King's College London

King's Research Portal

DOI:
10.1093/ehr/cex151

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Link to publication record in King's Research Portal

Citation for published version (APA):
Spencer, S. J. (2017). ‘Like a Raging Lion’: Richard the Lionheart’s Anger during the Third Crusade in Medieval and Modern Historiography. *The English Historical Review*, *132*(556), 495-532. https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cex151

Citing this paper
Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

•Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
•You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
•You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 26. Jan. 2025

[This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in *The English Historical Review* following peer review. The version of record Stephen J. Spencer, '"Like a Raging Lion": Richard the Lionheart's Anger during the Third Crusade in Medieval and Modern Historiography', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 132, issue 556 (June 2017), pp. 495–532 is available online at: https://academic.oup.com/ehr/article/132/556/495/3897145 and https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cex151].

'Like a Raging Lion': Richard the Lionheart's Anger during the Third Crusade in Medieval and Modern Historiography[*]

In *The Talisman*, first published in 1825, Sir Walter Scott imagined King Richard I of England (r. 1189–99), otherwise known as 'the Lionheart', responding irately to reports of the inactivity and defensive mindset of his troops, who were encamped somewhere between Acre and Ascalon: 'The English king chafed under these reports, like the imprisoned lion viewing his prey from the iron barriers of his cage. Naturally rash and impetuous, the irritability of his temper preyed on itself. … One faithful baron … dared alone to come between the dragon and his wrath'.[1] With this character-sketch established relatively early in the story, Richard emerges from the remaining pages as an impatient and ill-tempered king, who spits contemptuously while reading a letter from the Muslim Sultan Saladin, confronts Duke Leopold of Austria with a 'look of violent emotion', and who flies into 'a frenzy of passion' at the slightest provocation.[2] The persistence of this image outside academic circles has undoubtedly owed much to Scott's novels, including

[*] I am grateful to Thomas Asbridge, who offered invaluable advice and feedback at every stage in the writing of this article; to Andrew Buck for his typically erudite observations; and to Susan Edgington for her advice on several pieces of Latin. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at Cardiff, Leeds, and London: my thanks to the audiences on those occasions, and to the *EHR*'s anonymous readers, for their helpful comments and suggestions.

[1] Walter Scott, *Tales of the Crusaders*, III and IV: *The Talisman* (2 vols. of 4, Edinburgh, 1825), iii. 136–7.

[2] Ibid., iii. 187, 281, iv. 31.

Ivanhoe and *The Betrothed*, which profoundly shaped Victorian views of the crusades.[3] Nor should the cultural impact of L. Du Garde Peach's 1965 Ladybird history of the Lionheart be underestimated.[4] After all, many children in twentieth-century Britain would have first encountered the 'quarrelsome and very quick-tempered' figure of Richard I—set in the Scott mould—through this book, and as Gary Dickson has remarked, 'everyone knows that children's literature makes an excellent adhesive—perfect for sticking things in the memory'.[5]

One might be tempted to consign this view to the realms of 'popular imagination', but to do so would be to ignore the fact that on this point—the Lionheart's ferocious temper—popular and scholarly opinions have often coincided. To date, historians have almost universally characterised Richard as an intemperate hothead. Thus, in 1840, William Aytoun portrayed the king's temperament as a clear defect in his personality: 'He was choleric and passionate even to his friends, who … were forced to watch the countenance of their royal master, which never failed to give them warning, though short, of his rising anger'.[6] These 'fits', Aytoun continued, abated as suddenly as they arose, but 'during their continuance, it was wiser to avoid his presence than to brave the fury of the storm'.[7] The idea that Richard was emotionally unstable and irrational was echoed over a

---

[3] E. Siberry, *The New Crusaders: Images of the Crusades in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 112–30.

[4] L. Du Garde Peach, *Richard the Lion Heart* (Loughborough, 1965). These are just two of many works which have fuelled popular images of the Lionheart. For portrayals of Richard in film, see L.K. Stock, 'Now Starring in the Third Crusade: Depictions of Richard I and Saladin in Films and Television Series', in N. Haydock and E.L. Risden, eds., *Hollywood in the Holy Land: Essays on Film Depictions of the Crusades and Christian-Muslim Clashes* (Jefferson, NC, 2009), pp. 97–122.

[5] Du Garde Peach, *Richard the Lion Heart*, p. 8; G. Dickson, *The Children's Crusade: Medieval History, Modern Mythistory* (Basingstoke, 2008), p. 186. Du Garde Peach directly alluded to *The Talisman* and *Ivanhoe*, and this negative appraisal of Richard's wrath recurred throughout his book: Du Garde Peach, *Richard the Lion Heart*, pp. 26, 38, 12, 16, 18, 28, 40.

[6] William Edmondstoune Aytoun, *The Life and Times of Richard the First, Surnamed Coeur-de-Lion, King of England* (London, 1840), pp. 74–5.

[7] Ibid., p. 75.

century later by Sidney Painter, who personified him as 'little short of mad'.[8] In 1974, James Brundage subscribed to this view, suggesting that Richard's 'general emotional instability'—epitomised by his 'outbreaks of violent, unreasoning rage', which 'occurred with embarrassing frequency'—accounted for his 'final folly' in appointing his brother, John, count of Mortain, as heir-designate.[9] While much of Richard's reputation has been rehabilitated in recent years, his apparent susceptibility to anger continues to be espoused in modern historiography.[10] According to one recent biographer, Jean Flori, the king's 'ardent and immoderate temperament' inclined him towards boastfulness and self-glorification; and, even more recently, Jonathan Phillips has claimed that 'Richard could have the most volcanic temper'.[11]

The present study seeks to test the evidential foundations of this long-standing view, and to explain its genesis, by analysing descriptions of Richard's anger in the narratives of the Third Crusade—an expedition launched by Pope Gregory VIII in late October 1187, following a series of victories by Saladin earlier that year (most notably the defeat of the forces of the kingdom of Jerusalem at the battle of Hattin in July and the

---

[8] S. Painter, 'The Third Crusade: Richard the Lionhearted and Philip Augustus', in R.L. Wolff and H.W. Hazard, eds., *A History of the Crusades*, II: *The Later Crusades, 1189–1311* (2nd edn., Madison, WI, 1969), pp. 45–85, at 73.

[9] J.A. Brundage, *Richard Lion Heart* (New York, 1974), p. 255, and see also pp. 260–61.

[10] Important re-evaluations of Richard's character and career include J. Gillingham, 'Richard I and the Science of War in the Middle Ages', in J. Gillingham and J.C. Holt, eds., *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich* (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 78–91; J.O. Prestwich, 'Richard Coeur de Lion: *Rex Bellicosus*', in J.L. Nelson, ed., *Richard Coeur de Lion in History and Myth* (London, 1992), pp. 1–16; J. Gillingham, *Richard the Lionheart* (2nd edn., London, 1989); J. Gillingham, *Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the Twelfth Century* (London, 1994); J. Gillingham, *Richard I* (London, 1999); J. Flori, *Richard the Lionheart: King and Knight*, tr. J. Birrell (Edinburgh, 2006); T.S. Asbridge, 'Talking to the Enemy: The Role and Purpose of Negotiations between Saladin and Richard the Lionheart during the Third Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, xxxix (2013), pp. 275–96. An overview of earlier assessments is provided in R.V. Turner and R.R. Heiser, *The Reign of Richard Lionheart: Ruler of the Angevin Empire, 1189–1199* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 1–16. On the provisioning of Richard's crusade, see C. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades, 1095–1588* (Chicago, IL, 1988), pp. 75–85.

[11] Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, p. 348; J. Phillips, *Holy Warriors: A Modern History of the Crusades* (London, 2009), p. 138.

conquest of Jerusalem in early October). Richard I arrived in the Holy Land in early June 1191, having been delayed in Sicily and then Cyprus. Thereafter, he helped to engineer the capture of the port city of Acre, ordered the execution of the city's garrison, prosecuted a fighting march south along the coast of Palestine (achieving victory in the battle of Arsuf on 7 September 1191), and led two abortive advances on Jerusalem. In late July/early August 1192, he orchestrated the relief of Latin-held Jaffa, following a surprise attack by Saladin, and the enterprise came to an end with the agreement of a three-year truce (the Treaty of Jaffa) on 2 September 1192, leaving Jerusalem in Saladin's possession.[12]

Richard's conduct during the Third Crusade has been integral in formulating modern assessments of his temperament. For Jean Richard, the Lionheart's conquest of Cyprus in 1191 was 'essentially a product of chance circumstances, in which the passionate and brutal temperament of the Plantagenet was given free play'.[13] Similarly, discussing Richard's relationship with the English barons, Ralph Turner and Richard Heiser remarked that 'beneath his façade of courtesy lay a prickly personality, readily roused to outbursts of anger', with the king's actions during the Third Crusade—'for example, his aggressive behaviour at Messina or his insult to Leopold of Austria at Acre'—cited as supporting evidence.[14] In line with a generally unsympathetic assessment of the English monarch's crusading career, Michael Markowski tied 'Richard's terrible temper' to the apparent censorship of criticism towards the king in a history composed by

[12] For a detailed narrative of the Third Crusade, see T.S. Asbridge, *The Crusades: The War for the Holy Land* (London, 2010), pp. 367–516.
[13] J. Richard, *The Crusades, c.1071–c.1291*, tr. J. Birrell (Cambridge, 1999), p. 224.
[14] Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard Lionheart*, p. 245 n. 15.

one of his followers.[15] A belief that Richard's anger was both uncontrollable and socially dysfunctional seems to lie behind many of these characterisations—a view which has largely gone unchallenged. John Gillingham alone has sought, if only briefly, to place Richard's wrath in its twelfth-century context, acknowledging that 'Anger was part of the standard repertory of kingship; hence it was often—though not always—a controlled emotion'.[16]

Gillingham's cautionary interjection was seemingly inspired by a remark made by Stephen White in his contribution to the landmark collection of essays *Anger's Past*, published in 1998, which served as a catalyst for a generation of sustained research into medieval rancour and emotional styles more broadly.[17] It should be noted, however, that there is no single agreed-upon methodology for studying the emotions of the past. The emergence of the history of emotions as a field has been accompanied by the formation of various interpretative frameworks, perhaps the most influential being William Reddy's 'emotional regimes', Barbara Rosenwein's 'emotional communities', and Monique Scheer's ground-breaking study of emotions as a kind of practice.[18] Two recent trends also deserve comment. There are growing calls for a more comprehensive integration of literary studies into the history of emotions, while some scholars are starting to explore

[15] M. Markowski, 'Richard Lionheart: Bad King, Bad Crusader?', *Journal of Medieval History*, xxiii (1997), pp. 351–65, at 362 n. 67.
[16] Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 169.
[17] Ibid., p. 169 n. 65; S.D. White, 'The Politics of Anger', in B.H. Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1998), pp. 127–52, at 142. Two excellent introductions to the history of emotions are J. Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, tr. K. Tribe (Oxford, 2015); S.J. Matt and P.N. Stearns, eds., *Doing Emotions History* (Chicago, IL, 2014). The literature on medieval emotions is vast; see especially D. Boquet and P. Nagy, *Sensible Moyen Âge: Une histoire des émotions dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris, 2015), and B.H. Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600–1700* (Cambridge, 2016).
[18] W.M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 124–9; B.H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 2006); M. Scheer, 'Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (and Is That What Makes Them Have a History)? A Bourdieuian Approach to Understanding Emotion', *History and Theory*, li (2012), pp. 193–220.

the ways in which neuroscience might enhance our understanding of premodern passions.[19] At the heart of the present study, however, lies 'social constructionism'—the idea that, rather than simply being 'hardwired', emotions and the valuations a person or society attaches to them are conditioned by social and cultural stimuli.[20] More specifically, my position is that of the 'weak' social constructionist: there is undoubtedly an important corporeal substratum to emotions, but this is just one element in their make-up.[21] The social constructionist approach is not without its critics, yet it remains the most popular and flexible methodology for studying the emotional standards of the Middle Ages.[22] Furthermore, following the lead of Rosenwein and Robert Kaster respectively, medieval philosophical and theological treatises are used here as an entry-point into the emotional ideals of the period, and emotions are also treated in terms of 'narrative processes or scripts', for this allows us to 'more directly get at what a given form of emotion is about without becoming embroiled in the tedious regress of defining emotion-terms via other emotion-terms that in turn need definition'.[23]

While the historian of medieval anger can now call upon an impressive panoply of scholarship and a range of theoretical approaches, Richard I's indignation has been passed over, even in the seminal treatments of *ira regis* ('the anger of the king') by John

---

[19] S. McNamer, 'The Literariness of Literature and the History of Emotion', *PMLA*, cxxx (2015), pp. 1433–42; J. Bourke, 'An Experiment in "Neurohistory": Reading Emotions in Aelred's *De Institutione Inclusarum* (*Rule for a Recluse*)', *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures*, xlii (2016), pp. 124–42.
[20] R. Harré, 'An Outline of the Social Constructionist Viewpoint', in R. Harré, ed., *The Social Construction of Emotions* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 2–14; C.A. Lutz and G.M. White, 'The Anthropology of Emotions', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, xv (1986), pp. 405–36.
[21] See B.H. Rosenwein, 'Worrying about Emotions in History', *American Historical Review*, cvii (2002), pp. 821–45, at 837.
[22] W.M. Reddy, 'Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions', *Current Anthropology*, xxxviii (1997), pp. 327–51.
[23] B.H. Rosenwein, 'Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions', *Passions in Context*, i (2010), pp. 1–32, at 14–15; R.A. Kaster, *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 2005), p. 8.

Jolliffe and Gerd Althoff.[24] This omission is particularly surprising, for the twelfth century has been identified as a transformative period, during which the ideals associated with royal anger underwent significant development and reached their apogee.[25] It will not be suggested here that Richard was a meek or tranquil king, or even that he was always in control of his passions. Rather, it will be argued that there exists a disparity between how most medieval chroniclers perceived Richard's wrath and the evaluations of modern historians; and that the nature of the source material curtails any attempt to reconstruct the 'reality' of the king's temperament. Whether lived emotional experiences can be extracted from twelfth- and thirteenth-century historical narratives has divided scholarly opinion.[26] I have argued elsewhere that accepting the emotional content of crusade histories as straightforward evidence of protagonists' actual feelings is fraught with methodological problems: not only does such an approach fail to appreciate the literary functions of emotional descriptors, but it also ignores the guiding principles and influences which lie behind accounts of emotionally charged scenes.[27] As we shall see, in the case of Richard the Lionheart these issues are compounded by the inherently partisan nature of the sources, which tend to either glorify or condemn the king's actions, and the mythology which engulfed his character, even during his lifetime. In focusing on

[24] J.E.A. Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship* (2nd edn., London, 1963), pp. 87–109; G. Althoff, '*Ira Regis*: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger', in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, pp. 59–74.
[25] Althoff, '*Ira Regis*', pp. 73, 74; H.J. Orning, 'Royal Anger between Christian Doctrine and Practical Exigencies', *Collegium Medievale*, xxii (2009), pp. 34–54. In contrast, P.R. Hyams, 'What did Henry III of England Think in Bed and in French about Kingship and Anger?', in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, pp. 92–124, at 103–5, has emphasised the importance of *clementia* in the twelfth century.
[26] Compare White, 'Politics of Anger', p. 137, and P.R. Hyams, *Rancor and Reconciliation in Medieval England* (Ithaca, NY, 2003), pp. 63, 66. See also J.H. Arnold, 'Inside and Outside the Medieval Laity: Some Reflections on the History of Emotions', in M. Rubin, ed., *European Religious Cultures: Essays Offered to Christopher Brooke on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday* (London, 2008), pp. 107–29.
[27] S.J. Spencer, 'The Emotional Rhetoric of Crusader Spirituality in the Narratives of the First Crusade', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, lviii (2014), pp. 57–86; S.J. Spencer, 'The Representation and Function of Emotion in Narratives of the Crusades, *c.*1095–*c.*1291' (Queen Mary University of London Ph.D. thesis, 2015), esp. pp. 336–51.

representations of Richard's temperament, the following analysis dovetails with, and seeks to contribute to, a growing corpus of scholarship which is chiefly concerned with the memorialisation of the crusades, rather than the reconstruction of events, or indeed personalities.[28] There are three parts. The first maps the evolution of attitudes towards anger in the Middle Ages, thereby elucidating the frameworks against which contemporary chroniclers are likely to have interpreted Richard's ire. The twelfth- and thirteenth-century narrative accounts of Richard's wrath are then scrutinised, focusing specifically on the infamous execution of Muslim prisoners at Acre in the summer of 1191, in order to demonstrate that the current historiographical consensus is largely unsupported by the contemporary sources. The final part seeks to explain why historians have persisted in casting Richard as an individual who was unusually susceptible to irrational fits of rage. An examination of the interplay between modern historiographical interests in ideological violence and the leonine representations of Richard in twelfth- and thirteenth-century narratives points to the need for a more nuanced understanding of the role of memorialisation in the study of medieval emotions.

I

In order to understand representations of Richard's wrath in medieval chronicles, we need to be aware of changing attitudes towards anger in western Europe during the Middle Ages. Traditionally, Christianity counted anger, *ira*, as a deadly sin, a view

[28] J. Flori, *Chroniqueurs et propagandistes: Introduction critique aux sources de la première croisade* (Geneva, 2010); C. Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades* (Manchester, 2011), pp. 7–36; N.L. Paul and S. Yeager, eds., *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, Image, and Identity* (Baltimore, MD, 2012); M.G. Bull and D. Kempf, eds., *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge, 2014).

expressed by Alcuin of York (*c*.730–804): 'Anger is one of the eight principal vices. If it is not controlled by reason, it is turned into raging fury, such that a man has no power over his own soul and does unseemly things'.[29] Classical authorities, such as Seneca, and biblical testimony aligned on this point: anger was a vice to be either eschewed or controlled, and this remained the dominant interpretation of the emotion throughout the Middle Ages.[30]

Nevertheless, a degree of ambivalence can be detected among early Christian theologians. After all, the Bible was replete with stories of God's righteous ire, and biblical verses such as Psalm 4.5, 'Be angry, and sin not', were frequently cited by Christian commentators on anger.[31] In the fifth century, Augustine of Hippo toyed with the idea that anger might be useful for correcting wrongdoers, despite emphasising its destructive nature.[32] Gregory the Great appears to have been more sceptical, warning that anger taken up as 'an instrument of virtue' ('instrumento virtutis') could rule over one's mind, although he differentiated between *ira per vitium* (anger through vice) and *ira per zelum* (anger through zeal), with the latter deemed the lesser of two evils.[33] Alcuin of York, the same author who categorised *ira* as a vice, went a step further, insisting that anger was 'just and necessary' ('justa et necessaria') when directed internally at one's

---

[29] 'Ira una est de octo vitiis principalibus, quae si ratione non regitur, in furorem vertitur: ita ut homo sui animi impotens erit, faciens quae non convenit': Alcuin of York, *De virtutibus et vitiis liber ad Widonem comitem*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia cursus completus: series Latina* (221 vols., Paris, 1844–64) [hereafter *PL*], ci, col. 634; G. Bührer-Thierry, '"Just Anger" or "Vengeful Anger"? The Punishment of Blinding in the Early Medieval West', in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, pp. 75–91, at 75.

[30] See Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *De ira*, ed. and tr. J.M. Cooper and J.F. Procopé, *Seneca: Moral and Political Essays* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 1–116.

[31] For example, Alcuin of York, *De virtutibus et vitiis liber*, *PL*, ci, col. 631; Hincmar of Rheims, *De cavendis vitiis et virtutibus exercendis ad Carolum Calvum regem*, *PL*, cxxv, col. 880; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, XLIV: *Well-Tempered Passion (2a2ae. 155–70)*, ed. and tr. T. Gilby (London, 1972), p. 56.

[32] Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei*, *PL*, xli, col. 260; G. Gillette, *Four Faces of Anger: Seneca, Evagrius Ponticus, Cassian, and Augustine* (Lanham, MD, 2010), pp. 98–116.

[33] Gregory the Great, *Moralium libri, sive expositio in librum B. Job*, *PL*, lxxv, cols. 726–7.

own sins, while Hugh of Saint Victor, writing in the twelfth century, believed that 'anger is good when through it you refuse to do evil'.[34] Models of beneficial wrath were thus emerging, whereby anger's usefulness in combating internal sin became theologically approved. This rehabilitation process culminated in the development of *ira per zelum* as a virtuous species of anger, which could not only be legitimately harnessed internally to rectify one's own faults, but also externally to admonish evildoers. Though the concept of righteous, zealous wrath against sinners was undoubtedly circulating in the twelfth century, it was most pointedly expressed by Thomas of Chobham in the early thirteenth century: 'Anger through zeal is when we are angry against vice and against the vicious, and we can desire that this anger increases, because it is a virtue'.[35] The notion that anger could be socially beneficial was echoed by the great thirteenth-century theologian Thomas Aquinas, whose taxonomy of emotions and typology of anger were directly influenced by Aristotle's works.[36]

Significantly, this concept of virtuous wrath extended beyond the realms of philosophy and theology, for a string of recent studies has highlighted its presence in twelfth-century historical narratives, primarily in descriptions of royal and aristocratic anger. *Ira regis* was closely connected to the righteous wrath of God, Christ, and the Old

---

[34] Alcuin of York, *De virtutibus et vitiis liber*, *PL*, ci, col. 631; 'Est autem bona ira, qua dedignaris malum facere': Hugh of Saint Victor, *Allegoriae in Novum Testamentum*, *PL*, clxxv, col. 775; R.E. Barton, '"Zealous Anger" and the Renegotiation of Aristocratic Relationships in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France', in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, pp. 153–70, at 156–7.

[35] 'Ira autem per zelum est quando irascimur contra vitia et contra vitiosos, et possumus optare quod talis ira crescat, quia virtus est': Thomas of Chobham, *Summa confessorum*, ed. F. Broomfield (Louvain, 1968), p. 414; S.A. Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 1095–1216* (Farnham, 2011), p. 159.

[36] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, ed. Gilby, p. 56; M.B. Cels, 'God's Wrath Against the Wrathful in Medieval Mendicant Preaching', *Canadian Journal of History*, xliii (2008), pp. 217–26, at 221; S. Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy* (Oxford, 2004), p. 254. Unlike the Stoics, Aristotle maintained that anger was appropriate under certain conditions: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, ed. J. Barnes, *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation* (2 vols., Princeton, NJ, 1991), ii. 60–61.

Testament kings.[37] As Jolliffe demonstrated in his study of Angevin kingship, and others have since reiterated, a monarch's anger operated as a tool for bringing dissenting individuals under his authority. It might publicly signal his determination to go to war or the alteration of a social relationship, as in the case of King Philip II Augustus of France's rancorous hewing of the elm at Gisors in 1188, but it was also often unpredictable.[38] Lordly anger operated along similar lines: angry displays regularly facilitated the restructuring of social and political relationships between aristocrats.[39] *Iniuria* was an essential principle in determining the righteousness of a protagonist's wrath, with White and others having identified a widely attested emotional script in medieval histories whereby the receipt of injuries elicited feelings of shame and anger, which in turn motivated acts of vengeance.[40]

As Kate McGrath has convincingly argued, representations of nobles who raged uncontrollably offer the clearest indicators of ideal aristocratic conduct in relation to

---

[37] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, p. 98; Barton, '"Zealous Anger"', pp. 157–9.
[38] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, pp. 96–7, 106; Althoff, '*Ira Regis*'; L. Diggelmann, 'Hewing the Ancient Elm: Anger, Arboricide, and Medieval Kingship', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, xl (2010), pp. 249–72; K. McGrath, 'Royal Madness and the Law: The Role of Anger in Representations of Royal Authority in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Anglo-Norman Texts', in W.J. Turner, ed., *Madness in Medieval Law and Custom* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 123–45; Orning, 'Royal Anger', pp. 46–9; H.J. Orning, *Unpredictability and Presence: Norwegian Kingship in the High Middle Ages*, tr. A. Crozier (Leiden, 2008), pp. 168–94, 316. See also L. Smagghe, *Les émotions du prince: Émotion et discours politique dans l'espace bourguignon* (Paris, 2012), pp. 167–292; Boquet and Nagy, *Sensible Moyen Âge*, pp. 240–48; P. Nash, 'Reality and Ritual in the Medieval King's Emotions of *Ira* and *Clementia*', in M. Champion and A. Lynch, eds., *Understanding Emotions in Early Europe* (Turnhout, 2015), pp. 251–71. Classical authorities were generally more critical of royal anger: W.V. Harris, *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA, 2001), pp. 229–63.
[39] Barton, '"Zealous Anger"', pp. 153–70; R.E. Barton, 'Emotions and Power in Orderic Vitalis', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, xxxiii (2011), pp. 41–59, at 50–53; K. McGrath, 'The Politics of Chivalry: The Function of Anger and Shame in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Anglo-Norman Historical Narratives', in B.S. Tuten and T.L. Billado, eds., *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 55–69.
[40] White, 'Politics of Anger', pp. 142–5; R.F. Newbold, 'The Nature of Anger in Gregory of Tours' *Libri Historiarum*', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, li (2007), pp. 21–39, at 26–30, 33–4; Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 21–2, 161–5.

anger.[41] Twelfth- and thirteenth-century crusade commentators appear to have drawn upon a set of conventional traits and *topoi*, many of which also featured in texts not directly concerned with crusading, in order to articulate dysfunctional forms of anger. *Furor* and *rabies* were often used by Latin chroniclers, both inside and outside a crusading context, to designate disproportionate rage, since they possessed strong connotations of irrationality and madness and were considered bestial qualities.[42] Indeed, Richard Barton has identified a semantic distinction in the Latin terminology of anger whereby *ira* was utilised to communicate righteous wrath and *furor* to express insensate fury.[43] Other common markers of dysfunctional anger included accusations of demonic possession, commenting on the duration of a protagonist's rage, and emphasising the violence of anger and the brutality it inspired. In the context of this article, the latter is particularly important and requires further comment. Unrestrained bouts of anger were frequently represented as motivating derogatory speeches and violent actions. This perception can be traced back to Matthew 5.21–24, the *locus classicus* for Christian teachings on anger, which, as Marc Cels has observed, 'provides a triple gradation of anger from feelings, to utterances, to harmful acts'.[44] The violence of an individual's wrath was frequently expressed by using the adjective *vehemens* or the adverb *vehementer*, but also by highlighting their physiological symptoms, such as a savage

---

[41] McGrath, 'Politics of Chivalry', p. 64.
[42] C. Peyroux, 'Gertrude's *Furor*: Reading Anger in an Early Medieval Saint's *Life*', in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, pp. 36–55, at 44–5; R.E. Barton, 'Gendering Anger: *Ira*, *Furor*, and Discourses of Power and Masculinity in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in R. Newhauser, ed., *In the Garden of Evil: The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Toronto, 2005), pp. 371–92, at 383–7.
[43] Barton, 'Gendering Anger', pp. 387, 389.
[44] M.B. Cels, 'Interrogating Anger in the New Penitential Literature of the Thirteenth Century', *Viator*, xlv (2014), pp. 203–19, at 207–8.

expression, threatening eyes, or a terrifying voice.[45] This list is by no means exhaustive, but each attribute would probably have signalled to medieval audiences the impropriety and uncontrollable nature of the character's wrath.

II

It is against this backdrop of contemporary evaluations of anger, and the ways in which chroniclers depicted appropriate and dysfunctional species of wrath, that accounts of Richard the Lionheart's indignation should be assessed. One event, more than any other, has seemingly shaped both popular and scholarly opinions of Richard's character, including his temperament: the king of England's decision to execute around 2,600 Muslim prisoners at Acre on 20 August 1191.[46] This happened following Saladin's failure to uphold the terms of an agreement made when the city's Muslim garrison surrendered to the crusaders on 12 July 1191, after a siege of nearly two years. The pact agreed that day stipulated that the Muslim garrison would be held as hostages and only released if Saladin fulfilled several terms within thirty days. These included the return of the relic of the True Cross captured at Hattin in 1187, the release of 1,600 Christian prisoners, and the payment of 200,000 dinars.[47] In the weeks that followed, a series of negotiations took place between representatives of Richard and Saladin, until on 20

[45] These symptoms are taken from Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. Henry Richards Luard, Rolls Series, lvii (7 vols., London, 1872–83), iv. 474, though they were commonly associated with wrath. See John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, ed. C.C.I. Webb (2 vols., Oxford, 1909), i. 266; A. Classen, 'Anger and Anger Management in the Middle Ages: Mental-Historical Perspectives', *Mediaevistik*, xix (2006), pp. 21–50, at 28–9.
[46] The figure of 2,600 Muslim dead derives from Richard's letter to the abbot of Clairvaux, in Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. William Stubbs, Rolls Series, li (4 vols., London, 1868–71), iii. 131.
[47] These details derive from Baha al-Din Ibn Shaddad, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, tr. D.S. Richards (Aldershot, 2002), p. 161.

August Richard had the majority of the Muslim prisoners led out of Acre and slaughtered in full view of Saladin's army.[48]

Scholars have primarily explained this act as deriving from Richard's short temper, a view typified by Brundage's version of proceedings: 'As the days passed, Richard's fury increased proportionally. When the twentieth of August arrived and still no concessions had been made by his antagonists, Richard's fury burst its bounds. He would wait for the enemy no longer'.[49] While a range of alternative reasons for Richard's actions have been suggested in recent years, such as the king's desire to move the army on swiftly or to show Saladin the sort of enemy he faced, 'Richard lost his temper' or 'flew into a rage' remain customary explanations, even when other contributing factors are taken into consideration.[50] Jonathan Riley-Smith wrote that 'in a fit of rage Richard ordered the massacre of most of the hostages', and Hans Mayer arrived at a similar conclusion: 'The list of the Saracen dead was considerably lengthened when, in a fit of anger, Richard had the 3,000 prisoners murdered'.[51] As the phrase 'fit of rage/anger'

---

[48] For a reconstruction of these negotiations, see Asbridge, *The Crusades*, pp. 450–52.
[49] Brundage, *Richard Lion Heart*, p. 135.
[50] Gillingham, *Richard the Lionheart*, pp. 182–4; Gillingham, *Richard I*, pp. 169–71; C. Tyerman, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (London, 2006), p. 457; Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 453; Painter, 'The Third Crusade', p. 72; T.F. Madden, *The New Concise History of the Crusades* (rev. edn., Lanham, MD, 2005), p. 88.
[51] J.S.C. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A Short History* (London, 1987), p. 116; H.E. Mayer, *The Crusades*, tr. J. Gillingham (2nd edn., Oxford, 1988), p. 146. See also J.N. Claster, *Sacred Violence: The European Crusades to the Middle East, 1095–1396* (Toronto, 2009), p. 206; Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 455; J. France, 'Surrender and Capitulation in the Middle East in the Age of the Crusades', in H. Afflerbach and H. Strachan, eds., *How Fighting Ends: A History of Surrender* (Oxford, 2012), repr. in J. France, *Warfare, Crusade and Conquest in the Middle Ages* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 73–84, at 79. Others have refrained from commenting on Richard's wrath at Acre: Richard, *The Crusades*, pp. 227–8; Y. Friedman, *Encounter between Enemies: Captivity and Ransom in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Leiden, 2002), pp. 90–93; M.C. Lyons and D.E.P. Jackson, *Saladin: The Politics of the Holy War* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 333; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 455–7.

indicates, these comments typify the broader historiographical tendency to impute an unrelenting and distinctly negative form of anger to the Lionheart.[52]

The problem with this interpretation is that only a handful of contemporary writers actually presented Richard's decision to execute the prisoners as being motivated by insatiable rage. The German author (or compiler) of the *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, commonly referred to as 'Ansbert', reported that 'the king of England was annoyed, just as the violence of his fury often stirred him up, and he had them all slaughtered apart from a handful of nobles whom he kept as prisoners'.[53] Richard's violence was depicted as stemming from uncontained rage (*furor*), and it was also suggested that he was characteristically prone to anger—'the violence of his fury often stirred him up'. Ansbert's account of this episode needs to be seen in the context of his generally scathing assessment of the English monarch. In fact, it sits within a particularly vitriolic section of the work, in which the author repeatedly stresses Richard's pride, the root of all sin. His 'unrestrained haughtiness' ('fastus intemperantia'), we are told, ended up causing him harm and was the key factor behind Philip Augustus' decision to return home.[54] Despite remaining in the Holy Land longer than others, the king of England 'deserved the indignation of all' ('omnium indignationem meruit'), and his arrogance (*arrogantia*) was duly punished by God when Duke Leopold of Austria, whom Richard

[52] See the entries for 'fit' ('a sudden burst of intense emotion') and 'rage' ('violent uncontrollable anger') in the *Oxford Dictionary of English* (3rd edn., Oxford, 2010).

[53] 'conmotus rex Anglie, sicut vehementia sui furoris eum sepius exagitavit, omnes trucidavit preter paucissimos nobiles quos adhuc in spe alterius pacti captos reservavit': Ansbert, *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, nova series, V (Berlin, 1928), p. 99. The author is referred to as 'Ansbert' merely for convenience. The *Historia de expeditione* appears to be a composite text, created *c*.1200: G.A. Loud, *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa: The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 1–7.

[54] Ansbert, *Historia*, ed. Chroust, pp. 98, 100.

had earlier treated with contempt, took him captive during his return journey.[55] Ansbert was unequivocal: this was the just judgement of God.[56] *Furor* was thus one of a series of negative characteristics imputed to Richard in this section of the *Historia de expeditione*.

Another twelfth-century Latin writer, Rigord, a French monk at St-Denis, also offered a generally antagonistic account of the massacre:

> Because [the Saracens] were not able to accomplish what they had sworn to do, the king of England, violently angry, led the pagan prisoners out of the city and then had 5,000 or more beheaded. He kept the greater and wealthier, for whose ransom he received an immense sum of money… [57]

There are several indications that Rigord disapproved of Richard's wrath and may have been attempting to infer that it was disproportionate, despite not characterising it as *furor*. The use of *vehementer* to qualify *iratus* signified the violence of his anger, and Rigord also claimed that a significantly higher number of Muslims—some 5,000—were decapitated. Yet this is hardly surprising, given that Rigord was a biographer of Philip Augustus, Richard's rival during the expedition, and openly admitted that he had no intention of composing a history (*historia*) or account of the deeds (*gesta*) of the king of England.[58] A comparison with an earlier scene in Rigord's text supports the suggestion

---

[55] Ibid., p. 101. On Richard's captivity, see J. Gillingham, 'The Kidnapped King: Richard I in Germany, 1192–1194', *German Historical Institute London Bulletin*, xxx (2008), pp. 5–34.
[56] Ansbert, *Historia*, ed. Chroust, p. 101.
[57] 'Quod quia facere quod juraverant ad effectum perducere non potuerunt, rex Anglie, vehementer iratus, captivos paganos extra civitatem educens V milia et eo amplius decollari fecit, retentis majoribus et ditioribus a quibus innumeram pecunie summam pro redemptione accepit': Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, ed. and tr. E. Carpentier, G. Pon and Y. Chauvin, *Rigord: Histoire de Philippe Auguste* (Paris, 2006), pp. 306–8.
[58] Ibid., p. 308.

that this was a hostile account of Richard's ire. Rigord described how Philip commanded Richard, 'as if [he was] his man' ('quasi hominem suum'), to prepare to sail from Messina in mid-March 1191. Though the English monarch refused, several of his barons, including the rebellious Poitevin noble Geoffrey de Rancon and the viscount of Châteaudun, had earlier sworn that they would leave with the French king, and now recognised their obligation to him. At this, Richard grew 'vehementer iratus'—the same phrase used to describe his wrath at Acre—and vowed to disinherit them.[59] Tellingly, Rigord presented this episode as a pivotal moment in relations between the two kings, after which discords, jealousies and enmities arose.[60]

In contrast to the accounts of Ansbert and Rigord, as well as the dominant opinion espoused in modern studies, most twelfth- and thirteenth-century writers represented Richard's anger at Acre as the correct response to Saladin's inability to fulfil his obligations. One of the earliest accounts is found in the *Estoire de la guerre sainte*, completed at some point between 1194 and 1199 by Ambroise, a cleric in Richard's army. Ambroise recorded that the king was 'annoyed and displeased' ('grevoit et despleisoit') at Saladin's delaying tactics, and in order to 'bring down the pride of the Turks, disgrace their religion and avenge Christianity, he brought out of the town, in bonds, two thousand and seven hundred people who were all slaughtered'.[61] For Ambroise, this act constituted vengeance (*vengié*) for the sufferings the crusaders had

---

[59] Ibid., pp. 288–90.
[60] Ibid., p. 290.
[61] 'Mais por l'orgoil des Turs/ abatre,/ Et por lor lei desaëngier,/ Et por cristïenté vengier,/ En fist mener hors de la vile/ Totz lïez, .vii.c. et deus mile,/ Qui trestuit furent detrenchié': Ambroise, *The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, ed. M.J. Ailes and M. Barber, tr. M.J. Ailes (2 vols., Woodbridge, 2003), i. 89 (tr. at ii. 108). On Ambroise's portrayal of Richard more generally, see M.J. Ailes, 'Heroes of War: Ambroise's Heroes of the Third Crusade', in C. Saunders, F. Le Saux, and N. Thomas, eds., *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 29–48, at 37–47.

endured during the siege.[62] Of course, *grevoit* could simply be translated as ‘aggrieved’, rather than ‘annoyed’ (as Marianne Ailes rendered it), but we should bear in mind that there existed significant overlap between the vocabularies of anger and grief in Old French.[63] For example, *dol* could indicate grief or anger—or a combination of both, a sort of angry sorrow—and the same is true of *ire*: thus, Geoffrey of Villehardouin, marshal of Champagne, twice employed the construction ‘mult iriez et mult dolent’ in his chronicle of the Fourth Crusade.[64] The meanings of *grevoit* aside, it is clear that this term, in conjunction with *despleisoit* and vengeance terminology, functioned as part of an emotional script, with anger/grief both signalling the illegitimacy of Saladin’s procrastination, which required vengeance, and justifying Richard’s execution of the captives. Ambroise’s deployment of these emotion-words tallies with his repeated insistence that Saladin had defaulted on the agreement; indeed, Ailes has identified the execution of prisoners as a turning-point in the *Estoire*, after which Saladin’s brother, al-Adil, took on the sultan’s chivalric traits.[65]

Writing before 1200, Ralph of Diceto similarly interpreted the execution as an act of vengeance—around 2,000 Saracens underwent capital punishment ‘in revenge’ (‘in ultionem’)—and an array of other Anglo-Norman commentators utilised anger

[62] Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, ed. Ailes and Barber, i. 89 (tr. at ii. 108).

[63] See the entries for *grever* in A. Hindley, F.W. Langley and B.J. Levy, *Old French–English Dictionary* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 351.

[64] Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. Faral (2 vols., Paris, 1938–9), ii. 208, 232. See also F.L. Cheyette and H. Chickering, ‘Love, Anger, and Peace: Social Practice and Poetic Play in the Ending of *Yvain*’, *Speculum*, lxxx (2005), pp. 75–117, at 105; White, ‘Politics of Anger’, p. 135; Hyams, *Rancor and Reconciliation*, p. 36.

[65] Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, ed. Ailes and Barber, i. 88–9 (tr. at ii. 107–8); M.J. Ailes, ‘The Admirable Enemy? Saladin and Saphadin in Ambroise’s *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*’, in N. Housley, ed., *Knighthoods of Christ: Essays on the History of the Crusades and the Knights Templar, Presented to Malcolm Barber* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 51–64, at 59–63.

terminology and other emotion-words to signify the righteousness of the massacre.[66] The royal clerk Roger of Howden, who wrote the crusading portions of his *Gesta regis Henrici secundi* and *Chronica* following his return from the East in August 1191, attempted to justify Richard's actions by making Duke Hugh of Burgundy complicit in the execution and by claiming that Saladin had beheaded Christian captives beforehand.[67] According to this chronicler, Richard had threatened Saladin with the execution of the captives much earlier in August than was reported elsewhere, thereby establishing the events of 20 August as the logical outcome of the sultan's failure to fulfil the terms.[68] In the *Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, this exoneration was also achieved through the emotional response attributed to Richard—he 'grieved violently' ('doluit vehementer') when, on 19 August, he heard that Saladin had killed the Christian captives, a phrase which indicated the receipt of an injustice and so legitimised the execution of Muslims.[69] Significantly, rather than succumbing to a mad frenzy, the king was depicted as being in control of his passions: Roger explained that Richard did not decide to kill the captives on 19 August, but did so the following day.[70]

The righteous nature of Richard's wrath at Acre was emphasised most emphatically by William of Newburgh, a non-participant who finished his *Historia rerum Anglicarum*

---

[66] Ralph of Diceto, *Ymagines historiarum*, ed. William Stubbs, *Radulfi de Diceto decani Lundoniensis Opera Historica*, Rolls Series, lxviii (2 vols., London, 1876), ii. 94. Roger of Wendover also presented the massacre as vengeance (*ultio*) and later suggested that Muslims who heard news of that event feared Richard would inflict a similar punishment in his rage (*rabies*): Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, ed. Henry O. Coxe (4 vols., London, 1841–2), iii. 42, 44.
[67] Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, ed. William Stubbs, Rolls Series, xlix (2 vols., London, 1867), ii. 189; Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 127–8. On Roger of Howden's working method and the relationship between his two texts, see D. Corner, 'The *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi* and *Chronica* of Roger, Parson of Howden', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, lvi (1983), pp. 126–44; J. Gillingham, 'Roger of Howden on Crusade', in Gillingham, *Richard Coeur de Lion*, pp. 141–53.
[68] Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 127.
[69] Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 189. Richard's grief was excluded from Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 127–8.
[70] Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 189.

between 1196 and 1198.[71] Immediately after reporting that Saladin failed to return the True Cross and ransom the captives, William remarked that the king of England, 'ignited with just zeal' ('justo ignitus zelo'), ordered the decapitation of 2,600 prisoners.[72] Susanna Throop has persuasively argued that the Latin term *zelus* was 'a composite of passionate love, jealous protectiveness, and angry hostility', which was closely associated with the idea of crusading as an act of vengeance.[73] As we have seen, *zelus* was linked to the concept of virtuous anger at sin and sinners (*ira per zelum*), and so had strong connotations of righteous anger. William of Newburgh undoubtedly considered the Lionheart's wrath as just (*justus*)—as shown by the fact that he consistently deployed *zelus* to indicate legitimate anger elsewhere in his *Historia*. Accused of conspiring with Saladin, Count Raymond III of Tripoli was driven from Tyre by the zeal (*zelus*) of Conrad of Montferrat in 1187; and, indignant (*indignans*) over Christ's crucifixion, the Christians unleashed their zeal (*zelus*) against the Jews in 1190, although those responsible for massacring the Jewish community at York were criticised for being motivated more by hatred than the zeal of justice ('magis malitiae quam zelo justitiae saevierunt').[74] Furthermore, Richard I was 'inflamed by righteous zeal to vengeance' ('justo ad ultionem zelo inflammatus') against the Greek ruler of Cyprus, Isaac Doukas Komnenos, for his maltreatment of shipwrecked crusaders.[75] These examples suggest that, for William, *zelus* was inextricably linked to notions of righteous wrath and

---

[71] A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c.550 to c.1307* (London, 1974), p. 263.
[72] William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, ed. Richard Howlett, *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, Rolls Series, lxxxii (4 vols., 1884–9), i. 359.
[73] Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 145–71, at 170; S.A. Throop, 'Zeal, Anger and Vengeance: The Emotional Rhetoric of Crusading', in S.A. Throop and P.R. Hyams, eds., *Vengeance in the Middle Ages: Emotion, Religion and Feud* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 177–201.
[74] William of Newburgh, *Historia*, ed. Howlett, i. 263, 308, 310, 322.
[75] Ibid., i. 350.

vengeance; as such, its inclusion in his account of the Acre execution established Richard's decision as unambiguously just.

Crucially, some writers who were not necessarily predisposed to portray the Lionheart in a positive light reported his anger in much the same way as the Anglo-Norman commentators. William the Breton, another French biographer of Philip Augustus, wrote that Richard began to 'swell with just anger' ('justa … bile tumescens').[76] Jacques de Vitry, bishop of Acre (1216–27), certainly approved of Richard's anger and its violent ramifications. In his *Historia orientalis*, composed between 1216 and 1224, Jacques stated that, since the Saracens could not find the True Cross, 'angry and indignant, the king of England ordered all those who were in his share [of the captives] to be slaughtered'.[77] The king of France—who had, in reality, already returned to the West—was said to have conducted himself 'more temperately and more gently' ('temperantius et mitius'), keeping his share for the exchange of prisoners.[78] For Jacques, Richard's wrath was more beneficial than Philip's gentleness: 'However, the king of England did more to injure and weaken the enemies by killing many thousands who could have done the greatest harm to the Christians in the future'.[79] This not only fits with Jacques' generally eulogistic portrayal of Richard—he only questioned the king's loyalty to the expedition after the second retreat from Jerusalem in July 1192, remarking

---

[76] William the Breton, *Philippidos*, ed. H.F. Delaborde, *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, historiens de Philippe-Auguste* (2 vols., Paris, 1882–5), ii. 105; Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 169.
[77] 'iratus et indignatus, rex Anglorum omnes illos qui in partem eius cesserant precepit trucidari': Jacques de Vitry, *Historia orientalis*, ed. and tr. J. Donnadieu (Turnhout, 2008), p. 456. For the text's dating, see ibid., pp. 10–12.
[78] Ibid., p. 456.
[79] 'Rex autem Anglorum magis damnificavit et debilitavit inimicos, multis milibus interemptis qui plurimum in posterum nocere possent Christianis': ibid., p. 456.

that it was 'as if the man had changed into another'—but also one of his broader literary aims: to inspire future generations to combat the Saracens.[80]

Not all chroniclers drew attention to the king's ire at Acre; in fact, Richard himself failed to mention his anger when referring to the execution in a letter to the abbot of Clairvaux, dated 1 October 1191.[81] Despite having extracted material from Ambroise's *Estoire*, the Augustinian prior Richard de Templo, who is thought to be responsible for the creation of an early thirteenth-century version of the *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi*, known as 'IP2', did not impute anger to the king in this instance, and neither did other Anglo-Norman chroniclers.[82] The English monarch's indignation is similarly missing from the thirteenth-century text known as the *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, in which both kings, Philip as well as Richard, were responsible for the execution; and in one of the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre, the Lyon *Eracles*, which dates from the 1240s, Richard was motivated not by ire, but by great pity ('grant pitié') for the crusaders, who were weeping because Saladin had reneged on the agreement.[83] The monarch's alleged 'fit of rage' was also, perhaps surprisingly,

---

[80] 'quasi in virum alterum mutatus': ibid., p. 460.

[81] Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 131. The execution of prisoners was omitted altogether in another letter sent by Richard: ibid., iii. 129–30.

[82] *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi*, ed. William Stubbs, *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I*, Rolls Series, xxxviii (2 vols., London, 1864–5), i. 243; Richard of Devizes, *Cronicon Richardi Divisensis de tempore regis Richardi primi*, ed. and tr. J.T. Appleby (London, 1963), p. 47; Ralph of Diceto, *Ymagines historiarum*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 94–5. All references to the *Itinerarium peregrinorum* in this article are to 'IP2', edited by William Stubbs, rather than 'IP1', which has been edited by Hans Mayer: *Das Itinerarium peregrinorum: Eine zeitgenössische englische Chronik zum dritten Kreuzzug in ursprünglicher Gestalt*, ed. H.E. Mayer (Stuttgart, 1962). From this point onwards, I will refer to Richard de Templo as author of the *Itinerarium peregrinorum*. On the complex composition of this text and its relationship with Ambroise's *Estoire*, see H.J. Nicholson, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade: A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi* (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 6–14.

[83] *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, ed. L. de Mas Latrie (Paris, 1871), pp. 276–7; *La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184–1197)*, ed. M.R. Morgan (Paris, 1982), p. 129; P.W. Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation* (Aldershot, 1998), p. 108. On the dating of the Lyon *Eracles*, see P.W. Edbury, 'The Lyon *Eracles* and the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre', in B.Z. Kedar, J.S.C. Riley-Smith and R. Hiestand, eds., *Montjoie: Studies in Crusade History in Honour of Hans Eberhard Mayer* (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 139–53, at 140–41.

overlooked by the Muslim writers Baha al-Din Ibn Shaddad, Imad al-Din al-Isfahani, Ibn al-Athir, and later Abu Shama, all of whom vilified the crusaders for this atrocity.[84] For Imad al-Din, one of Saladin's secretaries, it exposed the Latins' perfidy, while in the thirteenth century Abu Shama recorded that the Franks 'mercilessly' slaughtered them, and that this event was the source of 'profound sadness' for Islam.[85] However, in both accounts, as well as that by Ibn al-Athir, 'the Franks' in general were to blame, rather than Richard specifically.[86] Ibn Shaddad, an advisor to the sultan, likewise wrote of the Muslims' great sorrow and distress, but he left no doubt that Richard bore sole responsibility for the execution.[87] The next mention of the king of England in his text was accompanied by the interjection 'God curse him', and in a later passage a Frankish captive supposedly acknowledged that the killing of the prisoners 'had been done merely by the will of the king alone'.[88] Yet, even in Ibn Shaddad's account, no mention was made of Richard's anger. In fact, the execution was represented as a premeditated act, rather than the result of an untimely fit of fury: 'He carried out what, according to the subsequent reports of his co-religionists, he had intended to do after taking the money and the [Christian] prisoners'.[89] A desire to exculpate Saladin from blame for failing to redeem the Muslim prisoners, which was considered an Islamic leader's duty, can

[84] Ibn Shaddad, *Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, tr. Richards, pp. 164–5; Imad al-Din al-Isfahani, *Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine par Saladin*, tr. H. Massé (Paris, 1972), p. 330; Ibn al-Athir, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi'l-Ta'rikh*, II: *The Years 541–589/1146–1193: The Age of Nur al-Din and Saladin*, tr. D.S. Richards (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 389–90; Abu Shama, *Le livre des deux jardins*, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Historiens orientaux* (5 vols., Paris, 1872–1906), v. 31–3.
[85] Imad al-Din, *Conquête*, tr. Massé, p. 330; Abu Shama, *Le livre des deux jardins*, v. 32.
[86] Ibn al-Athir, *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir*, tr. Richards, p. 390.
[87] Ibn Shaddad, *Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, tr. Richards, p. 165.
[88] Ibid., pp. 165, 169.
[89] Ibid., pp. 164–5.

certainly be detected in these words.[90] Even so, it is notable that, when discussing the possible reasons for the massacre, Ibn Shaddad appreciated that it may have been a pre-planned strategic move, with the king intent on marching south to Ascalon and unwilling to leave that number of captives in his rear.[91] Rather than highlighting Richard's wrath, Ibn Shaddad focused on the irate reactions of Saladin and his troops, who thereafter vented their rage on Latin captives.[92]

Despite exceptions such as those noted above, however, most western chroniclers, even some who were not partisans of the English monarch, both mentioned Richard's wrath and represented it as the just response to Saladin's inability to fulfil the terms of their agreement. In several of these texts, Richard's anger formed a key component in justifying the execution at Acre, and much of this evidence stands in opposition to the view most frequently articulated in modern studies—that the king was motivated by uncontrollable fury. In fact, the massacre of captives at Acre tallies with the general presentation of Richard's irascibility in narratives of the Third Crusade. In the Anglo-Norman texts, the Lionheart's wrath was nearly always represented as reactive in nature—the appropriate response to the receipt of an injury. At times, this was indicated by the terminology employed. Several Anglo-Norman commentators appear to have favoured *ira* and *indignatio* over *furor* and *rabies* when describing the king's anger.[93] For example, in the *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, Richard's anger is usually related through the use of the terms *ira* and *indignatio*, whereas *furor* is largely reserved for Muslims,

---

[90] Friedman, *Encounter between Enemies*, pp. 33–47.
[91] Ibn Shaddad, *Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, tr. Richards, p. 165.
[92] Ibid., p. 168.
[93] However, not all chroniclers adhered to this semantic distinction. For example, see the attribution of *furor* to both Richard and the duke of Burgundy in Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, ed. Coxe, iii. 57.

Greeks, and the French.[94] Indeed, Philip Augustus' mad rage seems to act as a foil for Richard's righteous wrath, with the French king twice depicted as falling prey to 'immoderate fury' ('immoderato … furore') during the siege of Acre.[95]

Significantly, Richard I was just as often depicted as growing angry with Greeks and fellow Christians as with his Muslim adversaries. In each instance, chroniclers appear to have taken care to portray the Lionheart's anger as the proper response to an injustice, rather than an unprovoked outburst. According to one thirteenth-century commentator, the 'angry king' ('rex iratus') took a fortification known as the 'the monastery of the Griffons' in early October 1190, because the inhabitants had killed several of his men.[96] His great indignation at the detainment and maltreatment of shipwrecked crusaders by the Byzantine ruler of Cyprus was widely reported, and Roger of Howden—adhering to the aforementioned anger–vengeance script—described the king declaring to his men that 'we will avenge the injuries which that treacherous emperor has done to God and us'.[97] Reticent crusaders were also said to have felt the king's ire on occasion, such as when they refused to guard fortifications in his absence, while King Philip and members of the French army were allegedly frequent recipients of the English monarch's wrath.[98] Richard was reportedly indignant (*indignans*) at Philip's demand for joint possession of Messina, since the French king had refrained from assisting in the siege, and, again, was 'more indignant than crushed' ('magis indignans quam fractus') when Philip insolently

---

[94] See *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Stubbs, pp. 6, 16, 201, 209, 266, 267, 273.
[95] Ibid., pp. 221, 217.
[96] Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, ed. Coxe, iii. 31–2.
[97] 'vindicemus injurias quas perfidus ille imperator Deo et nobis fecit': Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 106; *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Stubbs, p. 189; Ralph of Diceto, *Ymagines historiarum*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 92; Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, ed. Coxe, iii. 37.
[98] Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, ed. Ailes and Barber, i. 189 (tr. at ii. 186); *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Stubbs, pp. 242, 360; Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 126; Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 186–7.

charged him with breaking their agreement.[99] Likewise, having been informed of Philip's treacherous dealings with the Muslims by King Tancred of Sicily, 'the king of England was moved to anger against the king of France, offering him neither a cheerful expression nor the promise of peace'.[100] According to Ambroise, French envoys who met Richard on Cyprus in 1191 pestered him so much about reaching Acre 'that the king became angry, raising his eyebrows'.[101] Richard's anger was still represented here as reactive: the Frenchmen had 'insulted' (*ramponerent*) him.[102]

We can only speculate as to the authorial intentions behind these descriptions, although it is possible that some were designed to bolster the Lionheart's credentials as an effective ruler—a monarch who utilised anger correctly and successfully—in order to expose the flaws of his successors and to illustrate the type of king England again required. Helen Nicholson has suggested that Richard de Templo's representation of the Lionheart as an accomplished military commander, adept at ensuring the loyalty of his troops, may reflect the author's dissatisfaction with the unstable political situation in thirteenth-century England, when John's reign (1199–1216) was plagued by territorial losses and the outbreak of civil war, and followed by the rule of a minor, Henry III.[103] If Nicholson is correct, this disgruntlement could feasibly explain the author's consistently positive portrayal of Richard's wrath. It is equally plausible that earlier chroniclers sought to encourage comparisons between Richard and John through their presentation of anger episodes. Richard of Devizes, who wrote his *Cronicon* between 1192 and 1198,

---

[99] *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Stubbs, pp. 165–6.
[100] 'Rex vero Angliae in iram commotus adversus regem Franciae, nec faciem hilarem nec pacem spondentem ei praetendebat': Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 98; Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 160.
[101] 'Tant que li reis se coreça/ E les surcilz amont dresça': Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, ed. Ailes and Barber, i. 31 (tr. at ii. 58).
[102] Ibid., i. 31 (tr. at ii. 58).
[103] Nicholson, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade*, p. 11.

was plainly aware of the threat that John posed to Richard's rule while he was absent in the Holy Land, and offered a comparatively hostile treatment of the count of Mortain's anger. Multiple tropes associated with dysfunctional rage were deployed to describe John's fury at Richard I's chancellor, William Longchamp, in the summer of 1191, including a vivid account of his physiological symptoms. 'More than angry', John 'became unrecognisable in his entire body': 'anger furrowed his forehead into creases, his burning eyes sent out sparks, spite corrupted the rosy colour of his face'.[104] Importantly, the chronicler inferred from these signs that John's anger might have resulted in violence, although, on this occasion, his *indignatio* vomited forth its venom through frivolous words against the chancellor, until he was finally able to control himself.[105]

Whatever the authors' motives for representing Richard's anger as they did, there is nothing extraordinary or exceptional about these scenes, which represent little more than conventional portrayals of *ira regis*. Accounts of Frederick Barbarossa's anger during the Third Crusade offer a useful parallel. Several German chroniclers were seemingly at pains to stress Frederick's 'customary mildness' ('consuetudinem mansuetudinis') and 'usual restraint' ('solitam modestiam'), yet they too acknowledged moments when he met injustices with indignation and pursued revenge against the Byzantines and Turks.[106] Two such moments punctuated Ansbert's *Historia*: in the first, the German emperor and the princes were 'justly annoyed' ('iuste conmotis') when Byzantine envoys objected to

[104] 'Comes, ad mandatorum indecentiam plus quam iratus, toto corpore fiebat incognoscibilis. Rancor frontem sulcauit in rugas, scintillabant ardentes oculi, rosam faciei liuor infecit': Richard of Devizes, *Cronicon*, ed. Appleby, p. 32.
[105] Ibid., pp. 32–3.
[106] Ansbert, *Historia*, ed. Chroust, p. 83; *Historia peregrinorum*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I*, p. 141.

several clauses in a peace proposal and were summarily sent back to Constantinople with a declaration of war; and, in a later passage, the perfidious sultan of Iconium, Kilij Arslan II, reportedly sought to assuage Frederick's *indignatio*.[107] Another chronicler recorded that, since the sultan of Iconium had reneged on their treaty, Frederick grew angry (*iratus*) and allowed his army to take revenge (*ultio*).[108] Even in one Anglo-Norman text, Frederick was characterised as 'never tense with anger' ('nec ira contractus'), but 'conceived the anger worthy of a prince' ('dignas principe concipit iras') upon receiving a defiant letter from Saladin.[109] At times, Frederick was also depicted as using wrath to maintain discipline among his forces. According to the anonymous author of the *Historia peregrinorum*, who consulted an early recension of Ansbert, 'the most Christian emperor … poured out his anger' ('christianissimus … imperator … iram suam effudit') against transgressors in the army: those caught fornicating were humiliatingly stripped and whipped, and those guilty of more serious crimes were decapitated.[110] This is merely one representative case study of *ira regis*—William the Conqueror's wrath in William of Poitiers' *Gesta Guillelmi* and Odo of Deuil's account of Louis VII of France's indignation at an unruly Fleming during the Second Crusade would also serve—but it suffices to demonstrate that anger was an emotion expected of twelfth-century rulers.[111] Against this backdrop, the descriptions of Richard I's ire seem entirely normative. We

---

[107] Ansbert, *Historia*, ed. Chroust, pp. 58, 87.
[108] Otto of St Blasien, *Chronica*, ed. A. Hofmeister, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, XLVII (Hanover, 1912), p. 50.
[109] *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Stubbs, pp. 54, 42.
[110] *Historia peregrinorum*, ed. Chroust, p. 148.
[111] William of Poitiers, *The Gesta Guillelmi of William of Poitiers*, ed. and tr. R.H.C. Davis and M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1998), pp. 38, 60–62, 134; D. Bates, 'Anger, Emotion and a Biography of William the Conqueror', in J.L. Nelson, S. Reynolds and S.M. Johns, eds., *Gender and Historiography: Studies in the Earlier Middle Ages in Honour of Pauline Stafford* (London, 2012), pp. 21–33, at 23–5; Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. and tr. V.G. Berry (New York, 1948), p. 74. For similar accounts of Frederick's anger in a non-crusade setting, see Althoff, '*Ira Regis*', pp. 70–73.

might imagine that, in the context of holy war, contemporary writers would have considered anger unleashed against the enemies of Christendom as automatically legitimate, but the evidence pertaining to Richard's anger during the Third Crusade suggests that this was not the case.[112] Whether the Lionheart's wrath was directed at Muslims or fellow Christians, *iniuria* remained an important criterion for righteous anger, although (as we shall see) some chroniclers evidently appreciated that angry disputes within the crusader army could have undesirable ramifications.

Only a few instances of direct, unambiguous criticism of Richard's anger are identifiable in the Third Crusade narratives. Occasionally, there are hints that, when directed at fellow crusaders, his wrath was detrimental to the expedition's progress. Consider, for example, the king's angry dispute with Leopold of Austria at Acre in July 1191—another episode which has encouraged negative evaluations of his temperament. The notion that Richard was filled with 'unreasonable fury', to borrow Kate Norgate's words, when he noticed the duke's banner erected atop one of the city's towers, rests on the evidence, not of an eyewitness, but of Otto of St Blasien, a German chronicler who wrote *circa* 1209–10.[113] Since Leopold was related to the Hohenstaufen and, from January 1191, acted as a figurehead for the remnants of Frederick Barbarossa's army (the emperor having died in 1190), Otto invariably presented the duke in a favourable light, even affording him a privileged position in the command of the Christian army during the

---

[112] This conclusion is also borne out from a broader analysis of anger in crusade sources: Spencer, 'Representation and Function of Emotion', pp. 269–82; S.J. Spencer, 'Constructing the Crusader: Emotional Language in the Narratives of the First Crusade', in S.B. Edgington and L. García-Guijarro, eds., *Jerusalem the Golden: The Origins and Impact of the First Crusade* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 173–89, at 183–5.

[113] K. Norgate, *Richard the Lion Heart* (London, 1924), pp. 166, 330–31, took Otto's account at face value. For a more balanced view, see Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 444.

investment of Acre.[114] Though not uniformly critical of the 'distinguished king of England' ('rex Anglie egregiusque'), he described Richard's anger in condemnatory terms, perhaps in an attempt to exculpate Leopold for later imprisoning a fellow crusader.[115] The English monarch, 'stirred up by the greatest indignation' ('maxima indignatione permotus'), ordered Leopold's banner to be thrown from the tower and trampled under foot. In his ire, Richard addressed the duke 'with insulting words' ('verbis contumeliosis'), and Otto—who also charged Richard with insolently (*arroganter*) claiming sole responsibility for the city's capture—left no doubt that he had acted 'without cause' ('sine causa').[116] In Otto's eyes, Richard's conduct typified the treacherous tendencies of the English and 'exceedingly irritated' ('admodum exasperata') the German and Italian crusaders, who, along with Leopold, headed home.[117] A rather different (though no more reliable) account is found in Gervase of Canterbury's *Gesta regum*, according to which the whole affair was sparked by Leopold pitching his tent within the boundary of the king of England's encampment. At this slight, Richard was briefly stirred ('paulisper moveretur') and cut the cords of the duke's tent, causing it to collapse. In this version, it was Leopold, rather than Richard, who possessed destructive

---

[114] Leopold was presented as acting alongside the kings of France and England and 'the rest of the princes': Otto of St Blasien, *Chronica*, ed. Hofmeister, p. 53, 'Igitur Accaron a Christianis obsessa per regem Francorum regemque Anglorum Leopaldumque ducem ac per reliquos principes'. On Leopold's position within the Christian host at Acre, see Gillingham, *Richard I*, pp. 224–6.
[115] Otto of St Blasien, *Chronica*, ed. Hofmeister, p. 53. Otto was evidently aware that Leopold was excommunicated for this act, and that many criticised the duke on the grounds that Richard was a pilgrim (*peregrinus*) to the Holy Sepulchre. Nevertheless, he maintained that the king's confinement was 'deserved' (*meruit*). See ibid., p. 58; Gillingham, 'Kidnapped King', pp. 11–12.
[116] Otto of St Blasien, *Chronica*, ed. Hofmeister, p. 54.
[117] Ibid., p. 55.

rage: 'full with fury' ('furore plenus'), the duke returned to his ship and thereafter planned to entrap the king.[118]

Remarkably, one of the clearest instances of criticism was written by William of Newburgh, the same author who was seemingly at pains to stress the righteousness of Richard's zealous wrath at Acre. William related how, following the battle of Arsuf in September 1191, Richard tried to unite dissenting French nobles with the rest of the army, but 'the king exasperated by the impulses of his angry mind those whom perhaps he could have united with him by mildness'.[119] In acknowledging the superiority of *mansuetudo* ('mildness' or 'gentleness of spirit') over anger, William was adhering to a tradition which promoted meekness and self-control as virtuous qualities for a ruler.[120] Thus, John of Salisbury's twelfth-century political treatise, *Policraticus*, stipulated that 'a prince most rightly punishes transgressors, not in accordance with some stirring of irascibility, but by the mild arbitration of the law'.[121] The value of *mansuetudo*, rather than anger, for crusade leaders had long been recognised by chroniclers—hence the emphasis on Frederick Barbarossa's mildness in the German narratives—and, by the thirteenth century, in the wake of continuous campaign failures, this theme was being

---

[118] Gervase of Canterbury, *Gesta regum*, ed. William Stubbs, *Gervasii Cantuariensis Opera Historica*, Rolls Series, lxxiii (2 vols., London, 1879–80), ii. 88. Much of the *Gesta regum* represents an abridgement of Gervase's *Chronica*, yet the presentation of this event in both works differs markedly. The version in his *Chronica* more closely resembles the other accounts, with the dispute centring on the planting and removal of the duke's standard, and offers a subtly different portrayal of Richard's emotional reaction—he was apparently envious (*invidens*) upon seeing the banner—and that of Leopold: the duke and all the Germans departed with indignation (*indignantes*). Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica*, ed. William Stubbs, *Gervasii Cantuariensis Opera Historica*, i. 514. There are interesting parallels between Gervase's accounts and that by Richard of Devizes (*Cronicon*, ed. Appleby, pp. 46–7), for the latter recorded that, inflamed (*ardens*) over his banner being cast into the dirt, Leopold withdrew to his tent, which had already been taken down, and then sailed home 'full of rancour' (*plenus rancoris*).

[119] 'Rex … quos forte per mansuetudinem unire sibi poterat, indignantis animi motibus exasperabat': William of Newburgh, *Historia*, ed. Howlett, i. 363.

[120] C.S. Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939–1210* (Philadelphia, PA, 1985), p. 37.

[121] 'princeps delinquentes rectissime punit, non aliquo iracundiae motu sed mansuetae legis arbitrio': John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, ed. Webb, i. 239.

expounded in treatises for the recovery of the Holy Land, whose authors were particularly concerned with the fragmentation of Christian armies.[122] Considered in this context, the dichotomy that William of Newburgh established between Richard's angry impulses and meritorious meekness represents an explicit denunciation of the king's conduct.

Contextualisation within contemporary emotional values and literary conventions likewise exposes a moment of potential concern on the part of one of Richard's followers over his sovereign's temperament. According to Roger of Howden, a disagreement unfolded between the king of England and a French noble, William des Barres, during a mock tournament at Messina in February 1191.[123] The 'angry king' ('rex iratus') charged William, but in the ensuing *mêlée* was himself unhorsed. Frustrated, Richard banished him from the crusader army.[124] 'And so', Roger wrote, 'William des Barres withdrew from the king's presence, grieving and confused on account of the king's indignation'.[125] This quarrel has traditionally been seen as yet another occasion when Richard's untameable temper got the better of him, but Roger of Howden's unease seems to emanate more from the context in which the monarch's wrath was performed than from its uncontrollable nature. While not overtly critical of Richard's anger in this instance, Roger was apparently aware that internal conflict was detrimental to the crusaders' cause, for he went on to report several attempts to assuage the king's wrath. Initially, King Philip urged for reconciliation, though his request fell on deaf ears. Members of Philip's army—the bishop of Chartres, duke of Burgundy, count of Nevers, and many other

---

[122] For example, see Fidence of Padua, *Liber recuperationis Terre Sancte*, ed. J. Paviot, *Projets de croisade (v.1290–v.1330)* (Paris, 2008), pp. 135–6.
[123] Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 93–4; Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 155–7.
[124] Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, iii. 93–4.
[125] 'Discessit itaque Willelmus des Barres a facie regis, dolens et confusus propter indignationem regis': ibid., iii. 94.

French nobles—also entreated Richard to forgive William but, again, he refused to listen. It was only following the protestations of all the archbishops, bishops, counts, barons and other leaders of the crusader host that Richard finally acquiesced.[126] That this would have been considered an inappropriate, or at least disadvantageous, demonstration of ire seems all the more likely when we recognise that the intercession of wise arbiters was a common method of managing anger, both within and outside a crusading context.[127] According to the Lyon *Eracles*, 'wise men' (*proudeshomes*) successfully intervened to soothe Philip's anger at Richard, who had launched an assault on Acre while the French king was negotiating with Muslim envoys; and Roger himself suggested that the 'counsel of wise men' ('consilium sapientum virorum') was needed to calm the indignation between the English and French monarchs during the enterprise.[128]

It is also true that, on occasion, Richard was depicted as succumbing to bouts of unreasonable rage in other contexts, particularly in accounts of the unstable political environment of the Angevin Empire in the early 1180s. For example, Roger of Howden offered an unsympathetic account of Richard's ire at Caen in 1183. Unwilling to recognise his brother, Henry the Young King, as Henry II's heir, Richard became 'highly indignant' ('plurimum indignatus') and stormed off to bolster Poitou's fortifications.[129] Likewise, the *History of William Marshal*, written in the 1220s, portrayed Richard as being overcome by rage following a meeting with Peter of Capua in 1197, in which the papal legate had urged for reconciliation with the Capetian dynasty:

---

[126] Ibid., iii. 94.
[127] Spencer, 'Constructing the Crusader', pp. 186–7; Spencer, 'Representation and Function of Emotion', pp. 315–29; F.L. Cheyette, 'Suum cuique tribuere', *French Historical Studies*, vi (1970), pp. 287–99, at 295.
[128] *La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr*, ed. Morgan, p. 125; Edbury, *Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 105; Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 183.
[129] Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 273–4.

> King Richard was still so furious/ that he was unable to utter a single word;/ instead, he huffed and puffed in his anger./ Like a wild boar wounded by the huntsman/ he retired huffing and puffing into his chamber/ and ordered the doors to be closed… [130]

However, as with descriptions of Richard's anger during the Third Crusade, such 'anger incidents' need to be analysed critically, on a case-by-case basis. Behind the *History*'s portrayal of Richard's explosive fury, for instance, probably lies a desire to highlight William Marshal's capacity to soothe the king's anger and persuade him to consent to peace.[131] Furthermore, as Nicholas Vincent has suggested *vis-à-vis* accounts of Henry II's anger, we should remain alive to the possibility that ecclesiastical chroniclers exaggerated royal rage in order to stress the irrationality of kings and to affirm the importance of rational, clerical counsel.[132] An illuminating example relating to Richard I's wrath is found in Adam of Eynsham's *Magna Vita Sancti Hugonis*. In 1198, the king was apparently 'in great anger and rage' ('in ira et furore magno') when he received word that Bishop Hugh of Lincoln had refused to contribute financially to the war effort against Philip Augustus, and therefore ordered the confiscation of all the bishop's possessions, although no one dared touch his lands out of fear of causing offence. What allegedly

[130] 'Li reis Ricart remest en ire/ Si qu'il ne pout un sol mot dire,/ Ainz boufa e fu irascuz;/ Ausint comme sengler feruz/ Entra en sa chambre boufant/ E fist fermer les uis atant': *History of William Marshal*, ed. A.J. Holden, tr. S. Gregory, with historical notes by D. Crouch (3 vols., London, 2002–6), ii. 82.
[131] *History of William Marshal*, ed. Holden, ii. 82–4. For a similar scene, in which the Marshal interceded to calm Henry II, see ibid., i. 384–6. On the emotional rhetoric of this text more broadly, see L. Diggelmann, 'Emotional Responses to Medieval Warfare in the *History of William Marshal*', in S. Downes, A. Lynch and K. O'Loughlin, eds., *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature* (Basingstoke, 2015), pp. 24–41.
[132] N. Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II', in C. Harper-Bill and N. Vincent, eds., *Henry II: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 278–334, at 312.

transpired was a dramatic scene in which Hugh successfully calmed Richard's unwarranted indignation (and reprimanded him for his sins), which resulted in the English monarch making a series of concessions and left him convinced that Hugh was the sort of bishop who could stand up to any king or ruler.[133] Richard's irrational anger, twice described as *furor*, was thus a key element in what essentially amounts to a didactic tale of ecclesiastical supremacy over secular authority.[134]

Clearly, Richard's anger did not escape criticism, though these hostile accounts cannot necessarily be taken as unmediated reflections of his lived feelings. There are signs that even some of the king's supporters felt uneasy about his anger and chose to present it in an unflattering light. For the most part, however, the context in which his anger was displayed, rather than its excessive or uncontrollable nature, formed the focal point of their disapproval. William of Newburgh clearly believed that a demonstration of mildness, instead of ire, could have augmented the crusading army's numbers, and his criticism fits within a long tradition which extolled the virtue of *mansuetudo*; Roger of Howden seemingly appreciated that Richard's furious dispute with William des Barres had the potential to jeopardise the success of the enterprise, and that his initial refusal to heed counsel contravened the customary mechanisms for restraining rage. Yet the significance of these admittedly important anomalies should not to be overstated, for they are very substantially offset by the plethora of examples, primarily deriving from Anglo-Norman texts, in which Richard's reactive, just wrath was presented using the literary motifs normally associated with *ira regis*. Furthermore, the evidential basis for two of the principal episodes which have traditionally been upheld as examples of Richard's brutal

[133] Adam of Eynsham, *Magna Vita Sancti Hugonis*, ed. and tr. D.L. Douie and D.H. Farmer (rev. edn., 2 vols., Oxford, 1985), ii. 98–108, esp. 100–105.
[134] Ibid., ii. 100, 108.

temperament—the dispute with Leopold and the Acre execution—proves to be remarkably slender, comprising a handful of antagonistic accounts by German and French authors who were generally unsympathetic towards the English monarch.

III

Given the evidence outlined above, the vast majority of which depicted the Lionheart's wrath as a legitimate response to unjust actions, it is worth asking why modern historians have persisted in characterising Richard as an individual who was prone to irrational and socially unacceptable fits of rage. There are several reasons for this which warrant further consideration. In the Anglophone world, Steven Runciman's popular, if somewhat embellished, multi-volume history of the crusades has probably exercised a formative influence.[135] In the third instalment, *The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades*, we meet a Richard not dissimilar (though noticeably less bombastic) to the figure found in the pages of Scott.[136] Describing the king's character, Runciman stated that 'he derived a hot temper and a passionate self-will' from his parents. With his temperament thus established, Richard functioned as a counterpoint to Philip Augustus: 'Though choleric and self-indulgent, [Philip] could cloak his passions'—the implication being that Richard could not.[137] Echoes of this view, which meshed with Runciman's overarching appraisal of Richard as 'a bad son, a bad husband and a bad king, but a gallant and splendid

---

[135] On the reception and influence of Runciman's history, see Tyerman, *Debate on the Crusades*, pp. 192–9.

[136] S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, III: *The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades* (Cambridge, 1954). I am not the first to notice parallels between Scott and Runciman. J.S.C. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades, Christianity, and Islam* (New York, 2008), p. 66, suggested that Runciman's work 'is almost what Scott would have written had he been more knowledgeable'.

[137] Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, III, p. 35.

soldier', can be detected in the remainder of his account of the enterprise, especially its early phases.[138]

Few today accept Runciman's reconstruction of events and personalities *prima facie*, but this characterisation of Richard as an irrational hothead continues to find favour among historians, perhaps because it dovetails with another widely held oversimplification: that a dysfunctional temperament was typical of the Angevins. Indeed, Runciman himself embraced this idea, as did Bradford Broughton and Antony Bridge.[139] The Angevins' reputation for uncontrollable temper tantrums clearly directed the interpretation of Kate Norgate, who believed that, during his quarrel with William des Barres at Messina, 'Richard was seized with one of those fits of unaccountable, irrational fury before which all persons accustomed to associate with the Angevin counts quailed as before a direct manifestation of the powers of darkness whence the house of Anjou was said to have sprung'.[140] Apparently, Richard again lapsed into one of these 'fits of unreasonable fury which were part of his Angevin heritage' when he ordered the removal of Leopold of Austria's banner from Acre's defences.[141] Unaccountable, irrational, unreasonable fits of fury—there can be little doubt that, in Norgate's assessment, this was an undesirable, counterproductive kind of anger, which was symptomatic of Richard's Angevin pedigree. This is not a dated view. It has recently found expression in the scholarship of Paul Hyams and Martin Aurell, with the latter branding the Plantagenets 'the sons of anger', and the notion that Richard inherited his father's vile temper

---

[138] Ibid., pp. 75, 38, 39, 40, 44.
[139] S. Runciman, 'Richard Coeur-de-Lion', *History Today*, v (1955), pp. 219–27, at 220; B.B. Broughton, *The Legends of King Richard I Coeur de Lion: A Study of Sources and Variations to the Year 1600* (The Hague, 1966), p. 14; A. Bridge, *Richard the Lionheart* (London, 1989), p. 132.
[140] Norgate, *Richard the Lion Heart*, p. 135.
[141] Ibid., p. 166.

continues to be espoused.[142] An in-depth critique of this consensus would require an article in itself, but there are signs that some contemporaries held more nuanced opinions regarding Angevin personalities. Gerald of Wales, for one, did not make such broad-brush generalisations when describing the characters of Henry II's sons.[143] Some Angevin rulers were even praised for their meekness and self-control, including Richard himself in Gerald's character-sketch.[144] Walter Map, for example, insisted that there was nobody of 'such great mildness and affability' ('tante … mansuetudinis et affabilitatis') as Henry II; even when harassed by crowds, he allegedly listened patiently (*pacienter*), without any appearance of anger ('nemini … ire similitudinem').[145] A member of Henry II's court, Walter Map was far from an impartial observer, and his emphasis on the king's emotional restraint could be read as an attempt to mask a well-known flaw, or as an 'ironic inversion of what contemporaries and courtiers knew to be the truth'.[146] After all, this seems to contradict other evidence, including Peter of Blois' account of the dramatic changes that occurred to the king's eyes when angry.[147] The fact remains, however, that Walter did acknowledge several of Henry's faults and could have included his temperament among them.[148]

---

[142] M. Aurell, *L'Empire des Plantagenêt, 1154–1224* (Paris, 2004), p. 102; Hyams, 'What did Henry III of England Think in Bed', p. 102; Hyams, *Rancor and Reconciliation*, p. 60; Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, p. 35; Brundage, *Richard Lion Heart*, pp. 42–3, 255; Bridge, *Richard the Lionheart*, pp. 127, 248.
[143] Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica*, ed. James F. Dimock, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, Rolls Series, xxi (8 vols., London, 1861–91), v. 193–201.
[144] Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica*, ed. Dimock, p. 196.
[145] Walter Map, *De nugis curialium*, ed. and tr. M.R. James, rev. C.N.L. Brooke and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1983), pp. 484–6.
[146] Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II', p. 312.
[147] Peter of Blois, *Epistola LXVI*, ed. J.A. Giles, *Petri Blesensis Bathoniensis Archidiaconi Opera Omnia* (4 vols., Oxford, 1846–7), i. 193: 'Oculi ejus orbiculati sunt, dum pacati est animi, columbini et simplices: sed in ira et turbatione cordis quasi scintillantes ignem et in impetu fulminantes'. For further examples of Henry II's anger, see Boquet and Nagy, *Sensible Moyen Âge*, pp. 242–4; Hyams, 'What did Henry III of England Think in Bed', pp. 102–3; Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II', pp. 311–12.
[148] Walter Map, *De nugis curialium*, ed. James, p. 484.

Whether the Angevins were bad-tempered or not, there is probably a more immediate factor underpinning the persistence of this caricature of Richard: the influential role of the Acre execution in shaping modern assessments of the king. Richard's alleged 'fit of rage' at Acre has been repeated so often by historians that it has become self-sustaining. A likely reason for this is that Richard's supposed propensity to angry outbursts is compatible with broader perceptions of the massacre as an act of disproportionate violence. This interpretation has a long history: it gained particular credence among nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars such as René Grousset, who in 1936 denounced the execution as an 'act of unheard-of barbarism, perpetrated in cold blood', which laid bare Richard's lack of political acumen.[149] Runciman, too, believed that the king had acted 'cold-bloodedly'.[150] Yet neither Grousset nor Runciman, nor indeed Joseph-François Michaud before them, intimated that the order had stemmed directly from Richard's wrath.[151] This idea can be traced back as far as *The Historie of the Holy Warre* (1639) by Thomas Fuller, a Protestant minister who wrote from a staunchly anti-Catholic perspective: 'Yea, in anger King Richard commanded all the Turkish captives which were in his hands, seven thousand in number, to be put to death (except some choice persons)'. [152] Tellingly, Richard's wrathfulness was contrasted with Philip's laudable moderation, and the execution was dismissed as an act of 'rashnesse and

[149] R. Grousset, *Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem*, III: *La monarchie musulmane et l'anarchie franque* (Paris, 1936), pp. 60–62, at 61.
[150] Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, III, p. 53. Grousset and Runciman may have been influenced by Ibn Shaddad's comment that the Latins 'slew them in cold blood': Ibn Shaddad, *Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, tr. Richards, p. 165.
[151] Joseph-François Michaud, *Histoire des croisades* (4 vols., Paris, 1817–22), ii. 430–31.
[152] Thomas Fuller, *The Historie of the Holy Warre* (Cambridge, 1639), p. 123. On Fuller and his work, see G. Constable, 'The Historiography of the Crusades', in A.E. Laiou and R.P. Mottahedeh, eds., *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington, DC, 2001), pp. 1–22, at 7; Tyerman, *Debate on the Crusades*, pp. 60–63.

crueltie'.[153] The same combination of anger, violence, and abhorrence marked Edward Gibbon's account of this episode, although in his retelling 'the fury of the Franks' in general, rather than the rage of 'the sanguinary Richard' specifically, was the cause of the slaughter.[154] An equally emotive version of events was presented by Charles Mills, who wrote that the English king 'rejected with disdain' presents sent by Saladin in a bid to buy more time, and then 'murdered all the poorer class of the Muselman prisoners'.[155] In these reconstructions, Richard acted 'in anger' and 'with disdain', but there is little sense that this was a distinctly value-negative breed of anger, a 'fit of rage'.

The latter view only truly appears to have taken hold in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries, finding an outlet in the works by some of the field's most esteemed authorities—Brundage, Mayer, Riley-Smith and Flori—which has undoubtedly added to its appeal.[156] This development probably reflects a growing interest in ideological violence, with several of the aforementioned scholars making a cognitive connection between the execution—interpreted as an unusually brutal event—and Richard's dysfunctional temperament. Brundage concluded that the entire affair contravened twelfth-century conventions and ultimately exposed one of Richard's gravest flaws: his proneness to anger.[157] Even in Flori's authoritative biography of the Lionheart, we learn that the monarch 'had succumbed to an uncontrollable fury at Saladin's procrastination' and that the massacre 'was clearly contrary to the chivalric code then in the process of

---

[153] Fuller, *Historie of the Holy Warre*, p. 123.
[154] Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J.B. Bury (2nd edn., 7 vols., London, 1925–9), vi. 364.
[155] Charles Mills, *The History of the Crusades, for the Recovery and Possession of the Holy Land* (2nd edn., 2 vols., London, 1821), ii. 51.
[156] Brundage, *Richard Lion Heart*, p. 135; Mayer, *The Crusades*, p. 146; Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 116; Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, p. 134.
[157] Brundage, *Richard Lion Heart*, p. 135. Elsewhere in his biography, Brundage established a direct link between Richard's temperament and his propensity to violence: ibid., p. 255.

formation'.[158] However, there is an ongoing historiographical debate regarding whether crusading warfare was marked by a level of brutality which surpassed the normative standards in western Europe and elsewhere.[159] The Acre execution has been central to this debate, although historians have not yet reached a consensus as to whether it unequivocally transgressed the laws of war as they were understood in the twelfth century.[160]

Closely tied to this growing interest in ideological violence is an underlying conviction that explosions of rage were commonplace in the religiously charged atmosphere of crusading. Indeed, there exists a strand of historiography which sees anger as a prominent, perhaps the dominant, passion of crusading.[161] The validity of such claims aside, there is a belief among some historians, most notably Sophia Menache, that the crusaders unleashed their anger against the enemies of Christendom, particularly in moments of marked violence, such as the 1099 sack of Jerusalem; and this belief could explain the emphasis placed on Richard's rage at Acre.[162]

[158] Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, pp. 134, 361.
[159] M. Barber, 'The Albigensian Crusades: Wars like any Other?', in M. Balard, B.Z. Kedar and J.S.C. Riley-Smith, eds., *Dei Gesta per Francos: Crusade Studies in Honour of Jean Richard* (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 45–55; D. Hay, 'Gender Bias and Religious Intolerance in Accounts of the "Massacres" of the First Crusade', in M. Gervers and J.M. Powell, eds., *Tolerance and Intolerance: Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades* (Syracuse, NY, 2001), pp. 3–10, 135–9; J. France, *Western Warfare in the Age of the Crusades, 1000–1300* (London, 1999), pp. 227–9; J. France, 'Siege Conventions in Western Europe and the Latin East', in P. de Souza and J. France, eds., *War and Peace in Ancient and Medieval History* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 158–72.
[160] For the Acre execution as 'exceptional', see Barber, 'Albigensian Crusades', pp. 51–2; Friedman, *Encounter between Enemies*, p. 92; Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, pp. 359–61. In contrast, see Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 456; J. France, 'Warfare in the Mediterranean Region in the Age of the Crusades, 1095–1291: A Clash of Contrasts', in C. Kostick, ed., *The Crusades and the Near East: Cultural Histories* (Abingdon, 2011), pp. 9–26, at 22.
[161] S. Menache, 'Love of God or Hatred of your Enemy? The Emotional Voices of the Crusades', *Mirabilia*, x (2010), pp. 1–20, at 7, 11; S. Menache, 'Emotions in the Service of Politics: Another Perspective on the Experience of Crusading (1095–1187)', in Edgington and García-Guijarro, eds., *Jerusalem the Golden*, pp. 235–54, at 241, 246.
[162] For the First Crusaders' anger at Jerusalem, see Menache, 'Love of God', pp. 10–11; ead., 'Emotions in the Service of Politics', p. 245. See also Benjamin Kedar's longitudinal study of this event: B.Z. Kedar,

A final explanation lies in the role of memory—a theme which has not yet received the attention it deserves in studies of medieval anger, but is crucial to understanding portrayals of Richard's wrath in medieval texts. Recent research has demonstrated that the process of remembering and reinterpreting the crusading past and its central protagonists started at an early date, almost immediately after the events themselves.[163] Famously, in the thirteenth century, Saladin was transformed into a paragon of chivalry, an exemplar of knightly virtues for western warriors to emulate.[164] Richard the Lionheart was subjected to a similar process of memorialisation.[165] During his own lifetime, Richard actively sought to cultivate a reputation among his followers, and a degree of mythology surrounding the king coloured even the earliest narratives of the Third Crusade; for instance, perhaps the first recorded example of Richard's famous epithet, 'Coeur de Lion', is found in Ambroise's *Estoire*.[166] Consequently, as Flori correctly observed, the historical Richard is often indistinguishable from the Richard of legend.[167]

The 'Lionheart' sobriquet, or, more specifically, the willingness of medieval writers to draw parallels between Richard and a raging lion, has perhaps led historians to misinterpret representations of Richard's anger in the narratives. The raging lion

---

'The Jerusalem Massacre of July 1099 in the Western Historiography of the Crusades', *Crusades*, iii (2004), pp. 15–75.

[163] See n. 28 above.

[164] M. Jubb, *The Legend of Saladin in Western Literature and Historiography* (Lewiston, NY, 2000), esp. pp. 19–51; J.V. Tolan, *Sons of Ishmael: Muslims Through European Eyes in the Middle Ages* (Gainesville, FL, 2008), pp. 79–100, 177–83; J. France, 'Saladin, from Memory towards Myth in the Continuations', in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson, eds., *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 69–82.

[165] On the legends surrounding Richard, see J. Gillingham, 'Some Legends of Richard the Lionheart: Their Development and Their Influence', in Nelson, ed., *Richard Coeur de Lion in History and Myth*, pp. 51–69; Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, pp. 200–217, 397–414; Broughton, *Legends of King Richard*; George Henry Needler, *Richard Coeur de Lion in Literature* (Leipzig, 1890).

[166] Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, ed. Ailes and Barber, i. 37 (tr. at ii. 65). Broughton, *Legends of King Richard*, pp. 115–23, and Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, pp. 225–8, discuss the origins and evolution of the 'Lionheart' epithet, but without reference to anger.

[167] Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, p. 404.

metaphor can be traced back to biblical verses, such as Proverbs 19.12 ('as the roaring of a lion, so also is the wrath of a king'), and was common in Antiquity.[168] One of the earliest comparisons between the emotional disposition of Richard and the lion pre-dates his crusading exploits: 'For to restrain the fiercest impulses of his mind, this our lion, and more than a lion, is vexed like a lion by a quartan ague. Thus, he trembles almost continuously, though not through fear, and his trembling causes the whole world to tremble and fear'.[169] There is no sense in this passage, written by Gerald of Wales in 1189, that Richard's lion-like ferocity was a negative trait; in fact, the framing material suggests the very opposite. The resemblance between Richard's 'animi … motus'—a common phrase denoting the category of 'emotions'—and those of a lion formed part of Gerald's refutation of accusations of cruelty against the king. Burning with the zeal of peace and justice ('pacis et justitiae zelo defervens'), Richard's rigour in executing the law warranted praise, not criticism. In any case, after his severity abated, he showed mildness (*mansuetudo*) and clemency (*clementia*).[170] This acknowledgement of his capacity for meekness was followed by the account of his lion-like stirrings, without any sign of contradiction. Nature had created Richard that way, and, far from being a disadvantage, his leonine character made him a man to be feared. Gerald continued in this positive vein, highlighting the Lionheart's three exemplary qualities: his extraordinary courage and energy, immeasurable generosity, and resolute firmness in mind and word,

---

[168] Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II', pp. 311–12; S. Braund and G. Gilbert, 'An ABC of Epic *Ira*: Anger, Beasts, and Cannibalism', in S. Braund and G.W. Most, eds., *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 250–85, at 256–68. Proverbs 19.12 was applied to Richard I in Adam of Eynsham, *Magna Vita Sancti Hugonis*, ed. Douie and Farmer, ii. 107.

[169] 'Ad reprimendos namque ferocissimos animi ipsius motus, hic leo noster, et plusquam leo, quartanae stimulo leonino more vexatur. Quo sic continue fere tremit nec trepidat, ut et sui tremore mundum universum tremere faciat et timere': Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica*, ed. Dimock, p. 196. Translation based on Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 267.

[170] Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica*, ed. Dimock, p. 196.

with the latter upheld as the most praiseworthy of virtues for a prince.[171] This example (from Gerald's *Topographia Hibernica*, and later repeated in his *De principis instructione*) attests that equating Richard's feelings, and particularly his anger, with those of a lion functioned as a positive, rather than a negative, reflection on his character.[172]

The same impression is gained when we turn to the Third Crusade narratives. Several of the enterprise's chroniclers appear to have compared Richard with a lion in order to depict him as unrelenting in his quest to shed Muslim blood. Describing the king's assault on Saladin's forces besieging Jaffa in 1192, the Cistercian abbot Ralph of Coggeshall wrote that Richard 'boldly threw himself like a raging lion into the thickest of the enemy's troops, hewing them down right and left'.[173] It is important to note that comparing warriors to furious lions was a well-established rhetorical device for emphasising martial prowess.[174] In the *Gesta Francorum*, perhaps the earliest narrative of the First Crusade, Kerbogha of Mosul's mother announced that men fled from her son like sheep from the 'rage of a lion' ('leonis furorem'), while Ralph of Caen, who wrote at some point between 1112 and 1118, insisted that the Christian forces during the battle of Dorylaeum in 1097 were 'like a lion that had been roused from a long, lazy rest in its den and awaited the hunting spears in fury, its anger gradually increasing'.[175] But leonine

[171] Ibid., p. 196.
[172] Gerald of Wales, *De principis instructione*, ed. George F. Warner, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, viii. 247–8.
[173] 'velut leo furibundus, a dextris et a sinistris prosternens, audacter se ingessit': Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. Joseph Stevenson, Rolls Series, lxvi (London, 1875), p. 43.
[174] Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, p. 225. More generally on the use of leonine imagery in crusade sources, see N.R. Hodgson, 'Lions, Tigers, and Bears: Encounters with Wild Animals and Bestial Imagery in the Context of Crusading to the Latin East', *Viator*, xliv (2013), pp. 65–93, at 75–7.
[175] *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. and tr. R. Hill (London, 1962), p. 53; 'Ceu quondam venabula in furore opperiens leo, qui modo, longa quiete piger, a latibulis excitus, paulatim lucratur iras': Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana*, in *Recueil des historiens des*

imagery may have been considered particularly pertinent to the Lionheart. Ralph of Coggeshall repeatedly utilised it to communicate the ferocity of Richard and Anglo-Norman crusaders in his account of Jaffa's liberation: the king bore the expression of a wild lion in battle, and his men likewise attacked like ferocious lions.[176] Furthermore, this metaphor acquired added significance in Ralph's account of this episode, for the king was depicted as raging against his opponents in leonine fashion: 'Not delaying, that warlike king was adorned with proper arms, as if inflamed by fire because of exceeding fury, and would bring to bear and inflict yet more fresh blows, as if he had done nothing that day'.[177] In this instance, *furor* appears to have been deployed to highlight the extent of Richard's anger rather than to condemn his conduct, and the emphasis on his rage is consistent with the representation of the king as resembling a *leo furibundus* and as showing no mercy against his adversaries in combat.

In order to comprehend fully this portrayal of Richard as raging furiously against his enemies, we must acknowledge the broader significance of the battle of Jaffa in Ralph of Coggeshall's narrative of the Third Crusade. Unlike other chroniclers, such as Ambroise and Richard de Templo, who presented the battle of Arsuf as the expedition's climax, Ralph shifted the weight of his narrative by casting the liberation of Jaffa as Richard's crowning achievement.[178] There are strong indications that this reshaping of the expedition's narrative arc was a conscious authorial decision, probably intended to divert attention from the king's failure to recapture Jerusalem and consent to the Treaty

---

croisades: Historiens occidentaux (5 vols., Paris, 1844–95), iii. 622. For the dating, see N.R. Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders? Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi*', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, xxx (2008), pp. 117–32, at 117.

[176] Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, ed. Stevenson, pp. 49, 45.

[177] 'Nec mora, rex ille bellicosus armis decentibus decoratus, velut flamma prae nimio furore ignescens, et ad inferendas et perferendas plagas adhuc recens, quasi nihil ipsa die peregisset': ibid., p. 49.

[178] For the battle of Arsuf as the expedition's climax in Ambroise's *Estoire*, see Asbridge, *The Crusades*, pp. 468–9, 473–4.

of Jaffa; after all, the relief of Jaffa was Richard's last major military success during the enterprise and was chronologically closer to the signing of the treaty than the battle of Arsuf. Tellingly, Ralph devoted significantly more space to proceedings at Jaffa in 1192 than most chroniclers, and used the episode to describe Richard in laudatory terms.[179] Three morale-raising set-piece speeches were attributed to the king, and just as other authors magnified the Lionheart's brutality at Arsuf—Ambroise compared the Muslim dead to sheaves of corn—so too did Ralph when relating the king's bloodthirsty conduct at Jaffa: he delivered so many blows it was 'as if he had done nothing that day [i.e., as if he had come fresh to the battle]'.[180] The importance of the relief of Jaffa in Ralph's account of the expedition suggests that, despite the negative connotations of *furor*, it is extremely unlikely that he was seeking to criticise the king in this instance.

Ralph of Coggeshall's account also offers a window into the memorialisation of Richard's anger, for it directed the interpretation of at least one later chronicler. Roger of Wendover, who relied heavily on Ralph's chronicle, replicated verbatim the description of Richard attacking 'velut leo furibundus' and followed his source in using the episode to lionise the king, who achieved an 'unheard-of victory' ('victoriam inauditam').[181] It is also worth noting that Ralph of Coggeshall's opinion of Richard changed during the course of writing, and this was reflected in his portrayal of the king's indignation. Up to 1195, the Lionheart was the text's unambiguous hero. However, as David Carpenter has demonstrated, a more critical view of Richard's final years was presented in the second instalment of the *Chronicon Anglicanum*, which covered the period from 1195 to

---

[179] Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, ed. Stevenson, pp. 41–51.
[180] Ibid., pp. 44–5, 46–8, 49; Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, ed. Ailes and Barber, i. 104–5 (tr. at ii. 120).
[181] Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, ed. Coxe, iii. 60, 63; F.M. Powicke, 'Roger of Wendover and the Coggeshall Chronicle', *English Historical Review*, xxi (1906), pp. 286–96.

November 1200 and was probably completed in 1201.[182] A more condemnatory tone called for a corresponding form of anger. In the second instalment, Ralph depicted a wrathful, aged Richard of such great ferocity that all the virtues he had shown at the beginning of his reign 'were blacked by excessive severity'. At court, he looked 'sufficiently affable and charming', joking and indulging in games, his 'raging mind' relaxed. But in his presence, petitioners encountered a king who exhibited 'the fierceness of a lion in expression and gesture', complete with threatening glares and 'a violent and wild voice'.[183] That this was a negative portrayal of the king's anger, marked by the typical signs of dysfunctional rage, is not in doubt: Ralph went on to suggest that the petitioners could avoid the king's ire by satisfying his cupidity, which functioned as a segue to the author's famous denunciation of Richard's financial exploitation of England in the years after his release from captivity.[184] The sharp contrast between the representation of Richard's fury here and Ralph's earlier account of his wrath at Jaffa has a twofold significance. Firstly, it exemplifies the usefulness of anger rhetoric for medieval writers as a means of encouraging particular assessments of an individual; and, secondly, it bears witness to the complexity and malleability of leonine imagery, which could be utilised to achieve different authorial aims—to promote the Lionheart in the first

[182] D.A. Carpenter, 'Abbot Ralph of Coggeshall's Account of the Last Years of King Richard and the First Years of King John', *English Historical Review*, cxiii (1998), pp. 1210–30.

[183] Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, ed. Stevenson, p. 92: 'Tantae autem ferocitatis ac protervitatis processu temporis exstitit, ut omnes virtutes, quas in regni primordio ostentaverat, nimia severitate offuscaret, ita ut quoslibet de negotiis suis eum interpellantes minaci oculo transfigeret, proterva ac feroci voce reverberaret, leoninam feritatem in vultu atque in gestu praetenderet, nisi, pro libitu suo, pecuniis et promissis tumidum animum delinire satagerent. In triclinio vero, cum privata familia positus, satis affabilis et blandus esse videbatur, jocis et ludicris cum eisdem animum resolvens efferatum'. See also ibid., p. 97; Carpenter, 'Abbot Ralph of Coggeshall's Account', p. 1218. J. Gillingham, 'The Unromantic Death of Richard I', *Speculum*, liv (1979), pp. 18–41, at 26, suggests that Ralph's account was based on his own recollection of meeting Richard.

[184] Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, ed. Stevenson, pp. 92–3; Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 332; Carpenter, 'Abbot Ralph of Coggeshall's Account', pp. 1218–19.

instance, and to denounce him in the second.[185] Comparison with the lion, and animal symbolism more broadly, always afforded the opportunity to highlight a character's bestial nature.[186] For example, the lion's association with ferocity enabled Gerald of Wales to compare the Angevins unfavourably with the kings of France in his *De principis instructione*. Whereas some princes covered their arms and banners with images of 'fierce and ravenous beasts' ('bestias atroces et voraces')—bears, leopards, and lions—as 'an indication of ferocity' ('ferocitatis indicium'), the heraldic lilies of the Capetians expressed their 'praiseworthy morality' ('moralitate laudabili') and desire to observe moderation (*modestia*) in words and actions.[187] It is therefore possible, if necessarily speculative, that the inclusion of 'leoninam feritatem' in Ralph of Coggeshall's vivid account of the hostile ire that Richard directed at petitioners represents a purposeful move by the author to play upon the metaphor's many connotations, and to encourage a juxtaposition with his earlier, positive portrayal of the king's wrath at Jaffa. Boldly fighting God's enemies in 1192, Richard had resembled a raging lion, but now—in a markedly different setting—he appeared like a ferocious lion for all the wrong reasons, displaying the characteristics of a wild beast that was out of control.

Another author used leonine imagery more directly to characterise the Lionheart's wrath. According to Richard of Devizes, the daily slaughter of Anglo-Norman crusaders by the 'Griffons' of Messina in 1190 induced the king's anger: 'Stirred by these commotions, that fearful lion the king of England roared dreadfully, conceiving the wrath

---

[185] Interestingly, in Geoffrey of Monmouth's pseudo-history of Britain, 'leoninam feritatem'—the phrase employed by Ralph to criticise Richard—was used as a positive reflection on Constantine's character: Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain: An Edition and Translation of the De Gestis Britonum (Historia Regum Britanniae)*, ed. M.D. Reeve, tr. N. Wright (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 97.
[186] Hodgson, 'Lions, Tigers, and Bears', pp. 76–7.
[187] Gerald of Wales, *De principis instructione*, ed. Warner, p. 320; M. Haist, 'The Lion, Bloodline, and Kingship', in D. Hassig, ed., *The Mark of the Beast: The Medieval Bestiary in Art, Life, and Literature* (London, 1999), pp. 3–21, at 10.

worthy of such a breast. His raving fury terrified his dearest friends'.[188] As with Ralph of Coggeshall's account of Richard's rage during the relief of Jaffa, this was not necessarily a value-negative kind of fury; indeed, it was 'worthy [*dignas*] of such a breast'. Despite the insinuation of madness ('furor insanientis'), the bestial characterisation of Richard's anger probably reflects the author's desire to draw comparison with the lion—in fact, by equating Richard's lion-like roaring with his anger, this passage strongly echoes Proverbs 19.12.[189] Richard of Devizes (and his audience) would likely have interpreted this scene, not as an uncontrollable outburst of rage, but rather as a staged performance by the king in order to direct his chief men and ensure their loyalty. This is suggested, above all, by the author's emphasis on the king's angry expression and the frightening effect it had on observers. If anyone dared, they could have easily discerned the king's thoughts by looking at his face; and the English monarch then expressed his indignation (*indignantia*) by demanding vengeance on the 'Griffons'.[190] According to Richard of Devizes, after this speech King Richard could lay aside his frown ('ponat supercilium'), for his men would have subjected all Sicily if requested; indeed, when the council was adjourned amid applause, the king 'relaxed the sternness of his face' ('uultus rigore remisso') and adopted a 'serene expression' ('oris serenitate').[191]

The trepidation which Richard's anger was said to have inspired, even in his closest friends, has fuelled negative assessments of his temperament by modern commentators,

[188] 'Hisce tumultibus excitatus, rex Anglie, leo ille teterrimus, horrendum rugiit, iras tanto pectore dignas concipiens. Perterruit eius amicissimos furor insanientis': Richard of Devizes, *Cronicon*, ed. Appleby, pp. 19–20.
[189] See ibid., p. 17, where the 'Griffons' of Messina allegedly called Philip Augustus 'the Lamb' and Richard 'the Lion'. The same epithets were used in a lyric by Bertran de Born: *Volontiers fera sirventes*, ed. W.D. Paden, Jr., T. Sankovitch and P.H. Stäblein, *The Poems of the Troubadour Bertran de Born* (Berkeley, CA, 1986), p. 427.
[190] Richard of Devizes, *Cronicon*, ed. Appleby, pp. 20–21.
[191] Ibid., pp. 21, 22.

but such interpretations fail to appreciate that fear was a common marker of power in medieval narratives.[192] It was more than mere coincidence that Richard of Devizes and Gerald of Wales emphasised the terror induced by the king's wrath. Both were tapping into a pre-existing emotional index of power.[193] According to the *Gesta Francorum*, 'the whole world feared and loved' ('omnis mundus timebat et amabat') Bohemond of Taranto, a comment which bears a striking resemblance to Gerald's suggestion that Richard's leonine disposition caused 'the whole world to tremble and fear'.[194] That Richard of Devizes' account of the king's angry demonstration at Messina was likewise designed to symbolise the power of his principal protagonist is all the more likely when interpreted alongside a later scene, in which Saladin's brother, al-Adil, supposedly stressed the Muslims' fear of Richard in a eulogistic speech. They had formerly feared Henry II, but Richard was thought to be 'a thousand times better' ('milies meliorem') than his father.[195] The sultan's brother went on recount how the king of France had been filled with dread when Richard became duke of Aquitaine, before proclaiming that if this same Richard, whom he loved yet feared, was removed from their midst, the Muslims would possess moderate fear of John, who remained at home sleeping.[196] In effect, the eulogy set out a tripartite hierarchy of Angevin power, whereby Richard's ability to cultivate terror surpassed that of his father and brother. Thus, Richard of Devizes' use of fear terminology to express the power of his central protagonist helps to explain the emphasis on the king's frightening appearance during his angry performance at Messina.

[192] See Brundage, *Richard Lion Heart*, p. 83.
[193] See Barton, 'Emotions and Power', pp. 41–59; T.N. Bisson, 'Hallucinations of Power: Climates of Fright in the Early Twelfth Century', *Haskins Society Journal*, xvi (2006), pp. 1–11.
[194] *Gesta Francorum*, ed. Hill, p. 64.
[195] Richard of Devizes, *Cronicon*, ed. Appleby, pp. 75–6.
[196] 'O si Ricardus iste, quem quamuis diligam tamen timeo, si fuisset factus de medio, quam modicum iam metueremus, quam pro nichilo haberemus illum nouissimum filiorum, qui domi dormit in ordeo': ibid., pp. 76–7.

Richard of Devizes' portrayal of the king's anger at his men in the latter episode fits with what appears to be a broader narrative strategy: like Ralph of Coggeshall, he sought to assert the king's credentials as a crusader who was unswerving in his dedication to the expedition and merciless in his slaughter of God's enemies.[197] Indeed, there are other moments in the *Cronicon* where the king's anger acts as a vehicle for communicating this idea. The chronicler records that, while King Richard lay ill at Jaffa, members of his household secretly agreed a truce with al-Adil.[198] Unaware that a deal had been struck, Richard reportedly encountered reluctance from his troops when he attempted to lead them against the Muslims. At the defection of his men, the king was 'exceedingly angry, indeed raging, and chewed up with his teeth the pine staff which he was carrying in his hand', before indignantly accusing them of hindering God's work through cowardice.[199] Richard's demonstration of anger is in line with the chronicler's representation of the English monarch as unrelenting in his quest to slay his enemies and to liberate Jerusalem. Obviously, this image of the Lionheart was incompatible with the fact that the expedition ended in a stalemate. By depicting Richard as venting his anger at his reticent troops, Richard of Devizes effectively distanced the king from the ratification of the Treaty of Jaffa—a narrative strategy which is certainly discernible in the chronicle's final pages.[200] Indeed, this authorial decision also explains the attribution of *indignatio* to the Lionheart in the text's closing lines, which justified Richard's refusal to visit Jerusalem's holy places following the signing of the treaty: 'the indignation of his

---

[197] For example, see ibid., pp. 36, 44.
[198] Ibid., p. 79.
[199] 'nimis irascens immo uesaniens et uirgam pineam quam manu gestabat dentibus comminuens': ibid., p. 82.
[200] See ibid., p. 83.

great heart was not able to worthily accept that which was acquired from the goodwill of the pagans, not as a gift from God'.[201]

When the various strands of Richard of Devizes' account of the Lionheart's anger at Messina in 1190 are taken together, the king emerges not as an emotionally unstable hothead, but as a powerful monarch, capable of directing his men and bending them to his will through terrifying displays of wrath, which simultaneously symbolised his unswerving commitment to eradicating his enemies. Tellingly, with the loyalty of his followers secured, and thus the purpose of his anger achieved, he adopted a serene countenance—a comment which mirrors Gerald of Wales' belief that he exhibited mildness and clemency after anger.[202] In other words, Richard was portrayed as a king well versed in commanding through *ira regis*.

The willingness of these authors to use the lion as a reference-point can throw light on the most detailed description of Richard's anger in the *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, which refers to an incident that reportedly occurred in November 1191, when he arrived to aid in the defence of the army's squires. Urged by his retinue not to engage the more numerous enemy, Richard 'changed colour as a result of his boiling blood' ('ex fervente sanguine mutato colore') and, having declared such a course of action unacceptable for a king, he charged the Turks 'with indescribable rage, let it not be said with fury' ('inaestimabili fervore, ne dicatur furore').[203] Admittedly, Richard de Templo did not establish a direct connection here with the rage of a lion, but leonine imagery may not have been far from his mind when he wrote this scene. A few lines later we are told that

---

[201] 'adquiescere non potuit digna magni cordis indignatio, ut (quod) de Dei dono non poterat, de gratia gentilium consequeretur': ibid., p. 84.
[202] Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica*, ed. Dimock, p. 196.
[203] *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Stubbs, p. 294.

the king singlehandedly routed the enemy, 'just like a lion' ('sicut … leo'), and he had apparently arrived at the *mêlée* 'roaring' (*fremens*).[204] Both comments are absent from Ambroise's account of this episode, implying that Richard de Templo was responsible for their inclusion, and there are clear parallels with the aforementioned scenes recorded by Ralph of Coggeshall and Richard of Devizes, not least in the use of anger and leonine rhetoric to extol the king's intrepidity in combat.[205] It is also worth noting that although *furor* may have been used here for alliterative effect, to stress the extent of Richard's ire, the clause 'ne dicatur furore' seems to imply an awareness of the term's negative connotations and chimes with the author's general reluctance to impute it to his central protagonist.

In Ralph of Coggeshall, Richard of Devizes, and perhaps also Richard de Templo, then, we have three chroniclers who utilised leonine imagery to characterise Richard's anger for similar purposes: to emphasise the king's commitment to both the expedition and the extermination of his adversaries. None of these works was necessarily the point of origin of such rhetoric—indeed, Gerald of Wales' account of the Angevin king's leonine impulses pre-dates them all—but they demonstrate how the mythology surrounding Richard, and above all his emerging reputation as the 'Lionheart', influenced the ways in which writers depicted his anger; once established, the legend of Richard's lion-like fury reappeared in later works such as Roger of Wendover's *Flores historiarum*.

The immoderate, dysfunctional rage of Richard the Lionheart has become a hallmark of modern reconstructions of the king's personality, yet it has been contended here that the

---

[204] Ibid., pp. 294, 293.

[205] Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, ed. Ailes and Barber, i. 118–19 (tr. at ii. 131).

evidential foundations upon which such an interpretation rests are far from firm. To perpetuate the traditional perspective is to ignore the emotional standards of the twelfth century, against which Richard would have been judged; to oversimplify grossly the evidence and misinterpret the value-loaded representational strategies employed by medieval authors; and to underestimate the extent to which Richard's famous epithet, 'Coeur de Lion', and the desire of Anglo-Norman commentators to emphasise his leonine qualities, shaped accounts of his anger. Contrary to established historical opinion, which has largely castigated the English monarch for his vile temper, contemporary historians frequently represented Richard's wrath as a righteous response to injustices, and the idea that the slaughter of captives at Acre stemmed from a 'fit of rage' is, for the most part, unsubstantiated by the evidence. I would argue that the 'reality' of Richard's temperament is irretrievable. Ultimately, the evidence is polarised between Richard's supporters, who appear to have set his anger within established frameworks, such as the *ira regis* (reactive, righteous, tied to vengeance, at times unpredictable, but usually controlled), and his detractors, such as Ansbert, who had him fly into a mad, unrestrained rage. Anger and other emotional descriptors were valuable literary devices available to chroniclers for aggrandising or denouncing protagonists, and it is in this context that much of the evidence pertaining to Richard's temperament should be read.

A combination of factors has given rise to the idea in modern historiography that Richard's unyielding temper was a fundamental flaw in his character. In all likelihood, this view has primarily gained traction because it resonates with perceptions of the Acre execution as an exceptionally brutal event, and with a related assumption that surges of rage were commonplace on crusade. In addition, the traditional perspective can be seen

as a by-product of the persistent idea that a dysfunctional temperament was a typically Angevin trait, the validity of which has not yet been systematically determined, and as part of the legacy of Runciman's imaginative history of the crusades. Finally, the medieval narrative histories themselves, which incorporated legendary material at an early stage, may have encouraged value-negative assessments of Richard's anger; yet, the memorialisation of Richard by near contemporaries is far from convincing evidence for the king as an irrational and violent hothead. Instead, in response to his emerging reputation as the 'Lionheart', several twelfth- and thirteenth-century chroniclers appear to have used the raging lion as a point of reference for describing the king's anger and ferocity in combat; and such accounts of Richard's lion-like fury were usually a positive, rather than a negative, reflection on his character. Thus, an analysis of near contemporary accounts of Richard the Lionheart's wrath and modern historiographical interpretations attests to the value—and, in this instance, the necessity—of paying closer attention to memory in studies of medieval emotions.

Queen Mary University of London STEPHEN J. SPENCER