quite distraught, and he began to tremble hard, because he was sure that he was lost. The Count of Foix opened the purse and took some of the powder and put it on a trencher of bread, then whistled to a nearby hound and gave it the bread to eat. As soon as the dog took a bite it rolled over and died.
2.b	Le conte de Foix ouvri la bourse et prinst de la poudre et en mist sur un tailloer de pain, et puis cyfla un levrier que il avoit deléz lui, et lui donna a mengier. Sitost que le chien ot mengié le premier morsel, il tourna les piéz dessus et mourut.	When the Count of Foix saw this he became furious, and no wonder. He rose from the table and took up his knife and tried to stab his son. And he would have killed him without remedy, but the knights and squires leapt forward and said, "My lord, by God's mercy don't act hastily! Find out more about the matter before you do any harm to your son."
5.c.v	Quant le conte de Foix en vit la maniere, se il fu courrouciéz il y ot bien cause; et se leva de table et prinst son coustel et vout lancer après son filz. Et l'eust la occis sans remede, mais chevaliers et escuiers saillirent audevant et distrent: "Monseigneur, pour Dieu mercis ne vous hastéz pas, mais vous enforméz avant de la besoigne, que vous faciéz a vostre filz nul mal."	And the first thing that the count said, which was in his native Gascon: "Ha, Gaston, traitor! For your sake and to increase your inheritance I have had war and hatred with the kings of France, England, Spain, Navarre, and Aragon, and I have held out against them. And now you want to murder me! It comes to you from some evil nature: you will die by this stroke."
1.a 2.c.ii 2.f.v, 2.f.vi 2.f.vii 4.c	Et le premier mot que le conte dist, ce fu en son gascon: "Zo, Gaston, traïtour! Pour toy et pour accroistre l'eritaige qui te devoit retourner, j'en ay eu guerre et hayne au roy de France, au roy d'Angleterre, au roy d'Espaigne, au roy de Navarre et au roy d'Arragon; et contre eulx me sui je bien tenu et porté. Et tu me veulz maintenant murdrir! Il te vient de mauvaise nature; saches que tu en mourras a ce coup."	He leapt across the table, knife in hand, trying to kill him, but the knights and squires flung themselves on their knees weeping before him and cried, "Ah, my lord, mercy, for God's sake! Do not kill Gaston, you have no other children. Put him under guard and find out about the affair. There is hope that he did not know what he was carrying and has no
3.a.ii 3.b.ii	Et le premier mot que le conte dist, ce fu en son gascon: "Zo, Gaston, traïtour! Pour toy et pour accroistre l'eritaige qui te devoit retourner, j'en ay eu guerre et hayne au roy de France, au roy d'Angleterre, au roy d'Espaigne, au roy de Navarre et au roy d'Arragon; et contre eulx me sui je bien tenu et porté.	And the first thing that the count said, which was in his native Gascon: "Ha, Gaston, traitor! For your sake and to increase your inheritance I have had war and hatred with the kings of France, England, Spain, Navarre, and Aragon, and I have held out against them. And now you want to murder me! It comes to you from some evil nature: you will die by this stroke."
3.a.i	Et tu me veulz maintenant murdrir! Il te vient de mauvaise nature; saches que tu en mourras a ce coup."	He leapt across the table, knife in hand, trying to kill him, but the knights and squires flung themselves on their knees weeping before him and cried, "Ah, my lord, mercy, for God's sake! Do not kill Gaston, you have no other children. Put him under guard and find out about the affair. There is hope that he did not know what he was carrying and has no
2.c.i 2.f.v–vii	Lors sailli oultre la table, le coustel en la main, et le vouloit la occirre, mais chevaliers et escuiers se mistrent a genoulz en pleurant devant lui, et lui distrent: "Haa! Monseigneur, pour Dieu merci! N'occiéz pas Gaston, vous n'avéz plus d'enfans: faictes le garder, et vous informéz de la matiere. Espoir ne savoit	He leapt across the table, knife in hand, trying to kill him, but the knights and squires flung themselves on their knees weeping before him and cried, "Ah, my lord, mercy, for God's sake! Do not kill Gaston, you have no other children. Put him under guard and find out about the affair. There is hope that he did not know what he was carrying and has no
2.a.v	distrent: "Haa! Monseigneur, pour Dieu merci! N'occiéz pas Gaston, vous n'avéz plus d'enfans: faictes le garder, et vous informéz de la matiere. Espoir ne savoit	He leapt across the table, knife in hand, trying to kill him, but the knights and squires flung themselves on their knees weeping before him and cried, "Ah, my lord, mercy, for God's sake! Do not kill Gaston, you have no other children. Put him under guard and find out about the affair. There is hope that he did not know what he was carrying and has no
4.d	distrent: "Haa! Monseigneur, pour Dieu merci! N'occiéz pas Gaston, vous n'avéz plus d'enfans: faictes le garder, et vous informéz de la matiere. Espoir ne savoit	He leapt across the table, knife in hand, trying to kill him, but the knights and squires flung themselves on their knees weeping before him and cried, "Ah, my lord, mercy, for God's sake! Do not kill Gaston, you have no other children. Put him under guard and find out about the affair. There is hope that he did not know what he was carrying and has no

2.g	il que il portoit, et n'a nulle coulpe a ce meffait."	fault in this evil." "Then at once," said the
2.f.viii	"Or tost," dist le conte, "mettéz le en la tour, et soit telement gardéz que on m'en rende compte."	count, "put him in the tower, and let him be guarded in such a manner that the guards will be accountable to me."
<i>The Count of Foix hears that his son has died in prison.</i>		
1.a	Adonc fu le conte de Foix courrouciéz	At that the Count of Foix became
1.d	oultre mesure, et regreta son filz trop grandement. Et dist: 'Haa! Gaston! com povre aventure ci a. A mal heure pour toy ne pour moy alas onques en Navarre veoir ta mere. Jamais je n'auray si parfaite joye comme je avoie devant.'	<i>courrouciez</i> beyond measure, grieving very/too deeply for his son. And he said: "Ah, Gaston! what a terrible business this is. Alas, it was an unhappy day for both of us that ever we went into Navarre to see your mother. I shall never know any perfect happiness again such as I have known before."
2.e	Lors fist il venir son berbier et se fist rere tout jus, et se mist moult bas et se vesti de noir, et tous ceulx de son hostel.	He summoned his barber and had his head completely shaved, and he humbled himself and dressed all in black, and did the same to all of his household. And the child's body was carried with tears and cries to the Franciscans at Orthez, and buried there.
2.a.v	Et fu le corps de l'enfant portéz en pleurs et en cris aux Freres Meneurs a Ortais, et la fu ensepulturéz.	

Note: Note that the child and the father both have a moment of speechlessness: the child's, however, is caused by fear, not anger. The Count's is more interesting: "the first thing he said was..." already suggests a moment of furious speechlessness (see similar constructions above in SHF 1-666 and 1-312), and his lapse into Gascon rather than "good French" is an interesting variant form of inarticulate rage.

Walter of Guisborough's chronicle

Written c. 1290-1305, covering the period from the Norman conquest, with a few additions to 1312. Text from Rothwell's edition, translation mine.

Robert Bruce has sent for John Comyn of Badenoch, meaning to kill him under the guise of negotiations (366).

2.g	Qui nichil mali suspicans venit ad eum cum paucis et mutuo se receperunt in osculum sed non pacis in clauastro fratrum minorum.	[Comyn] came to him suspecting no evil, and with few followers. They received each other in the cloisters of the Franciscans with a kiss, though not of peace.
3.a.i	Cumque mutuo loquerentur ad inuicem	And when they were speaking together
2.a, 3	verbis vt videbatur pacificis statim	to each other words of seeming peace,
3.b.ii	conuertens faciem et verba peruertens cepit impropere ei de sedicione sua quod eum accusauerat apud regem Anglie et suam condicionem deteriorauerat in dampnum ipsius.	suddenly [Bruce], changing his face and twisting his words, began to upbraid [Comyn] with having accused him of sedition to the King of England, damaging his cause to his destruction.
2.f.vi	Qui cum pacifice loqueretur et excusaret se noluit exaudire sermonem eius sed vt conspirauerat percussit eum pede et	And when he no longer wanted to speak peacefully and heed his words but to
2.f.vii	gladio et retrorsum abiit.	

- | | | |
|---------|---|---|
| 4.a | At sui extunc insequentes eum | conspire, he struck [Comyn] with foot |
| 2.f.vii | prostrauerunt eum in pauimento altaris
pro mortuo dimittentes. | and sword and went away.
And his men following him out knocked
[Comyn] down on the altar pavement
and left him for dead. |

Prince Edward sends Bishop Walter Langton to Edward I to plead on his behalf (382–83).

Langton says to the king:

- | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| 1.a,
3.a.i
3.c.i | <p>“Domine mi rex, ex parte domini mei domini principis filii vestri missus sum, licet inuitus, vivit dominus, vt ipsius nomine petam a vobis quod bakelarium suum dominum Petrum de Cauerton possit promouere de licencia vestra ad comitatum de Pontyff.”</p> <p>Et iratus rex nimis ait, “Quis es tu qui talia audes postulare? Viuit dominus, nisi esset timor domini et quod ab inicio dixisti quod inuitus suscepisti negocium, non euaderes manus meas. Nunc autem videbo quid dicturus erit qui misit te, et non recedas.”</p> | <p>“My lord king, I come on behalf of my lord the prince your son, who has sent me here (though against my will, as the Lord lives) to entreat in his name that you promote his bachelor Sir Piers Gaveston by your gift to Count of Ponthieu.”</p> <p>Furious, the king said, “Who are you that you dare make such a bold demand? As the Lord lives, if not for fear of the Lord and because you said at the beginning that you undertook this business unwillingly, you would not escape my hands. Now, however, I will see what he who sent you has to say—and you shall not go away.”</p> |
| 2.d.i | <p>Quo vocato dixit ei rex, “Quid negotii misisti per hominem istum?” Qui ait, “Vt cum pace vestra dare possem domino Petro de Cauerton comitatum de Pontyff.”</p> <p>Et ait rex, “Fili meretricis male generate, vis tu modo terras dare qui nuncquam aliquas impetrasti? Viuit dominus, nisi esset timor dispersionis regni nuncquam gauderes hereditate tua.” Et apprehensis capillis vtraque manu dilacerant eos in quantum potuit et in fine lassus eiecit eum.</p> | <p>When [the prince] had been called, the king said to him, “On what business did you send this man?” He said, “That with your blessing I might give the county of Ponthieu to Sir Piers Gaveston.”</p> <p>And the king said, “You ill-born son of a whore, do you want to give away lands now, you who never won any? As the Lord lives, if it were not for fear of breaking up the realm you should never enjoy your inheritance.” And seizing his own hair in both hands he tore out as much as he could, and finally, exhausted, threw him out.</p> |

Geoffrey of Monmouth’s chronicle

Written c. 1135–39, covering the period from Brutus’ conquest of England to the death of Cadwallader (CE 689). Originator of the *Brut* tradition. Facing-page text and translation from Reeve and Wright’s edition. Even numbers are Latin, odd numbers are English.

Uther and Igera (184–85).

4.a	Aduenerant namque tot nobiles cum coniugibus et filiabus suis, laeto conuiuio digni. Aderat inter ceteros Gorlois dux Cornubiae cum Igera coniuge sua, cuius pulcritudo mulieres tocus Britanniae superabat. Cumque inter alias inspexisset eam rex, subito incaluit amore illius ita ut	As befitted a joyous banquet, many nobles attended with their wives and daughters. Among them was the duke of Cornwall, Gorlois, with his wife Igera, the most beautiful woman in Britain. As soon as the king saw her among the rest, he suddenly burned with love for her and had eyes only for her, neglecting the others.
1.a	postpositis ceteris totam intentionem suam circa eam uerteret.	
4.a	Haec sola erat cui fercula incessanter dirigebat, cui aurea pocula familiaribus internuntiis mittebat. Arridebat ei multociens et iocosa uerba interserebat. Quod cum comperisset maritus	To her alone he constantly presented dishes, to her alone he directed goblets of gold with friendly messages. He kept on smiling and joking with her. Her husband noticed and angrily
2.g	confestim iratus ex curia sine licentia recessit. Non affuit qui eum reuocare quiuisset, cum id solum amittere timeret quod super omnia diligebat. Iratus itaque	stormed out of court without permission. No one could call him back, since he feared to lose the thing he valued above all else.
1.a	praecepit ei redire in curiam suam ut de illata iniuria rectitudinem ab eo sumeret.	Uther angrily commanded him to return to court, intending to punish him for the slight he had inflicted.
2.g.ii	Cui cum parere diffugisset Gorlois,	
1.a	admodum indignatus est iurauitque	When Gorlois refused, Uther was
3.c.i	iureiurando se uastaturum nationem	enraged and swore to ravage his province if he did not comply immediately.
2.f.i	ipsius nisi ad satisfactionem festinasset.	
1.a	Nec mora, manente praedicta ira inter eos collegit rex exercitum magnum	When neither's fury abated, the king gathered a large army, marched to Cornwall and set about burning its cities and towns.
2.f.i	petiuitque prouinciam Cornubiae atque ignem in urbes et oppida accumulauit. At Gorlois non ausus est congredi cum eo, quia eius minor erat armatorum copia; unde praelegit munire oppida sua donec auxilium ab Hibernia impetrasset. Et cum magis pro uxore sua quam pro semet ipso anxietur, posuit eam in oppido Tintagol in littore maris, quod pro tuciori refugio habebat; ipse uero ingressus est castellum Dimilioc, ne infortunium superuenisset ambo insimul periclitarentur.	Gorlois did not dare to oppose him, since his forces were outnumbered; so he decided to fortify his strongholds until he could get help from Ireland. Fearing less for himself than for his wife, he placed her in fort of Tintagel, a safe place of refuge on the coast. He himself entered the castle of Dimilioc, so that both of them should not be endangered together in case of a setback.
2.f.i	Cumque id regi nuntiatum fuisset, iuit ad oppidum quo inerat Gorlois et obsedit illud omnemque aditum ipsius praeclusit. Emensa tandem ebdomada, reminiscens amoris Igerae...	When this was reported to the king, he marched on the castle where Gorlois was and besieged it, cutting off all access. After a long week had passed he recalled his passion for Igera...

*Despite his advancing age, Uther stirs himself to defend Britain
from the invading Saxons (188–91).*

1.a	Vastata itaque fere insule, cum id regi nuntiaretur, ultra quam infirmitas expetebat iratus est iussitque cunctos procures conuenire, ut ipsos de superbia et debilitate sua corriperet. Et cum	When the king [Uther] learned that the island had been almost laid waste, more angry than was good for his illness, he ordered all the nobles to meet so that he could rebuke them for their pride and
3.d.i		

- omnes in praesentia sua inspexisset, conuitia cum castigantibus uerbis intulit iurauitque quod ipsemet eos in hostes conduceret. Praecepit itaque fieri sibi feretrum quo asportaretur, cum gressum alterius modi abnegaret infirmitas...
- 3.c.i *The Saxons refuse to fight an enemy who is already half dead and retreat into the city. Uther orders the city besieged, and defeats them. He finds himself suddenly able to rise and sit up on his litter, and he laughs as he speaks:*
- 3.c.ii “Vocabant me ambrones regem semimortuum, quia infirmitate grauatus in feretro iacebam. Sic equidem eram. Malo tamen semimortuus ipsos superare quam sanus et incolumis superari sequenti uita perfuncturus. Praestantius enim est mori cum honore quam cum pudore uiuere”.
- weakness. Seeing them gathered before him, he taunted them with harsh words and swore to lead them against the enemy in person. He had a litter made for himself as he was too ill to travel in any other way...
- “The villains called me a king half-dead, because I lay sick on a litter. And so I was. Yet I prefer conquering them when half-dead to being beaten when hale and hearty, and having to endure a long life thereafter. It is better to die with honour than to live in shame.”

King Arthur rallies his men against the latest Saxon invasion (198–99).

- Quibus Saxones pectora praetendentes omni nisu resistere nituntur. Cumque multum diei in hunc modum praeterisset, indignatus est Arturus ipsis ita successisse nec sibi uictoriam aduenire. Abstracto ergo Caliburnus gladio, nomen sanctae Mariae proclamat et sese cito impetu infra densas hostium acies immisit. Quemcumque attingebat Deum inuocando solo ictu perimebat, nec requieuit impetum suum facere donec quadringentos septuaginta uiros solo Caliburno gladio peremit. Quod uidentes Britones densatis turmis illum sequuntur, stragem undique facientes.
- 1.a
3.b.ii
2.f.v
2.c.i
2.f.vi
2.f.vii
4.a
- The Saxons stood firm, striving to put up the best resistance they could. Much of the day passed like this, until Arthur was angered that their prowess was denying them victory. Unsheathing his sword Caliburnus, he called out the name of St Mary and swiftly hurled himself upon the dense ranks of the enemy. As he called on God, he killed any man he touched with a single blow and pressed forward until with Caliburnus alone he had laid low four hundred and seventy men.
- At this sight, the Britons closed ranks and followed him, spreading slaughter.

Arthur against the Roman army (244–47).

- Ipsa etenim, audita suorum strage, quae paulo ante eisdem dabatur, cum legione irruerat et abstracto Caliburno gladio optimo celsa uoce atque his uerbis commilitones suos inanimabat, inquit: “Quid facitis, uiri? Vt quid muliebres permittis illaesos abire?...”
- 2.c.iii
2.f.v
3.a.i
3.d.i
2.f.vi
2.f.vii
2.f.iv
4.b
5.c.i
- Hearing of the losses the Britons had just suffered, Arthur had rushed up with his legion and, drawing his mighty sword Caliburnus, was urging on his fellow-soldiers, shouting: “What are you doing, men? Why are you letting these women get away unharmed?...”
- With cries such as these, he charged the enemy, bowling them over, cutting down any man who got in his way and killing him or his horse with a single blow. They fled from him like prey before a fierce lion, whose hunger-pangs drive it to devour whatever it can find...

4.a	Viso igitur rege suo in hunc modum decertare, Britones maiorem audatiam capessunt, Romanos unanimiter inuadunt, densata caterua incedunt.	Seeing their king fighting so valiantly, the Britons took heart and all together assaulted the Romans, closing ranks as they advanced.
-----	--	---

Cadwallader's grief (266–67).

1.a	Occupauit continuo Caduallonem tantus dolor et ira ob amissionem sociorum suorum ita ut tribus diebus et noctibus	Thereupon Caduallo was seized by such <i>dolor</i> and anger at the loss of his comrades that he refused to eat and lay
2.e	cibo uesci aspernaretur ac in lecto infirmatus iaceret.	sick in his bed for three days and nights.

Alliterative *Morte Arthure*

Alliterative Middle English poem of the late fourteenth century, focussing primarily on the war of Arthur with the forces of Rome, before returning to England to fall against Mordred.

Text is Edmund Brock's EETS edition, and citations are by line number. Translations are mine.

*The Roman senator demands that Arthur pay tribute to the Emperor
and acknowledge him as liege lord (116–39).*

2.a.iii	The kynge blyschit one the beryne with his brode eghne,	The king looked redly upon the man with his wide eyes,
1.a, 5.a	That fulle brymly for breth brynte as the gledys;	That, very fierce with wrath, burned like hot coals,
2.a.ii	Keste colours as kynge with crouelle	[He] changed colours, as the king, with a
5.a.i,	lates,	pitiless expression,
2.a.i	Luked as a lyone, and on his lyppe bytes!	Looked like a lion, and bites at his lip!
4.b	<i>They cower like curs, and one cries out:</i> "Kynge corounede of kind, curtays and noble,	"Rightfully crowned king, courteous and noble,
4.d	Misdoo no messangere for menske of thi seluynne... We come at his commaundment; haue vs excused."	Harm no messenger, for thy honour's sake!... We came here by [the Emperor's] command—hold us excused!"
3.d.ii	<i>Arthur mocks them with harsh words and calls them cowards.</i>	
4.b	"Sir," sais the senatour, "so Crist mott me helpe,	"Sir," says the senator, "as Christ may help me,
2.a,	The voute of thi visage has woundyde vs	The view of thy visage has wounded us
2.f.vii	alle! Thow arte the lordlyeste lede that euer I one lukyde;	all! Thou art the lordliest man that every I looked upon,
5.c.i	By lukynge, with-owttyne lesse, a lyone the semys!"	By your gaze [or your appearance], I say truly, you seem like a lion!

Arthur recounts earlier events to his knights (265–70).

3.b.ii, 1.a	“Thou sees that the emperour es angerde a lytille;	“Thou seest that the emperor is somewhat angry:
1.a	Yt semes be his sandismene that he es sore greuede;	It seems, by his messengers, that he is sore grieved.
3.d.ii	His senatour has sommonde me, and said what hym lykyde,	His senator has summoned me, and spoken as he pleased,
3.a.i	Hethely in my halle, wyth heyn3ous wordes,	Spited me scornfully with hateful words
3.b.i, 3.a.ii,	In speche disspyszed me, and sparede me lytille;	Spoken aloud in my hall, and spared me but little,
1.a, 1.c	I myght noghte speke for spytte, so my herte trymblyde!”	My heart trembled so that I could not speak for rage!”

Gawain's battle rage (1352–55).

1.a, 3.d.ii	Thane greuyde sir Gawayne at his grett wordes,	Then Sir Gawayn felt <i>gref</i> at his bold words,
2.c.i, 1.c	Graythes to-warde the gome with grucchande herte;	He rushes toward the man with angry heart.
2.f.vii	With hys stelyne brande he strykes of hys heuede,	With his steely sword he strikes off his head,
2.c.iii, 2.f.iv	And sterttes owtte to hys stede, and with his stale wendes!	Then darts to [the other knight's] horse, and makes off with his booty!

The Emperor of Rome hears of Arthur's victories against his men (1957–72).

1.a, 1.c	Than the emperour irus was at his herte...	Then the emperor was angry in his heart...
1.c, 3.b.i	“My herte sothely es sette, assente 3if 3ow lykes,	“My heart truly is set—agree, if this pleases you—
3.c.i	To seke in-to Sexone, with my sekyre knyghttez,	To quest forth into Saxony, with my trusted knights,
	To fyghte with my foo-mene, if fortune me happene,	To fight with my foe-men, should Fortune permit
	3if I may fynde the freke with-in the foure haluez;	That I may find the man within the four hallows,
	Or entire in-to Awguste awnters to seke, And byde with my balde mene with-in the burghe ryche;	Or enter Aosta to seek adventures, And abide there with my bold men within that rich city:
	Riste vs and reuelle, and ryotte oure selfene,	Rest there in revel and riot,
	Lende thare in delytte in lordechippez ynewe,	Linger there in delight, in full power,
	To sir Leo be comene with alle his lele knyghtez,	Until Sir Leo should arrive with all his loyal knights,
	With lordez of Lumberdye, to lette hyme the wayes.”	With the lords of Lombardy, to bar [Arthur's] way.”

Note: This is the script of feudal anger, but subverted. The emperor gives a formal statement of anger and war (3.b.i), leading into a vow of war (3.c.i). However, instead of listing the specific military victories he intends against his enemy, the emperor talks of the riot and revel he will enjoy during the campaign.

Gawain fights a Roman knight (2557–80)

1.a	Thane sir Gawayne was greuede, and grychgide fulle sore;	Then Sir Gawain was <i>greved</i> , and, full of resentment,
2.f.v	With Galuthe his gude swerde grymlye he strykes!	With his good sword Galuthe he strikes fiercely!
2.f.vi, 2.f.iv	Clefe the knyghttes schelde clenliche in sondre!	Clove the knight's shield cleanly asunder!
2.f.vii	Who lokes to the leftte syde, whene his horse launches, With the lyghte of the sonne men myghte see his lyuere!	If one were to look at [the knight's] left side, when his horse lunges, By the light of the sun men might see his liver!
1.a	Thane granes the gome fore greefe of his wondys,	Then the man groans for the <i>gref</i> of his wounds,
2.f.v	And gyrdrus at sir Gawayne, as he by glentis;	And he strikes at Gawain as he dashes by,
2.f.vi	And awkewarde egerly sore he hym smyttes...	And with a sharp backhand stroke he strikes him sorely...
2.f.iv	<i>He cuts through ornate layers and wounds Gawain...</i>	
2.f.vii	With the venymous swerde a vayne has he towchede!	With the venomous sword he has struck a vein!
1.d	That voydes so violently that alle his witte changede!	Which empties so violently that all [Gawain's] <i>wit</i> changed [<i>i. e., he felt suddenly faint</i>]
2.f.iv	The vesere, the aventaille, his vesturis ryche,	His visor, his neck piece, his rich garments,
5.b	With the valyant blode was verrede alle ouer!	Were bespattered over with the valiant blood!
2.c.iii	Thane this tyrante tite turnes the brydille,	Then this tyrant quickly turns his bridle,
3.c	Talkes vn-tendirly, and sais, "thow art towchede!	Talks untenderly, and says, "Thou art touched!
2.a.ii	Vs bus haue a blode-bande, or thi ble change, ffor alle the barbouris of Bretayne salle noghte thy stawnche! ffor he that es blemeste with this brade brande, blyne schalle he neuer."	We shall need a bandage before thy colour changes, For all the barbers of Brittany shall not [be able to] staunch thee! For he who is wounded with this broad blade shall never cease [to bleed]."
3.d.ii	"3a," quod sir Gawayne, "thow greues me bot lyttile! Thow wenys to gloyne me with thy gret wordez!"	"Ya!" sir Sir Gawain, "thou <i>grevest</i> me but lightly! Thou thinkest to frighten me with thy great words!"

Mordred is wounded in battle (4213–19).

1.a, 2.a.ii	The beryne blenkes for bale, and alle his ble chaunges,	The man blanches in pain, and all his colour changes,
5.c.ii	Bot 3itt he byddys as a bore, and brymly he strykes!	But yet he rallies like a boar, and boldly he strikes!
2.f.v	He braydes owte a brande bryghte als euer ony syluer, That was sir Arthure awene, and Vtere his fadirs,	He lashes out a blade bright as any silver, Which had been Sir Arthur's own, and Uther's his father,

	In the wardrop of Walyngfordhe was wonte to be kepede;	Which was wont to be kept in the treasury at Wallingford;
2.f.vi	Thare-with the derfe dogge syche dynttes he rechede,	With that the wicked dog deals such blows,
4.b	The tother with-drewe one dreghe and durste do none other.	That the other withdrew to a safe distance and dared do no more.

Raoul de Cambrai

12–13C *chanson de geste*. Text and translation by Sarah Kay.

*The king refuses to give Raoul his father's land, as he gifted it to another knight
while Raoul was in his minority (laisses 32–33; vv. 466–534).*

4.c	Guerri parole o le grenon flori. 'Par ma foi, sire, ne vos en iert menti, molt longement vos a mes niés servi. Rien ne li donne[n]t, se sachiés, si ami qant son service ne li avez meri. Rendez li viax l'onnor de Cambrizi, toute la terre Taillefer le hardi.' 'Je nel puis faire,' li rois li respondi...	Guerri speaks, with his snow-white whiskers: 'By my faith, my lord, I tell you truly, my nephew has served you for a very long time. His friends will give him nothing so long as you fail to reward his service. At least restore to him the Cambresis, all bold Taillefer's estate.' 'I am unable to do so,' the king answered him...
2.c.iii	[478] Et dit li sors, 'mal en sommes bailli. Ce chaleng je, par le cors Saint Geri!'	[478] 'This is shameful treatment', said [Guerri] the Red. 'By the body of St Géri. I contest it!' He went quickly out of the room and entered the ancient hall in anger. Raoul is playing chess like a man who meant no harm: Guerri sees him and seizes him by the ann, tearing his fur mantle.
1.a	Isnelement fors de la chambre issi; par maltalant vint el palais anti. As eschés joue R[aous] de Camhrizis si con li hom qi mal n'i entendi: G[ueris] le voit, par le bras le saisi,	
2.f.iv	son peliçon li desront et parti.	
3.c.i	'Fil a putain,' le clama—si menti— 'malvais lechieres, por quoi joes tu ci? N'as tant de terre, par verté le te di, ou tu peüses conreer un ro[n]ci.'	'Son of a whore', he called him—quite without foundation—'cowardly brute, why are you here playing games? I tell you truly, you haven't enough land to rub down an old nag on!'
2.c.ii	[490] R[aous] l'oï, desor ces piés sailli—	[490] Raoul heard him; leaping to his feet, he speaks so loudly that the great hall shakes and many noble men all down the hall could hear him: 'Who is taking it from me? I think him very foolhardy!' Guerri replies: 'I'll tell you now: it's the king himself—how he must regard you as disgraced!—who should be upholding and protecting us.' Hearing this, Raoul's blood boiled. Two knights brought up at his father's court heard the uproar and shouting; [500] they were all set to help him; and Bernier is waiting on them, holding out a drinking cup. They all hastened into the king's presence. He did
3.a.i	si haut parole qe li palais fremit, qe par la sale l'a mains frans hon oï. 'Qi la me tout? trop le taing a hardi!' G[ueris] respont, 'Ja te sera gehi:	
3.b.ii	li rois meïsmes—bien te tient a honi— dont devons estre tensé et garanti.'	
1.b,	R[aous] l'oï, toz li sans li fremit.	
2.b	Dui chevalier qe ces peres norri	
4.a	en entendirent et la noise et le cri— [500] de lui aidier furent amanevi; et B[erniers] sert qi le henap [t]endi.	
2.c.iii	Devant le roi vienent cil aati.	

Cele parole pas a pié ne chaï.
R[aous] parole, dejoste lui G[ueris].

Laisse 33, v. 505

- 1.a Raous parole qi ot grant maltalent.
3.b.ii- 'Drois empereres, par le cors Saint
iii Amant,
servi vos ai par mes armes portant;
ne m'en donnastes le montant d'un
bezant.
Viax de ma terre car me rendez le gant,
[510] si com la tint mes pere[s] au cors
vaillant.'
'Je nel puis faire,' li rois respont atant.
'Je l'ai donnee au Mancel combatant.
Ne li tolroie por l'onnor de Melant.'
3.a.i G[ueris] l'oi si se va escriant:
'Ainz combatroie armez sor l'auferrant
vers Giboin le Mancel souduiant!'
3.d.i R[aoul] clama malvais et recreant.
'Par cel apostre qe qiere[n]t penaant,
s'or ne saisis ta terre maintenant,
[520] hui ou demain ains le soleil
couchant,
je ne mi home ne t'ierent mais aidant.'
C'est la parole ou R[aous] ce tint tant,
dont maint baron furent puis mort
sanglant.
'Drois emperere, ge vos di tot avant,
l'onnor del pere, ce sevent li auquant,
doit tot par droit revenir a l'esfant.
3.b.ii Des iceste eure, par le cors Saint Amant,
3.d.i me blasmeroient li petit et li grant
se je plus vois ma honte conquerant
[530] qe de ma terre voie autre home
tenant.
Mais par celui qui fist le firmamant,
se mais i truis le Mancel souduiant,
de mort novele l'aseür a mon brant!'
Oit le li rois, si se va enbronchant.

not fall at his feet. Raoul speaks with
Guerri beside him.

In a towering rage, Raoul addresses him.
'By St Amant, rightful emperor, I have
served you at arms; you never gave me
so much as a bezant for it. At least
restore my land to me, pledged with your
glove, [510] just as my valiant father held
it.'

'I cannot do so,' the king replies at once. 'I
have given it to the warrior Giboin. Not
for the wealth of Milan would I take it
from him.' Hearing this, Guerri bursts
out: 'I would sooner fight that villainous
Mansel, armed and on horseback!' He
called Raoul a coward and a break-faith.
'By the apostle whom penitent pilgrims
seek, if you do not seize your land at
once, [520] today or tomorrow before
sunset, neither I nor my vassals will help
you ever again.'

This is the speech that Raoul was to
stand by so unshakeably that many
barons later died bloody deaths:
'Rightful emperor, I tell you straight out,
everybody knows that a father's fief
ought in all justice to pass to his son.
From now on, by St Amant, small and
mighty would reproach me if I court
further disgrace [530] by countenancing
another man holding my land.
But by him who made the firmament, if
ever I catch that villainous Mansel, I
guarantee him an early death on the
point of my sword.'
Hearing this, the king bows his head.

*In lieu of his father's lands, the king has promised Raoul the gift of certain lands
when their current incumbent should die.*

When this happens, he goes to the king to ask for this promise to be carried out.

The king refuses. (Laisse 40, vv. 682–85.)

- 1.d R[aous] l'entent, les cens qide derver.
3.d.i/ii Escharnis est, ne seit mais qe penser.
1.a Par maltalent s'en commence a torner;
2.c.iii Desq'a[u] palais ne se vost arester.
- Hearing this, Raoul nearly goes out of his
mind. He has been made a laughing stock,
and is completely at a loss. Turning
angrily away, he did not stop before
reaching the great hall.

*Raoul's mother, though she would approve of his taking back his father's lands by force,
begs him not to pursue war for the other lands that were promised him,
because they belonged to a friend of his father. They belong by right
to that other knight's four sons, one of whom is the father of Raoul's best friend Bernier.
Raoul says that Bernier is already protesting the gift of the lands to Raoul.*

(Laisse 54, vv. 911–59.)

- | | | |
|--------|--|---|
| 1.a | Oit le la dame, qide vive esraigier; | When she hears this Alice is wild with |
| 3.a.i | a haute vois commença a huchier:
'Bien le savoie, a celer nel vos qier,
ce est li hom dont avras destorbier,
c'il en a aise, de la teste trenchier. | rage. She started to shout at the top of
her voice: 'I knew it well, I will not hide it
from you: this is the man who will cause
your downfall. and will slice your head
off if he gets the chance. Raoul, my son, I |
| 4.c | Biax fix R[aous], un conseil vos reqier,
q'as fix H[erbert] vos faites apaisier
et de la guere acorder et paier.
Laisse lor terr[e], il t'en aront plus chier,
[920] si t'aideront t'autre gu[e]re a
baillier,
et le Mancel del païs a chacier.' | urge this counsel on you, make peace
with Herbert's sons, and agree a
settlement and compensation for the
war. Leave their land alone, they will
think better of you for it, [920] and help
you wage your other war to drive the
Mansel from the country.' |
| 1.d | R[aous] l'oï, le sens quida changier,
et jure Dieu qi tot a a jugier,
q'il nel feroit por l'or de Monpeslier. | Hearing this, Raoul is beside himself, and
he swears by God who judges all things
that be would not do so for all the gold of
Montpellier. 'Devil take the nobleman— |
| 3.c.ii | 'Maldehait ait—je le taing por lanier—
le gentil homme, qant il doit tornoier,
a gentil dame qant se va consellier!
Dedens vos chambres vos alez aasier:
bevez puison por vo pance encaissier,
[930] et si pensez de boiwre et de
mengier,
car d'autre chose ne devez mais plaidier!' | what a coward he must be—who runs to
a woman for advice when he ought to go
off fighting!
Go and loll about in bedrooms and drink
drinks to fatten your belly, [930] and
think about eating and drinking, for
you're not fit to meddle with anything
else!' |
| 2.a.v | Oit le la dame, si prist a larmoier.
'Biax fils,' dist ele, 'ci a grant destorbier! | When the Lady Alice bears this, she starts
to cry. 'My son,' she said, 'What great
violence this is! |
| 3.a.ii | <i>She reproaches him with everything she has done to care for him and increase his honour,
and the good that has come to him because of it.</i> | |
| 1.a | [950] 'Tes anemis en vi molt
embronchier,
et tes amis lor goie sorhaucier
car au besoing s'en qidoient aidier.
Or viez aler tel terre chalengier
ou tes ancestres ne prist ainz un denier,
et qant por moi ne le viez or laisier. | [950] I saw your enemies downcast and
your friends exult, for they counted on
your help in case of need. Now you want
to lay claim to land where your forebear
never took so much as a penny, and if
you won't give it up for my sake, then let
God who judges everything not bring you
back safe and sound and in one piece!' |
| 3.c.ii | cil Damerdiex qi tout a a jugier
ne t'en ramaint sain ne sauf ne entier!'
Par cel maldit ot il tel destorbier,
com vos orez, de la teste trenchier! | Disaster overtook him as a result of this
curse, as you shall hear—he had his head
sliced off. |

*Raoul orders Origny attacked and destroyed because it is dear to his enemies.
He orders that his men should camp in the church, rape the nuns,
and stable the horses in the porch. Though his men set fire to the land around Origny
they cannot bring themselves to attack the church, and instead they camp in the field outside.
Raoul is furious at this disobedience. (Laisses 61–62, vv. 1085–1102.)*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1.a R[aus] i vint endroit prime sonnant;
a sa maisnie tença par maltalant.
3.d.ii 'Fil a putain, fel glouton souduiant!
Molt estes ore [cuvert] et mal pensant
qi trespassez onques le mien commant!' 4.d
[1090] 'Merci biau sire, por Dieu le
raemant!
5.d Ne sommes mie ne Giue ne tirant,
qi les corsains alomes destruiant.'</p> | <p>Raoul arrived at about the hour of prime,
and angrily reprimanded his men. 'You
sons of whores, you treacherous, low-
born villains! How base and wrong-
headed can you be, ever to disobey my
orders!
[1090] 'Do not be hard on us, lord, for
God the Redeemer's sake! We are not
Jews or executioners, to destroy holy
relics.</p> |
|---|---|
- 1.d *Laisse 62, line 1093*
- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>3.d.ii Li quens R[aus] fu molt desmesurez.
'Fil a putain'—ce dist li desreez—
je commandai el mostier fust mes trez,
tendus laiens, et li pommiaus doreiz.
Par qel concel en est il destornez?</p> <p>1.d, 'Voir,' dist G[ueris], 'trop ies desmesurez!
4.c Encor n'a gaires que tu fus adoubés.
[1100] Se Diex te heit, tu seras tost finez.
Par les frans homes est cis lius honnorez;
ne doit pas estre li corsains vergondez.'</p> | <p>Count Raoul cast all moderation aside.
'You sons of whores!'—those were the
madman's words—I ordered my tent to
be in the church, pitched right inside it,
complete with gilded top. Whose idea
was it to put it somewhere else?'
'Indeed,' said Guerri, 'you are getting
above yourself! It's scarcely any time
since you were knighted. [1100] If God
takes against you, you won't last long.
This place is venerated by men of good
standing; the holy relics should not be
brought into dishonour.'</p> |
|---|--|

*Raoul attacks Origny—angry now at the town, not at its owners,
because they fought back (laisse 70, vv. 1284–1293).*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1.a, 1.c Li quens R[aus] ot molt le quer irié
3.b.ii por les borgois qi l'ont contraloïé.
3.c.i Dieu en jura et la soie pitié
q'il ne laroit por Rains l'arseveschié
2.f.i/vii qe toz nes arde ainz q'il soit anuitié.
5.a Le fu cria—esquier l'ont touchié;
[1290] ardent ces sales et foude[n]t cil
planchier,
tounel espren[n]t—li sercle sont
trenchié,
li effant ardent a duel et a pechié.
Li quens R[aus] en a mal exploitié.</p> | <p>Count Raoul was heartily angry with the
townspeople for crossing him. He swore
by God and his mercy that not for the
diocese of Reims would he hold off from
burning every one of them by nightfall.
He shouted the order for fire—and [now]
the squires have lit it. [1290] Rooms are
burning here and floors collapsing there,
barrels are catching fire, their hoops
split, and children are burning to death in
horrible agony.
Count Raoul has behaved atrociously.</p> |
|---|---|

*Raoul has sacked Origny, killing Bernier's mother in the process.
Now he proposes to slaughter Herbert's sons: Bernier's father and uncles. Bernier objects.
(Laisse 78, vv. 1470–75.)*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>3.b.ii 'Or viex m[es] oncle[s] et mon pere
essillier—
3.b.i n'est pas merveille s'or me vuel corecier.
Il sont mi oncle, je lor volrai aidier,
et pres seroie de ma honte vengier!'
1.d R[aus] l'oï, le sens quida changier;
4.d.ii le baron prist forment a laidengier.</p> | <p>'Now you want to slaughter my uncles
and my father—it's not surprising I wish
to vent my anger. They are my uncles, I
mean to help them, and I would be ready
to avenge the outrage done to me!'
Hearing this, Raoul was beside himself
and began to heap abuse on his vassal.</p> |
|---|---|
- The quarrel grows more heated. Raoul calls his mother a whore and Bernier son of a whore;*

2.c	G[ueris] le vit—cele part vint corant: lui et R[aoul] a pris de maintenant, [3060] andeus les oeuvre a l'espee trenchant,	killed him, as is widely known. Seeing him, Guerri galloped over and at once took his body and Raoul's. [3060] With his sharp sword he opens them both up
1.c	les cuers en traist, si con trovons lisant. Sor un escu a fin or reluisant les a couchiés por vëoir lor samblant: l'uns fu petiz ausi con d'un effant; et li R[aoul], ce sevent li auquant, fu asez graindres, par le mien esciant, qe d'un torel a charue traiant.	and drew out their hearts, so our reading tells us. He laid them on a shield glistening with gold to see what they were like: one was small, like a child's, while Raoul's, as common knowledge and my own confirm, was very much larger than that of a draught ox at the plough.
1.a	G[ueris] le vit—de duel va larmoiant;	Seeing this, Guerri sheds tears of grief
2.a.v	ces chevaliers en apele plorant, [3070] 'Franc compaignon, por Dieu venez avant. Ves de R[aoul] le hardi combatant, gel cuer il a encontre cel gaiant!'	and calls out, weeping, to his knights. [3070] 'Noble comrades, come over here, for God's sake. See what a heart Raoul, the fearless fighter, had in comparison with that giant!'

Vita Edwardi II

Single anonymous chronicler, covering 1307–1325. Written in instalments, rather than at the end of that period, with each instalment probably close to the events narrated. Shows close knowledge of events and persons at court, an analytical turn of mind, and a strong rhetorical focus on vices. Text and translation from Wendy Childs' edition.

<i>Strife arises in England on account of Edward II's love for Piers Gaveston (10–11).</i>		
3.e.i	Hec sediciosa dissencio inter dominum regem et barones orta per totam	This treacherous quarrel, which had arisen between the lord king and the
4.a	Angliam iam diuulgata est, set et tota terra pro tali tumultu ualde desolata est; omne enim regnum in se diuisum desolabitur. Homines mediocres pacifici, paci amatores, guerram et pacis exilium	barons, now spread far and wide through all England, and the whole country was utterly devastated by such a disturbance: for every kingdom divided against itself shall be brought to desolation. Ordinary
2.f.i	ualde formidabant; predones uero qui predam captabant et ad aliena manum extendere, bellum non pacem affectabant. Rex uero ciuitates suas et castra muniri fecit et reparari, set magnates ex parte sua hoc idem fecerunt. Per totam terram uero in comitatibus, hundredis, ciuitatibus, burgis et uillis, conuocaciones et inprouisiones facte sunt, et quibus quilibet armis, necessitate inueniente,	peaceful men, peace-lovers, greatly feared war and the banishment of peace; but robbers, who longed for booty and to lay hands on the goods of others, desired war not peace. The king had his towns and castles fortified and repaired, and the great men for their part did the same. Throughout the whole land in shires, hundreds, cities, boroughs, and vills, meetings were held and regulations made, and it was duly provided and
1.a	uteretur ex debito prouisum est et ordinatum.	ordained what arms each should use in the event of necessity.

Certissime enim putabatur discencionem iam ceptam sine magna ruina sedari non posse.

For it was thought most certain that the quarrel once begun could not be settled without great destruction.

Note: The wrong kind of emotional leadership: it is the disunity between Edward II and his barons that is now being spread to the rest of the realm.

The king recalls Gaveston from exile (14–15).

1.a	Rex itaque, sciens Petrum iam rediisse, obuiam illi uenit ad Cestriam, ibique de reditu suo letus gratanter ualde eum tamquam fratrem suum honorifice suscepit. Reuera fratrem suum semper appellauerat. Nullus autem baronum ausus est amplius uel contra eum manum extendere, uel de reditu suo querelam deponere; claudicabat enim cetus eorum, et pars eorum, in se diuisa, infirmata est. Sic igitur qui bis antea dampnatus erat in exilium, iam exultat reuersus ad solium.	The king, therefore, knowing that Piers had returned, came to meet him at Chester, and there, delighted at his return, he very joyfully received him with honour as his brother. Indeed he had always called him his brother. None of the barons now dared further to raise a finger against him, or to lay any complaint about his return; their ranks wavered, and their party, divided against itself, was weakened. So he who had twice been condemned to exile exults, having returned to high position.
2.f		
4.a		
1.a		
2.g.i		

Baronial hatred of Gaveston (26–29).

1.a	Queret autem aliquis unde tantam indignacionem baronum meruerat Petrus; que causa odii, quid seminarium ire et inuidie extiterit, uehementer forsan admirabitur, cum in omnium fere magnatum domibus optentum sit hodie ut unus aliquis de familia dominice dileccionis gaudeat prerogatiua....	But if anyone asks how Piers had come to deserve such great baronial displeasure, what was the cause of the hatred, what was the seedbed of the anger and jealousy, perhaps he will be very surprised, since it happens in almost all noble houses today that some one of the lord's household enjoys a prerogative of affection...
1.a		

28–29

1.a	Credo igitur et constanter teneo quia, si Petrus ab inicio prudenter et humiliter erga magnates terre se gessisset, nunquam eorum aliquem sibi contrarium habuisset. Erat enim causa odii secundaria hec, quod cum ab antiquo omnibus desiderabile exstiterit habere gratiam in oculis regum, solus Petrus gratiam et uultum hillarem regis habuit et fauorem, in tantum ut, si comes uel baro colloquium habiturus cum rege cameram regis intraret, in presencia Petri nulli rex uerba dirigeat, nulli faciem hillarem ostendebat, nisi soli Petro.	I therefore believe and firmly maintain that if Piers had behaved discreetly and humbly towards the great men of the land from the beginning, none of them would ever have opposed him. But there was a secondary cause of their hatred, namely that, though of old it has been desirable for all men to find favour in the eyes of kings, Piers alone received the king's favour, welcome, and goodwill, to such an extent that, if an earl or baron entered the king's chamber to speak with the king, while Piers was there the king addressed no one, and showed a friendly countenance to no one except Piers alone. And in truth envy is accustomed frequently to spring from such behaviour. Certainly I do not remember having heard that one man so loved
3.d.ii		
2.g		
2.a		
1.a		
1.a		

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1.d | set illi modum excessisse non leguntur.
Modum autem dileccionis rex noster
habere non potuit, et propter eum sui
oblitus esse diceretur, et ob hoc Petrus
malificus putaretur esse... | another. Jonathan cherished David,
Achilles loved Patroclus; but we do not
read that they went beyond what was
usual. Our king, however, was incapable
of moderate affection, and on account of
Piers was said to forget himself, and so
Piers was regarded as a sorcerer... |
| 1.a | Hiis maxime de causis excitata erat
contra Petrum indignacio baronum; et
Petrus nihilominus magnanimus,
tumidus et elatus permansit. | These were the principal causes which
had aroused the anger of the barons
against Piers; and Piers nevertheless
remained arrogant, haughty, and proud. |

Note: I have included jeering speech here, because Gaveston's arrogance has involved taunts, giving some of the most powerful barons insulting nicknames. The chronicler mentions this earlier (16–17), and returns to it later (44–45). (Cf. *Brut* 206–07 above). Here we see the barons' response to it.

Gaveston's pride (30–31).

- | | | |
|-------|--|--|
| 1.a | ... nec mirum si in superbia sua nec Deo
nec homini foret acceptus. Nam in
superbia et in abusione sublimes oculos | nor it is surprising if he in his pride
should be acceptable to neither God nor
man. For, scornfully rolling his eyes |
| 2.a.i | distorquens in fastum, quadam pomposa
et superciliosa facie despexit uniuersos...
Et certe in filio regis satis esset
intollerabile supercilium quod pretendit. | upwards in pride and in insult, he looked
down upon all with overbearing and
disdainful countenance... And the
haughtiness which he affected would
certainly have been unbearable enough
in a king's son. |

The barons have Gaveston exiled again and try to re-order the king's household (38–39).

- | | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| 1.a | Ad hec rex ultra modum commotus, | At this the king, angered beyond |
| 3.b.ii | quod nec unum familiarem iuxta
proprium uotum retinere sibi liceret, set
sicut prouidetur fatuo, tocius domus sue
ordinacio ex alieno dependeret arbitrio, | measure that he was not allowed to keep
even one member of his household at his
own wish, but that, as is provided in the
case of an idiot, the ordering of his whole
house should depend upon the decision |
| 1.a,
2.g.i | in odio comitum reuocauit Petrum, per
animam Dei iurans ex solito quod libere
proprio uteretur arbitrio. | of another, recalled Piers out of hatred
for the earls, swearing, as he was wont,
on God's soul that he would freely use his
own judgement. |

*Members of Gaveston's household remain at the king's court,
and they still cause trouble (70–71).*

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 4.c | ... perturbant pacem tocius patrie et
regem inducunt uindictam querere. Da
pacem, Domine, diebus nostris, et rex
cum baronibus fiat unanimis. | [They] disturb the peace of the whole
country and persuade the king to seek
vengeance. Give peace in our time, O
Lord, and may the king be at one with his
barons!... |
| 4.a | ... | |
| 1.a | Set rex exasperatus, et aduersus
primatem et tocius Anglie clerum | But the king being wrathful and strongly
roused to anger against the primate and |
| 1.a | uehementer commotus, publica uoce | the clergy of all England, publicly |

2.g.iii	promisit curialibus ut in nullo penitus defferrent clericis, set, siue religiosis seu secularibus obuiarent, ipsos ab equis	announced to his officials that they should have no consideration at all for clerks, but, when they met regulars or
2.f.iv	protinus deicerent et in usum proprium equos assumerent, et indistincte nullis parcerent nisi regia proteccione gauderent.	secular clergy, should at once have them off their horses and take the horses for their own use, and, without discrimination, they should spare no one unless they enjoyed royal protection.

1314: Robert Bruce captures some of Edward II's castles (86–87).

1.a	Audiens hec rex uehementer doluit, et	When the king heard the news he was
2.a.v	pro castrorum capcione lacrimas	very much grieved, and for the capture of
3.c.i	continere uix potuit. Mandauit igitur	his castles could hardly restrain his tears.
4.a	comitibus et baronibus quatinus in	He therefore summoned the earls and
2.g.ii	auxilium suum uenirent, et proditorem qui se regem facit expugnarent.	barons to come to his help and overcome the traitor who pretends to be king.

Note: Edward II weeps, but then he responds with aggressive action: this is *gref*.

90–93

4.c	Comes autem Gloucestrie consuluit regi ne ipso die in bellum prodiret, set propter festum pocius uacaret, et exercitum suum ualde recrearet. Set rex	The earl of Gloucester, on the other hand, counselled the king not to go forth to battle that day, but rather to rest on account of the feast and let his army
3.d.ii	consilium comitis spreuit, et prodicionem et preuaricacionem sibi imponens in	recuperate as much as possible. But the king scorned the earl's advice, and grew
5.a	ipsum uehementer excanduit. 'Hodie,' inquit comes, 'erit liquidum quod nec proditor nec preuaricator sum', et statim parauit se ad pungnandum...	very heated with him, charging him with treachery and deceit. 'Today,' said the earl, 'it will be clear that I am neither a traitor nor a liar', and at once prepared himself for battle...
2.f.vi	Cum autem ad hoc uentum esset ut congredi simul oporteret, Jacobus Douglas, qui prime turme Scotorum preerat, aciem comitis Gloucestrie acriter inuasit. Et comes ipsum uiriliter excepit, semel et iterum cuneum penetrauit, et triumphum utique reportasset si fideles socios habuisset. Set ecce, subito	When, however, it had come to the point that the two sides must meet, James Douglas, who commanded the first division of the Scots vigorously attacked the earl of Gloucester's line. The earl withstood manfully, time and again he penetrated their wedge, and would without doubt have been victorious if he
2.c.i	irruentibus Scotis equus comitis	had had faithful companions. But look! At
2.f.iv	occiditur et comes in terram labitur. Ipse eciam defensore carens et mole corporis nimis oneratus faciliter exsurgere non potuit, set inter quingentos armatorum quos suis sumptibus duxerat ad bellum,	a sudden rush of Scots, the earl's horse is killed and the earl falls to the ground. Furthermore, without a defender and
2.f.vii	ipso fere solum occubuit. Cum enim uiderent dominum suum ab equo	burdened by the weight of its body he could not easily rise, and of the five
4.a	deiectum, stabant quasi attoniti non ferentes auxilium.	hundred men-at-arms whom he had led to battle at his own expense, almost only he was killed. For when they saw their lord thrown from his horse, they stood stunned and did not help him.

Maledicta milicia cuius summa
necessarie perit audacia.

Cursed be the knighthood whose courage
fails in the hour of greatest need!

Reflections on pride and malice (98–99).

	Hodie pauper et tenuis, qui nec obolum habet in bonis, maiorem se contempnit, et maledictum pro maledicto referre non metuit. Set ex rusticitate forsan hoc accidit. Veniamus igitur ad eos qui se putant eruditos. Quis putas maiori rixa in alium excandescit quam curialis? Dum forte rancore tumescit inferiorem non respicit, parem fastidit, maiori par fieri semper intendit. Nam armiger militem, miles baronem, baro comitem, comes regem, in omni fere cultu antecedere nititur et laborat.	Today the poor and needy man, who has not a halfpenny to his name, despises his betters, and is not afraid to exchange a curse for a curse. But perhaps this arises from rusticity. Let us come therefore to those who think themselves educated. Who do you think is inflamed with greater malice against another than the courtier? While he is greatly puffed up with bitter ill-feeling he ignores his inferiors, despises his equals, is always striving to equal his betters. For in almost every aspect of life the squire strains and strives to outdo the knight, the knight the baron, the baron the earl, the earl the king.
--	---	--

The king responds to unrest in Bristol (124–27).

1.a	Nolens ergo rex malicie eorum ulterius satisfacere, milites et maiores de comitatu Glouernie uocantur Londonias, quibus iniunxit in uirtute sacramenti ibidem prestiti causam Bristollie et cuius esset iniuria patenter edicere. Qui omnes dixerunt communitatem Bristollie partem sinistram fouere, et octoginta uiros auctores iniurie. Misit ergo Bristollie Adolmarum comitem de Penbrok, qui uocatis maioribus communitatis dixit eis ex parte regis:	Unwilling, therefore, to put up any longer with their wickedness, the king summoned the knights and the more important men of Gloucestershire to London, and enjoined them by virtue of an oath taken there to make a clear pronouncement on the case of Bristol and who had suffered wrong. And they all said that the Bristol community had favoured the wrong cause and that the eighty men were the authors of the wrongdoing. So the king sent to Bristol Aymer, earl of Pembroke, who called together the leaders of the community and spoke to them on the king's behalf:
3.c.iii	‘Dominus rex,’ inquit, ‘causam uestram uentilans, uos reos inuenit, et ut iuri pareatis uos monet et precipit. Homicidas et reos illos tradite, et uos et uilla uestra in pace manete. Promitto quod, si sic feceritis, dominum regem erga uos satis placibilem et misericordem inuenietis.’	‘The lord king,’ he said, ‘on hearing your cause has found you guilty, and he warns and commands you to obey the law. Hand over the killers and the guilty, and you and your town shall remain in peace. I promise that if you do this you will find the lord king lenient and merciful enough towards you.’
3.b.i		
2.g		
3.b.iii	Respondit communitas: ‘Nos iniurie auctores non fuimus; nos in dominum regem nichil deliquimus. Quidam nitebantur iura nostra tollere, et nos sicut decuit e contra defendere. Iccirco, si dominus rex ea que nobis inponuntur	The community replied: ‘We were not the authors of this wrongdoing; we have done nothing wrong towards the lord king. Certain men strove to take away our rights, and we, as was proper, strove to defend them. Therefore if the lord king

3.c.i	remiserit, si uitam et membra, redditus et predia nobis concesserit, sibi ut domino parebimus, et omnia quecunque uoluerit faciemus; alioquin persistemus ut cepimus, et libertates et priuilegia nostra usque ad mortem defendemus.'	will remit the penalties placed upon us, if he will grant us life and limb and rents and property, we will obey him as lord and do whatever he wishes; otherwise we shall continue as we have begun, and defend our liberties and privileges to the death.'
1.a 2.g.ii 2.f.i	Audiens rex contumaciam eorum, et considerans rem esse mali exempli, iussit uillam obsederi, et non recedere donec caperentur obsessi.	The king hearing of their stubbornness, and thinking that this was a bad example, ordered the town to be besieged, and not left until those besieged had been taken.

Lancaster and the other rebels are captured after the Battle of Boroughbridge (212–13).

1.c 1.a	Pars enim comitis numero armatorum partem persequencium excessit in septuplum. Capti sunt enim cum comite Lancastrie et ceteris baronibus milites ualentes centum et amplius. Set et scutariorum non minus ualencium multo maiorem credo fuisse numerum. Quare igitur non restitissent et pro salute sua uiriliter dimicassent? Reuera cor delinquencium semper est pavidum et ideo minus ualens ad negocium.	For in the number of men-at-arms the earl's side was more than seven times that of its pursuers. More than a hundred valiant knights were captured with the earl of Lancaster and the other barons. I believe the number of squires, no less strong, was much greater. Why therefore should they not have stood firm and fought manfully for their safety? In fact the criminal's heart is always fearful and therefore less effective in action.
------------	---	---

Les Voeux du Héron

Composed c. 1346, narrating the beginning of the Hundred Years War and referencing in prediction several events over the decade preceding its composition. Text and translation from Grigsby and Lacy's edition.

<i>Robert of Artois brings in the dressed heron and challenges the court (66–92).</i>		
3.a.i	Et chil Robers s'escrie hautement a haut cris:	And Robert called out loudly,
3.d.i	"Widiés les rens! Widiés, mauuaise gent falis!	"Clear the way! Clear the way, you miserable failures!
	...	...
	[74] Le plus couart oysel ay prins, ce m'est avis,	I believe I have caught the most cowardly bird
	Qui soit de tous les autres, de che soit chescuns fis,	Of all birds, have no doubt of that,
	Car li hairons est telz de nature toudis	For the nature of the heron is such
	Si tost qu'il voit son ombre, il est tous estordis.	That when it sees its own shadow, it is terrified;
3.e.ii	Tant dort s'escrie et brait com s'il fust a mort mis.	It cries out and screams as if being put to death.
	A li dovent vouuer les gens de chest païs;	

- [80] Et puisque couars est, je di mon avis,
 3.d.i C'au plus couart qui soit ne qui onques
 fust vis
 Dourray le hayron, ch'est Edouart Loeïs,
 Deshiretés de Franche, le nobile païs,
 1.c Qu'il en estoit drois hoirs, mes cuers li est
 falís,
 Et par se lasquethé en morra dessaisís,
 S'en doit bien au hairon voer le sien avis."
- 2.a.ii Et quant li roys l'entent, tous li rougi li
 vis.
 1.a, D'ire et de mautalent li est li coers fremís,
 1.c Et dist: "Puisque couars est par devant
 moy mis,
 3.c.i [90] Drois est que mieux en vaille, s'en
 dirai mon avis,
 Et s'en verray le fait se longuement je vis,
 Ou je moray en painne de men veu
 acomplir..."
- 3.b, *Edward III swears to break faith with the King of France before the end of the year,*
 2.g, *then describes the itinerary by which he will enter France*
 3.c.i *and which regions he will attack.*

- Edward III finishes speaking, and Robert of Artois laughs to himself (119–23).*
 3.d.ii Et quant Robers l'entent, s'en jeté un ris,
 3.c.i Et dist tout en basset: "Or ai je men avis,
 Quant par ichel hairon que au jour d'ewy
 ay prins
 Commenchera grant guerre, selonc le
 mien avis.
 1.a Je doi bien avoir joie par Dieu de
 paradis."
- When Robert heard that, he laughed
 And said to himself, "Now I have my
 wish,
 Since, on this heron that I caught today,
 A great war will begin, I think.
 I should be happy, by God in heaven."

- The Earl of Salisbury closes one eye and takes his vows (190–99)*
 1.c Adont dist de la bouche du ceur le
 pensement:
 3.c.i "Et je veu et promech a Dieu omnipotent
 Et a sa douche Mere, qui de beauté
 resplent,
 Qu'il n'ert jamais ouvers por ore ne pour
 vent,
 Pour mal ne pour martire, ne pour
 encombement,
- Then with his mouth [he] spoke the
 thought in his heart:
 "I vow and promise to God almighty
 And to his sweet Mother, resplendent
 with beauty,
 That my eye will never be open, for
 storm or wind,
 For evil or pain or disaster,

2.f.i Se seray dedens Franche, ou il a boine
 gent,
2.f.vi Et si arai le fu bouté entierement,
 Et seray conbatus a grant efforchement
 Contre les gens Philippe, qui tant a
 hardement...”

And yet I will be in France, where there
 are good people,
And I will set fire everywhere,
And fight with great force
Against the army of Philip, who is very
 bold...”

Works cited

Primary texts

Alliterative *Morte Arthure*. See *Morte Arthure*.

An Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle. Edited by Ewald Zettl, EETS OS 196, Oxford UP, 1935.

Annales Paulini. Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, edited by William Stubbs, Rolls Series 76 vol. 1, London, 1882, pp. 254–370.

Anonimale Chronicle 1307–1335: From Brotherton Collection MS 29. Edited and translated by Wendy R. Childs and John Taylor, Leeds UP, 1991.

Le Baker, Geoffrey. *Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynbroke*. Edited by Edward Maunde Thompson. Clarendon, 1889.

----- *The Chronicle of Geoffrey le Baker*. Translated by David Preest, edited by Richard Barber. Boydell, 2012.

Le Bel, Jean. *Chronique de Jean le Bel*. Edited by Jules Viard and Eugène Déprez. Société de l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1905.

----- *The True Chronicles of Jean le Bel 1290–1360*. Translated by Nigel Bryant, Boydell and Brewer, 2011.

Book of Vices and Virtues. See Orleans.

Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds 1212–1301. Translated and edited by Antonia Gransden, Nelson 1964.

Chanson de Roland. Edited by Joseph Bédier, Paris, 1922.

----- *The Song of Roland*. Translated by Jessie Crosland, In Parentheses, 1999.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Troilus and Criseyde. The Riverside Chaucer*. General editor Larry D. Benson, 3rd edition, Oxford UP, 1987.

Fantosme, Jordan. *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*. Ed. and trans. R. C. Johnston. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.

Fineshade chronicle. "A Chronicle of the Civil Wars of Edward II." Ed. George L. Haskins. *Speculum* 14.1 (1939): 73–81.

----- London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D IX, ff. 84–90.

- Froissart, Jean. *Chroniques de J. Froissart*. Edited by Siméon Luce et al., Société de l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1869–1975.
- *The Online Froissart*. HRIOOnline, Edited by Peter Ainsworth and Godfried Croenen. *Chroniques*, <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/onlinefroissart/>, version 1.5. Accessed August 2019.
- Gawain and the Green Knight*. See *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth. See Monmouth.
- Golden Legend*. See Voragine.
- Guisborough, Walter of. *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, previously edited as The Chronicle of Walter of Hemingford or Hemingburgh*. Edited by Harry Rothwell, Camden Society 3rd ser. 89, Royal Historical Society, 1957.
- Haskins. See Fineshade.
- Jean le Bel. See Bel.
- Lazamon's Brut*. Edited by G. L. Brook and R. F. Leslie, EETS OS 250 and 277, Oxford UP, 1963–78.
- Mannyng, Robert. *Robert Mannyng of Brunne: The Chronicle*. Edited by Idelle Sullens, Binghampton UP, 1996.
- Monmouth, Geoffrey of. *The History of the Kings of Britain: An Edition and Translation of 'De Gestis Britonum: Historia Regis Britanniae'*. Edited by Michael D. Reeve, translated by Neil Wright, Boydell, 2007.
- *The History of the Kings of Britain*. Translated by Michael A. Faletra, Broadview 2008.
- Morte Arthure, or, The Death of Arthur*. Edited by Edmund Brock, 1871, EETS OS 8, Oxford UP.
- Murimuth, Adam. *Continuatio Chronicarum*. In *Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum et Robert de Avesbury De Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii*. Edited by Edward Maunde Thompson, Rolls Series 93, London, 1889, pp. 1–276.
- d'Orleans, Lorens *The Book of Vices and Virtues: A Fourteenth Century English Translation of the Somme Le Roi of Lorens D'Orleans*. Edited by W. Nelson Francis, EETS OS 217, Oxford UP 1942.
- Raoul de Cambrai*. Edited and translated by Sarah Kay, Clarendon, 1992.
- Roland*. Roland. See *Chanson de Roland*.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Edited by Daniel Donoghue, translated by Larry D. Benson, West Virginia UP, 2012.
- Somme le Roi*. See Voragine.
- Song of Roland*. See *Chanson de Roland*.

The Brut; or, the Chronicles of England. Ed. Friedrich Brie. EETS OS 131. London: Paul, Trench and Trübner, 1906.

Vita Edwardi II. Edited and translated by Wendy R. Childs, Clarendon, 2005.

Voragine, Jacobus de. *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*. Translated by William Granger Ryan, Princeton UP, 1993.

Vows of the Heron (Les Voeux du Héron): A Middle French Vowing Poem. Edited by John L. Grigsby, translated by Norris J. Lacy, Garland, 1992.

Walter of Guisborough. See Guisborough.

Reference works

Anglo-Norman Dictionary. Anglo-Norman On-line Hub, 2001–2019, www.anglo-norman.net/. Accessed throughout August 2019.

Dictionnaire du Moyen Français (1330–1500). 9th edition, ATILF (Analyse et Traitement Informatique de la Langue Française), 2019, www.atilf.fr/dmf/. Accessed throughout August 2019.

Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle. Gen. ed. Graeme Dunphy. Brill, 2010.

Lewis and Short Latin Dictionary. Perseus Digital Library, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.04.0059. Accessed throughout August 2019.

Middle English Dictionary. Middle English Compendium, edited by Frances McSparran et al., 2000–2018, quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/. Accessed throughout August 2019.

Secondary texts

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. 2nd ed., Edinburgh UP, 2014.

Ailes, Marianne J. "The Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* as a chanson de geste." *Sir Bevis of Hampton in Literary Tradition*, edited by Jennifer Fellows and Ivana Djordjević, Brewer, 2008, pp. 9–24.

Allen, Rosamund, et al. *Reading Lazamon's Brut: Approaches and Explorations*. Rodopi, 2013.

- Althoff, Gerd. "Ira Regis: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger." Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, pp. 59–74.
- Antón, Isabel Alfonso. "The Language and Practice of Negotiation in Medieval Conflict Resolution (Castille-Léon, Eleventh–Thirteenth Centuries)." Tuten and Billado, pp. 157–74.
- Baden-Daintree, Anne. "Visualising War: The Aesthetics of Violence in the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*." Bellis and Slater, pp. 56–76.
- Barber, Richard. *Edward III and the Triumph of England: The Battle of Crécy and the Company of the Garter*. Allen Lane, 2013.
- Bartlett, Robert. "'Mortal Enmities': The Legal Aspect of Hostility in the Middle Ages." Tuten and Billado, pp. 197–212.
- Barton, Richard E. "Making a Clamor to the Lord: Noise, Justice, and Power in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France." Tuten and Billado, pp. 213–35.
- "'Zealous Anger' and the Renegotiation of Aristocratic Relationships in France in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France." Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, pp. 153–70.
- Bellis, Joanna. *The Hundred Years War in Literature, 1337–1600*. Boydell and Brewer, 2016.
- "Mapping the National Narrative: Place-name Etymology in *Lazamon's Brut* and Its Sources." Allen et al., pp. 321–42.
- "'The Reader Myghte Lamente': The sieges of Calais (1346) and Rouen (1418) in chronicle, poem, and play." *War and Literature*, edited by Laura Ashe and Ian Patterson, Boydell and Brewer, 2014, pp. 84–106.
- and Laura Slater, editors. *Representing War and Violence 1250–1600*. Boydell and Brewer, 2016.
- Benz St John, Lisa. *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Bloch, Marc. *La Société Féodale: La Formation des Liens de Dépendance*. Albin Michel, 1949.
- Boddice, Rob. "Emotions, morals, practices." *The Science of Sympathy: Morality, Evolution, and Victorian Civilization*. U of Illinois P, 2016, pp. 1–25.
- *The History of Emotions*. Manchester UP, 2018.
- Brandsma, Frank, et al, editors. *Emotions in Medieval Arthurian Literature: Body, Mind, Voice*. Boydell and Brewer, 2015.
- Bryan, Jennifer. *Looking Inward: Devotional Reading and the Private Self in Late Medieval England*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2008.

- Bull, Marcus and Damien Kempf, editors. *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*. Boydell and Brewer, 2014.
- Burgess, R. W. and Michael Kulikowski. "Medieval Historiographical Terminology: The Meaning of the Word *Annales*." *The Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 8, 2013, pp. 165–92.
- Burrow, John. *Gestures and Looks in Medieval Narrative*. Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Busby, Keith. "Narrative Genres." *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval French Literature*, edited by Simon Gaunt and Sarah Kay, Cambridge UP, 2008, pp. 139–52.
- Butterfield, Ardis. *The Familiar Enemy: Chaucer, Language, and Nation in the Hundred Years War*. Oxford UP, 2009.
- Cels, Marc B. "God's Wrath Against the Wrathful in Medieval Mendicant Preaching." *Canadian Journal of History / Annales Canadiennes d'Histoire*, vol. 43, no. 2, 2008, pp. 217–26.
- "An Irous Man': Anger and Authority in the *Summoner's Tale*." *The Chaucer Review*, vol. 53, no. 3, 2018, pp. 308.
- Classen, Albrecht. "Anger and Anger Management in the Middle Ages: Mental-Historical Perspectives." *Mediaevistik*, vol. 19, 2006, pp. 21–50.
- Crocker, Holly A. "Medieval affects now." *Exemplaria*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2017, pp. 82–98.
- and Glenn Burger. *Medieval Affect, Feeling, and Emotion*. Cambridge UP, 2019.
- Croenen, Godfried. "The Reception of Froissart's Writings in England: The Evidence of the Manuscripts." Wogan-Browne et al., pp. 409–19.
- Davies, Wendy. "Anger and the Celtic saint." Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, pp. 191–202.
- DeMarco, Patricia. "Imagining Jewish Affect in the *Siege of Jerusalem*." Burger and Crocker, pp. 47–69.
- Diggelman, Lindsay. "Emotional Responses to Medieval Warfare in *The History of William Marshal*." Downes et al., 24–41.
- Downes, Stephanie, et al., editors. *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Downes, Stephanie, and Rebecca F. McNamara. "The History of Emotions and Middle English Literature." *Literature Compass*, vol. 13, no. 6, 2016, pp. 444–56.
- Dumville, David. "What is a Chronicle?" *The Medieval Chronicle* 2, 2002, pp. 1–27.
- Dunn, Caroline. "The Language of Ravishment in Medieval England." *Speculum*, vol. 86, no. 1, 2011, pp. 79–116.
- Echard, Siân. *Arthurian narrative in the Latin tradition*. Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Elias, Marcel. "Mixed feelings in the Middle English Charlemagne romances: Emotional reconfiguration and the failures of crusading practices in the Otuel texts." *New*

- Medieval Literatures 16*, edited by Laura Ashe et al., Boydell and Brewer, 2016, pp. 172–212.
- Elias, Marcel. "Violence, Excess, and the Composite Emotional Rhetoric of *Richard Coeur De Lion*." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 114, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1–38.
- Elsweiler, Christine. *Lazamon's Brut between Old English Heroic Poetry and Middle English Romance: A Study of the Lexical Fields 'Hero', 'Warrior' and 'Knight'*. Peter Lang, 2011.
- Eustace, Nicole, et al. "AHR Conversation: The Historical Study of Emotions." *American Historical Review*, vol. 117, no. 5, 2012, pp. 1486–1531.
- Flannery, Mary C. "A Bloody Shame: Chaucer's Honourable Women." *Review of English Studies*, vol. 62 no. 255, 2011, pp. 337–57.
- "The Concept of Shame in Late-Medieval English Literature." *Literature Compass*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2012, pp. 166–82.
- Flynn, Maureen. "Taming Anger's Daughters: New Treatment for Emotional Problems in Renaissance Spain." *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 51, no. 3, 1998, pp. 864–86.
- Foot, Sarah. "Finding the meaning of form: Narrative in Annals and Chronicles." *Writing Medieval History*, edited by Nancy Partner, Hodder Arnold, 2005, pp. 88–108.
- Freedman, Paul. "Peasant Anger in the Late Middle Ages." Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, pp. 171–88.
- Frevert, Ute. *Emotions in History: Lost and Found*. Budapest and Central European UP, 2011.
- et al., editors. *Emotional Lexicons: Community and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling 1700–2000*. Oxford UP, 2014.
- Gammerl, Benno. "Emotional Styles: Concepts and Challenges." *Rethinking History: The Journal of Theory and Practice*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2012, pp. 161–75.
- Garrison, Jennifer. *Challenging Communion: The Eucharist and Middle English Literature*. Ohio State UP, 2017.
- Gertsman, Elina. "The facial gesture: (Mis)Reading Emotion in Gothic Art." *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2010, pp. 28–46.
- Giancarlo, Matthew. "Speculative genealogies." Strohm, *Middle English*, pp. 352–68.
- Given-Wilson, Chris. "The Earl of Arundel, the War with France, and the Anger of King Richard II." *The Medieval Python: The Purposive and Provocative Work of Terry Jones*, edited by R. F. Yeager and Toshiyuki Takamiya, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, 27–38.
- Gordon, Stephen. "Emotional practice and bodily performance in Early Modern vampire literature." *Preternature: Critical and Historical Studies on the Preternatural*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2017, pp. 93–124.

- Gransden, Antonia. "The continuations of the *Flores Historiarum* from 1265 to 1327." *Medieval Studies*, vol. 36, 1974, pp. 472–92.
- *Historical Writing in England*. Routledge, 1974–1982. 2 vols.
- Greenway, Diana E. "Historical writing at St Paul's." *St Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004*, edited by Derek Keene et al., Yale UP, 2004, pp. 151–56.
- Guenée, Bernard. "Histoires, Annales, Chroniques: Essai sur les Genres Historiques au Moyen Age." *Annales-Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, vol. 28, 1973, pp. 997–1016.
- Gunn, Vicky. *Bede's Historia: Genre, rhetoric, and the construction of Anglo-Saxon church history*. Boydell, 2009.
- Hallett, Nicky. *The Senses in Religious Communities, 1600–1800: Early Modern 'Convents of Pleasure'*. Ashgate, 2013.
- Hanning, Robert. *The Vision of History in Early Britain: from Gildas to Geoffrey of Monmouth*. Columbia UP, 1966.
- Harbus, Antonina. "Cognitive Approaches to the History of Emotions and the Emotional Dynamic of Literature." *Cognitive Approaches to Old English Poetry*, Boydell and Brewer, 2012, pp. 162–76.
- Hassig, Debra. "The iconography of rejection: Jews and other monstrous races." *Image and Belief*, edited by Colum Hourihane, Princeton UP, 1999, pp. 25–46.
- Hatcher, John. "Fiction as History: The Black Death and Beyond." *History*, vol. 97, no. 325, 2012, pp. 3–23.
- Hiatt, Alfred. "Genre without system." Strohm, *Middle English*, pp. 277–94.
- Hillier, Russell M. "'Valour Will Weep': The Ethics of Valor, Anger, and Pity in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 113, no. 2, 2016, pp. 358–96.
- Huneycutt, Lois. "Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos." *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, edited by Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean, U of Illinois P, 1995, pp. 124–46.
- Hyams, Paul R. "What did Henry III of England Think in Bed and in French about Kingship and Anger?" Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, pp. 92–124.
- Jaeger, C. Stephen. *Ennobling Love: In Search of a Lost Sensibility*. The Middle Ages Series. U of Pennsylvania P, 1999.
- Justice, Stephen. *Adam Usk's Secret*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2015.
- Kaufman, Alexander L. "'And many oþer diuerse tokens...' Portents and wonders in 'Warkworth's' chronicle." Rajsic et al., pp. 49–63.

- Kilpatrick, Hannah. "Edward I's Temper: Anger and its Misrepresentations in the Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough and the Fineshade Chronicle." *The Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 12, 2019, pp. 75–93.
- "The Problematic Present: Locating and Losing Meaning in the Narrative Structure of the Fineshade Chronicle." *Parergon* vol. 21, no. 1, 2015, pp. 31–51.
- Kjaer, Lars. "Writing Reform and Rebellion." *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-1267*, edited by Adrian Jobson, Boydell, 2016, pp. 109–24.
- Knaller, Susanne. "Emotions and the Process of Writing." *Writing Emotions*, edited by Susanne Knaller et al., Transcript Verlag, 2017, pp. 17–28.
- Kooper, Erik. "Longleat House MS 55: An Unacknowledged *Brut* Manuscript?" Rajsic et al., pp. 75–93.
- Larrington, Carolyne. "Learning to Feel in the Old Norse Camelot?" *Scandinavian Studies*, vol. 87, no. 1, 2015, pp. 74–94.
- Laynesmith, J. L. *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445–1503*. Oxford UP, 2004.
- Lazikani, A. S. *Cultivating the heart: Feeling and Emotion in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Religious Texts*. U of Wales P, 2015.
- Le Saux, Françoise H. M. "The Languages of England: Multilingualism in the Work of Wace." Wogan-Browne et al., pp. 188–97.
- Leek, Thomas. "On the Question of Orality behind Medieval Romance: The Example of the 'Constance' Group." *Folklore*, vol. 123, no. 3, 2012, pp. 293–309.
- Léglu, Catherine. "Tearful Performance: When Troubadours Weep." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, vol. 101, no. 4, 2000, pp. 495–504.
- Leitch, Megan. "Sleeping Knights and 'Such maner of sorow-makyng'." *Arthurian Literature XXXI*, edited by Elizabeth Archibald and David F. Johnson, Boydell and Brewer, 2014, pp. 83–100.
- Leverett, Emily. "An Affective Romance? Genre Blending in The Siege of Jerusalem." *Medieval Perspectives*, vol. 27, 2012, pp. 111–24.
- Little, Lester. "Anger in Monastic Curses." Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, pp. 9–35.
- Lynch, Andrew. "'Blisse Wes on Londe': The Feeling of Peace in Lazamon's *Brut*." Downes et al., 42–59.
- "'Manly cowardyse': Thomas Hoccleve's peace strategy." *Medium Ævum*, vol. 73, no. 2, 2004, pp. 306–23.
- "'What cheer?' Emotion and action in the Arthurian world." Brandsma et al., pp. 47–63.

- Macdonald, Alastair J. "Courage, Fear and the Experience of the Later Medieval Scottish Soldier." *Scottish Historical Review*, vol. 92, no. 235, 2013, pp. 179–206.
- Marchant, Alicia. *The Revolt of Owain Glyndŵr in Medieval English Chronicles*. York Medieval P, 2014.
- Marvin, Julia. "Albine and Isabelle: Regicidal Queens and the Historical Imagination of the Anglo-Norman *Brut* Chronicles." *Arthurian Literature*, vol. 18, 2001, pp. 143–91.
- "Latinity and Vernacularity in the Tradition of Geoffrey of Monmouth: Text, Apparatus, and Readership." *The Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 8, 2013, pp. 1–33.
- "Narrative, Lineage, and Succession in the Anglo-Norman *Brut* Chronicle." *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval Britain and France*, edited by Raluca L. Radulescu and Edward Donald Kennedy, Brepols, 2008, pp. 205–20.
- "The Vitality of Anglo-Norman in Late Medieval England: The Case of the Prose *Brut* Chronicle." Wogan-Browne et al., pp. 303–19.
- Marx, William. "An Absent King: Perceptions of the Politics of Power in the Reign of Richard II and the Middle English Prose *Brut*." *Chaucer in Context: A Golden Age of English Poetry*, edited by Gerald Morgan, Peter Lang, 2012, pp. 135–52.
- Maurer, Helen. *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England*. Boydell, 2003.
- McClary, Susan, editor. *Structures of Feeling in Seventeenth-Century Cultural Expression*. U of Toronto P, 2012.
- Mcdougall, Sara. "The Transformation of Adultery in France at the End of the Middle Ages." *Law and History Review*, vol. 32, no. 3, 2019, pp. 491–524.
- McGrath, Kate. "The Politics of Chivalry: The Function of Anger and Shame in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Anglo-Norman Historical Narratives." Tuten and Billado, pp. 55–70.
- McNamara, Rebecca F. "The Sorrow of Soreness: Infirmary and Suicide in Medieval England." *Parergon*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2014, pp. 11–34.
- "Wearing your heart on your face: Reading lovesickness and the suicidal impulse in Chaucer." *Literature and Medicine*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2015, pp. 258–78.
- and Juanita Feros Ruys. "Unlocking the Silences of the Self-Murdered: Textual Approaches to Suicidal Emotions in the Middle Ages." *Exemplaria*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2014, pp. 58–80.
- McNamer, Sarah. *Affective Meditation and the Invention of Medieval Compassion*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2010.
- "Feeling." Strohm, *Middle English*, pp. 241–57.

- Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography*, edited by Gerd Althoff et al., Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Megna, Paul. "Langland's Wrath: Righteous Anger Management in *The Vision of Piers Plowman*." *Exemplaria*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2013, pp. 130–51.
- Miller, Andrew G. "'Tails' of Masculinity: Knights, Clerics, and the Mutilation of Horses in Medieval England." *Speculum*, vol. 88, no. 4, 2013, pp. 958–95.
- Morse, Ruth. *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation and Reality*. Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Munro, Lucy. "Speaking History: Linguistic Memory and the Usable Past in the Early Modern History Play." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 76, no. 4, 2013, pp. 519–40.
- Newbold, Ron. "The Nature of Anger in Gregory of Tours' *Libri Historiarum*." *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, vol. 51, 2007, pp. 21–39.
- Newhauser, Richard G., and Susan J. Ridyard, editors. *Sin in Medieval and Early Modern Culture: The Tradition of the Seven Deadly Sins*. York Medieval P, 2012.
- Novikoff, Alex J. *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2013.
- O'Reilly, Jennifer. *Studies in the Iconography of the Vices and Virtues*. Garland, 1988.
- Ormrod, W. Mark. "The Language of Complaint: Multilingualism and Petitioning in Later Medieval England." Wogan-Browne et al., pp. 31–43.
- Orning, Hans Jacob. "Royal Anger between Christian Doctrine and Practical Exigencies." *Collegium Medievale*, vol. 22, 2009, pp. 34–54.
- Partner, Nancy. *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England*. U of Chicago P, 1997.
- Peverley, Sarah L. "Genealogy and John Hardyng's Verse Chronicle." *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval Britain and France*, edited by Raluca L. Radulescu and Edward Donald Kennedy, Brepols, 2008, pp. 259–82.
- Peyroux, Catherine. "Gertrude's *furor*: Reading anger in an early medieval saint's life." Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, pp. 36–56.
- Plamper, Jan. "The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara H. Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns." *History and Theory*, vol. 49, no. 2, 2010, pp. 237–65.
- *History of Emotions: An Introduction*. 2012. Translated by Keith Tribe, Oxford UP, 2015.
- Pollock, Linda A. "Anger and the Negotiation of Relationships in Early Modern England." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 47, no. 3, 2004, pp. 567–90.

Purdie, Rhiannon. "Medieval Romance and the Generic Frictions of Barbour's Bruce."

Barbour's Bruce and its Cultural Contexts: Politics, Chivalry, and Literature in Late Medieval Scotland, edited by Steve Boardman and Susan Foran. Boydell and Brewer, 2015, pp. 51–74.

----- and Michael Cichon, editors. *Medieval Romance, Medieval Contexts*. D.S. Brewer, 2011.

Radulescu, Raluca. *The Gentry Context for Malory's Morte Darthur*. D.S. Brewer, 2003.

----- "'Oute of Mesure': Violence and Knighthood in Malory's *Morte Darthur*." *Re-Viewing Le Morte Darthur: Texts and Contexts, Characters and Themes*, edited by K. S. Whetter and Raluca L. Radulescu, D.S. Brewer, 2005, pp. 119–31.

----- *Romance and its Contexts in Fifteenth-Century England: Politics, Piety, and Penitence*. D. S. Brewer, 2013.

Rajsic, Jaclyn, et al., editors. *The Prose Brut and Other Late Medieval Chronicles: Books Have Their Histories: Essays in Honour of Lister M. Matheson*. York Medieval P, 2016.

Reddy, William M. *Money and Liberty in Modern Europe: A Critique of Historical Understanding*. Cambridge UP, 1987.

Reddy, William M. *The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Postrevolutionary France, 1814–1848*. U of California P, 1997.

----- *The Making of Romantic Love: Longing and Sexuality in Europe, South Asia, and Japan, 900–1200 CE*. U of Chicago P, 2012.

----- *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge UP, 2001.

----- "Sentimentalism and its Erasure: The Role of Emotions in the Era of the French Revolution." *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 72, 2000, pp. 109–152.

Richardson, H. G. "The *Annales Paulini*." *Speculum*, vol. 23, no. 4, 1948, pp. 630–40.

Rosenfeld, Jessica. "Envy and Exemplarity in *The Book of Margery Kempe*." *Exemplaria*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2014, pp. 105–21.

Rosenwein, Barbara H., editor. *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*. Cornell UP, 1998.

----- "Afterword: Imagined Emotions for Imagined Communities." *Imagined Communities on the Baltic Rim from the Eleventh to Fifteenth Centuries*, edited by Wojtek Jezierski and Lars Hermanson, Amsterdamn UP, 2016, pp. 379–86.

----- *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Cornell UP, 2006.

----- "Review of William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling*." *American Historical Review*, vol. 107, no. 4, 2002, pp. 1181–82.

- "Theories of Change in the History of Emotions." *A History of Emotions, 1200–1800*, edited by Jonas Liliequist, Pickering & Chatto, 2012, pp. 7–20.
- "Worrying about Emotions in History." *American Historical Review*, vol. 107, no. 3, 2002, pp. 821–45.
- Rota, Michael. "The Moral Status of Anger: Thomas Aquinas and John Cassian." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 81, no. 3, 2007, pp. 395–418
- Saunders, Corinne. "Affective Reading: Chaucer, Women, and Romance," *Chaucer Review*, vol. 51, no. 1, 2016, pp. 11–14.
- Scase, Wendy. *Literature and Complaint in England, 1272–1553*. Oxford UP, 2007.
- Scheer, Monique. "Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (and is that what makes them have a history)?" *History and Theory*, vol. 51, 2012, pp. 193–220.
- Sikorska, Liliana. "Dealing with Anger: *Robert of Cisyle* and the Medieval Didactic Tradition." *Poetica*, vol. 66, 2006, pp. 115–25.
- Somerset, Fiona. *Feeling Like Saints: Lollard Writings after Wycliffe*. Cornell UP, 2014.
- and Nicholas Watson, editors. *Truth and Tales: Cultural mobility and medieval media*. Ohio State UP, 2015.
- Spiegel, Gabrielle, editor. *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*. Routledge, 2005.
- *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-century France*. U of California P, 1993.
- "Theory into Practice: Reading Medieval Chronicles." *The Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, 1999, pp. 1–12.
- Stearns, Peter N. *American Cool: Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style*. New York UP, 1994.
- *Shame: A Brief History*. U of Illinois P, 2017.
- and Carol Z. Stearns. *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America's History*. U of Chicago P, 1986.
- and Carol Z. Stearns. "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards." *The American Historical Review*, vol. 90, no. 4, 1985, pp. 813–36.
- Strohm, Paul. *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts*. Princeton UP, 1992.
- , editor. *Middle English*. Oxford UP, 2007

- Summerfield, Thea. "'Fi a debles,' quath the king': Language Mixing in England's Vernacular Historical Narratives, c.1290–c.1340." Wogan-Browne et al., pp. 68–90.
- Tiller, Kenneth J. "Lazamon's Leir: Language, Succession, and History." Allen et al., pp. 155–78.
- Trigg, Stephanie. "Chaucer's Silent Discourse." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, vol. 39, 2017, pp. 33–56.
- "Weeping like a beaten child: Figurative language and the emotions in Chaucer and Malory." Burger and Crocker, pp. 25–46.
- "Faces That Speak: A Little Emotion Machine in the Novels of Jane Austen." *Spaces for Feeling: Emotions and Sociabilities in Britain, 1650–1850*. Edited by Susan Broomhill, Routledge, 2015, pp. 185–201.
- Turcan, Robert and Yin Liu. "Middle English Romance as Prototype Genre." *Chaucer Review*, vol. 40, no. 4, 2006, pp. 335–53.
- Tuten, Belle S. and Tracey L. Billado, editors. *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White*. Ashgate, 2010.
- Vecchio, Silvana. "Ira mala / ira bona. Storia di un vizio che qualche volta è una virtù." *Doctor Seraphicus: Bollettino d'Informazione del Centro di Studi Bonaventuriani, Bagnoregio*, vol. 45, 1998, pp. 41–62.
- Wall-Randell, Sarah. *The Immaterial Book: Reading and Romance in Early Modern England*. U of Michigan P, 2013.
- Weiss, Judith. "Modern and Medieval Views on Swooning: The Literary and Medical Contexts of Fainting in Romance." *Medieval Romance, Medieval Contexts*, edited by Rhiannon Purdie and Michael Cichon, Boydell and Brewer, 2011, pp. 121–34.
- White, Stephen. "The Politics of Anger." Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, pp. 127–52.
- Windeatt, Barry. "Lazamon's Gestures: Body Language in the *Brut*." Allen et al., pp. 253–66.
- Wogan-Browne, Jocelyn, et al., editors. *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c. 1100–c. 1500*. York Medieval P, 2009.