

## Romancing the East: Greeks and Saracens in *Guy of Warwick*

Rebecca Wilcox

### *Guy's ties to the East*

For decades, literary critics such as Frederic Jameson and Stephen Knight have argued that medieval romance, for the most part, unquestioningly reflects dominant ideologies of the ruling elite.<sup>1</sup> Far from conforming to this prescription, however, the fourteenth-century popular romance *Guy of Warwick* engages contemporary socio-political concerns in critical and transformative ways. *Guy's* fantastic reworking of England's past through its titular hero both recognises England's historic culpabilities in its interactions with other countries and transforms these culpabilities into redeeming alternative possibilities for remembering the past and for performing the future. The historical events to which *Guy of Warwick* responds, above all others, took place during the first four – perhaps five – Crusades. Indeed, the earliest Anglo-Norman versions of *Guy*, which predate the oldest known English translations by more than half a century, followed closely on the Fourth Crusade.<sup>2</sup> While the Middle English *Guy* is clearly based on the Anglo-Norman romance, it emphasises with greater strength the Englishness of its material and its hero and intensifies the ideologically charged Crusade-like conflicts in which Guy participates.<sup>3</sup> The Middle English *Guy* reshapes England's historical relationships with the East in order to redress its English audience's anxieties regarding these relationships.

Recent criticism on *Guy of Warwick* has emphasised, above all else, the manuscript history of the romance. Critics such as L. Hibbard, A. J. Bliss, D. Pearsall, I. C. Cunningham, T. Shonk and J. Frankis explore the *Guy* manuscripts and their production, while M. Mills, J. Burton, P. Price, R. Dalrymple, T. Turville-Petre, S. Crane and V. B. Richmond elaborate *Guy's* structure, its connections to hagiography and social

politics, and its analogues in visual art and non-romance literature.<sup>4</sup> Yet, despite their interest in the romance, critics have almost entirely ignored one of the central themes in *Guy*: the hero's domination of Eastern empires, both Christian and Saracen. This neglect has limited criticism of *Guy* to fairly local concerns, in particular how the romance reinforces the socio-political ideals of its noble and upper bourgeois audience. Recognising the romance's Eastern emphasis reorients modern readings of *Guy* toward a broader historical framework: the romance engages wide chronological and geographical lenses that encompass several centuries of British history and most of the known medieval world. The importance of the East in *Guy of Warwick* reveals itself textually in three primary ways: the structure of the romance; its historical positioning; and the ideological conflicts that pit Guy against several different Eastern antagonists.

Structurally, Guy's adventures in the East comprise the centre of each half of the romance; in the first half, Guy falls in love with his lord's daughter, Felice; in order to win her affection he sets off to fight tournaments in Europe and repeatedly emerges the champion. Guy then travels to Constantinople to protect the Christian emperor Ernis from Saracen invaders. He is again victorious, successfully repulsing both the Saracens and Ernis' attempts to marry Guy to his daughter, Clarice. Guy returns to England where he defeats an Irish dragon who is ravaging Northumberland, after which he finally marries Felice. In the second half of the romance, Guy realises that he has neglected his heavenly duties in pursuing only his desire for Felice. He once again travels through Europe to the East, this time to the Holy Land. There Guy defends Christian interests by defeating the Saracen giant Amoraunt, ensuring a balance of power more favourable to Christian dominance in the Holy Land. Guy finally returns to England and, as in the first half of the romance, reestablishes English sovereignty at home through one-to-one combat with Colbrond, champion of the Danish invaders. In the final scenes of the romance, Guy retires from public life and dies a hermit.

The structure of the romance, in two parallel cycles (a feature particularly marked in the early Auchinleck manuscript),<sup>5</sup> emphasises the centrality of the two long Eastern episodes.<sup>6</sup> This centrality is underlined by the importance of these episodes for Guy's development as a romance hero, for in each case he wins both military and moral battles in the East that could not have occurred elsewhere. In the first cycle, Guy triumphs over the Saracens who besiege Constantinople; he also overcomes the allure of the Emperor's daughter and his empire, which Guy would inherit as Clarice's husband. By conquering his foe

and rejecting Clarice's temptations, Guy proves himself worthy of returning home and claiming Felice's love and her inheritance of Warwick. In the second cycle, Guy shifts from chivalric knight to knight of God, and again overcomes his foe, the giant Amoraunt. Guy also wins a moral victory for Christianity, not only in defeating a pagan, but also by ensuring safe passage for all Christians through the kingdom of Alexandria and by freeing the Christian defenders of Jerusalem (the Earl Jonas and his sons) from captivity. Thus each Eastern victory prepares Guy for a crucial transformation in his life: in the first, Guy returns from Constantinople ready to marry Felice and re-evaluate his purpose as a knight; in the second, the hero prepares himself to reject earthly values and to dedicate his life entirely to God. A doubling structure is also at work within each of the two cycles, emphasising the connection between Guy's triumphs in the East and those in England: in the first cycle, for instance, Guy fights two dragons (one near Constantinople and the other, later, in Northumberland), each of them threatening England or a symbolic representation thereof. Likewise, in the second cycle Guy takes on trials by battle with two giant African Saracens, one in Alexandria and one in England; by defeating each giant, Guy saves Christians (first Jonas and his family, then the English people) from the bonds of slavery. Each journey to the East spurs Guy to victory, both in arms and spiritually, but it also leads him back home to fulfil his duties to England. Guy's conquests in Constantinople and the Holy Land reinforce not only Western stereotypes of the East, but also the sense of Englishness against which these stereotyped images appear more alien.

While the double cycle that leads Guy from England to the East and back again emerges as a way of ordering and recognising coherence in this episodic romance, the Auchinleck version of *Guy of Warwick* offers the reader a visual clue as well: it changes from couplets to tail-rhyme stanzas between the two cycles and underlines this caesura with a short summary of part one before beginning part two. *Guy's* place near the centre of the Auchinleck manuscript, both physically and thematically, replicates this sense of parallelism and continuation; each item in the codex complements *Guy*, either pre-facing it or building upon it in ways too intricate to be explored here. As a whole, the collection suggests that the person or family who commissioned the book was interested in the East as a place for exploration, adventure, conquest, and Christian faith.<sup>7</sup> This context sharpens the focus of *Guy of Warwick* as a romance that is invested in Eastern identities and histories, especially when they are in conflict

with Western Christianity. The rest of the contents of the Auchinleck manuscript support this claim: most of its other romances – notably, *Bevis of Hampton*, *Florice and Blancheflour*, *King Richard* and *The King of Tars* – devote considerable attention to East–West conflict and, in some cases, fantastic resolution, while the religious material also tends to focus on Eastern figures and saints, like Margaret of Antioch and Catherine of Alexandria, who are imagined in these versions as openly in conflict with other Eastern religions. *Guy of Warwick* reworks these themes into a more immediate, historical framework. Indeed, *Guy* engages not only popular misconceptions of the East that we see so often in medieval romance – frequently centred on its religious and ethnic otherness, its perversity or licentiousness, and its violent threat to the West or Christianity – but also historical events whose implications for England and Western Europe remained unresolved well into the fourteenth century.

As its hero battles Eastern foes familiar to Crusade chronicles and legends, *Guy of Warwick* reveals the West's lingering anxieties about the questionable outcomes of the Crusades which, as a connected series of military and colonial endeavours, waxed and waned throughout England and Europe's later medieval period. The Crusades proved difficult for the medieval West to accept fully, particularly as success became more elusive and tales of the horrors wrought on Christians and non-Christians alike began to filter back to the homelands and enter popular knowledge and imagination.

The First Crusade (1096–99), although successful in capturing Jerusalem from the Muslims, was disastrous for relations between the West and the Byzantine East because it shattered the illusion, carefully maintained throughout decades of thinly veiled antagonism, that Eastern and Western Christianities still made up a single, unified entity called 'Christendom'. The Eastern Empire was important to the Christian West because it served as a geographical buffer zone between the West and its Muslim enemies. With Constantinople in the way, the Latin West was less vulnerable to invasion from the East. The Byzantine Empire also linked the West spiritually with the East and its major shrines. While Eastern and Western Christianity remained on reasonably amicable terms, Europe and England could assume a spiritual connection between themselves and their Eastern brethren.<sup>8</sup> Relations between Greeks and Latins had been strained for several decades before the First Crusade, but the distrust generated between Constantinople and the Latin Crusaders in the last years of the eleventh century would negatively influence East–West contact for centuries to come.

The utter failure of the Second Crusade (1147–49) and the ambiguous outcome of the Third Crusade (1189–92), led by Richard the Lionheart, increased Latin anxiety over Christianity's impotence to maintain control of the Holy Land. Richard's ruthlessness toward his prisoners of war, contrasted with Saladin's famous generosity toward Christians, may have caused the West to question the stereotypical monstrosity of its Muslim foe. The Fourth Crusade (1202–04) only confirmed the West's culpability: the Latin armies marched not against the infidel, but against their former Christian ally, the Byzantine Empire. Constantinople was burned and plundered of treasure and relics, and its citizens were raped and slaughtered.<sup>9</sup> The greed, arrogance, and poor judgement evidenced by such acts followed the Latin armies into the Fifth Crusade (1217–21), when they captured important Egyptian territories and were offered Jerusalem, but lost both due to immoderate demands and selfish leadership.

Guy's military triumphs compensate for the West's historical losses in the East, while his moral and spiritual superiority recuperates Latin atrocities against fellow Christians during the Crusades. Guy defeats his Eastern enemies manfully and cleanly; and, perhaps more importantly, he refrains from accepting compensation for his good deeds, much less demanding vast rewards as did his Crusading counterparts. Moreover, *Guy* rewrites the history of the Crusades obliquely rather than overtly; the romance does not simply embellish facts or modify major players, but instead places the echoes of these events into a distant past. *Guy of Warwick* ostensibly takes place not in the centuries of the historical Crusades, but in the mid tenth century, during the rule of King Athelstan. By making Guy a pre-conquest hero, the romance emphasises the purity of his Englishness – and thus his value as a representative of his people – and places the story within a much wider context of conflict, invasion, conversion, and resistance. By recalling historical events and people of the tenth century, notably toward the end of the romance when the Danes invade England, *Guy* plays on its audience's fears of external threats to national sovereignty and draws an implicit parallel between Guy's defence of his homeland and his defence of Western righteousness and Christianity while in the East. The romance thus legitimises Guy's Crusade-like efforts by linking them with England's past. The anachronistic setting of *Guy* in the tenth century also places the potentially troubling events of the Crusades into a long-finished and partly forgotten history, one that has taken on a quality of legend rather than recent, stark reality.

The argument of this essay, then, is that at the centre of each of

*Guy*'s two cycles, the hero finds himself on a formative adventure in a fantastically imagined East; *Guy* devotes so much narrative attention to the East because the romance responds to and reimagines the West's conflicts with the East during the Crusades. *Guy* simultaneously asserts Latin dominance in both Christian and Muslim settings and rejects the most egregious moral error of the Crusades – the sack of Constantinople – by creating an alternative outcome in which the hero chooses not to seize control of the Byzantine Empire. In this way, *Guy* both affirms the project of the Crusades and rewrites those events that were unacceptable to the Latin West, allowing its audience to come to terms with its difficult past and to imagine a future of Crusading that will not repeat history's mistakes.

### *The Christian East: wily and womanly*

The Byzantine Empire was the gateway to the East for the armies of the First Crusade and many of their later followers. In keeping with *Guy of Warwick's* reworking of Crusade themes and events, *Guy's* first trip to the East leads him to Constantinople, the capital of Eastern Christendom. His stated motive: to help the Emperor Ernis repel the Saracens who have besieged the city. This *Guy* accomplishes successfully, but his adventures in Constantinople have only just begun; *Guy's* Byzantine beneficiaries, as I demonstrate below, prove more dangerous than the overt Saracen threat.

From the first news of the Emperor's distress, *Guy* establishes Constantinople's vulnerability and the potential rewards for the knight who will aid the city in its need. *Guy* hears of the siege of Constantinople through a group of merchants who have recently escaped the destruction of the Empire by the Sultan: 'In Costentyn þe noble emperour Ernis / þai han strongliche bisett, y-wis. / Castel no cite nis him non bileued, / þat altogider þai han to-dreued, / & for-brant, and strued, y-wis' (A 2819–23). The merchants continue by announcing in detail the riches they have brought with them from the noble city: 'Fowe & griis anouz lade we, / Gold and siluer, & riche stones, / þat vertu bere mani for þe nones, / Gode cloþes of sikelatoun & Alisaundrinis, / Peloure of Matre, & purper & biis, / To þour wille as þe may se' (A 2832–7). These tidings echo popular justifications for the First Crusade by implying that the Byzantine Empire is not only in desperate straits, but that rich compensation will reward those willing to risk the trip eastward.<sup>10</sup>

The leaders of the First and Fourth Crusades were encouraged to take the cross using similar rationale. At the end of the eleventh century, a forged letter, purportedly from the Byzantine Emperor Alexius I to Count Robert of Flanders, circulated in Europe and was cited by the foremost instigator of the First Crusade, Pope Urban II.<sup>11</sup> According to Urban and the 'letter', Alexius had invited a Latin force to Constantinople in order to help the Greeks subdue Saracen infidels. Though the Emperor may indeed have hoped to lure Europeans for temporary military aid,<sup>12</sup> he undoubtedly did not intend to spark a large-scale invasion of the East. Europe, however, found it expedient to imagine that the Eastern Empire was on the brink of collapse;<sup>13</sup> the 'letter' was crafted to suggest this perspective:

Nearly the entire territory from Jerusalem to Greece ... and many other areas ... have all been invaded by [the Turks], and hardly anything remains except Constantinople, which they threaten soon to take from us unless we are speedily relieved by the help of God and the faithful Latin Christians .... We therefore implore you to lead here to help us and all Greek Christians every faithful soldier of Christ you can obtain in your lands.<sup>14</sup>

In addition to this plea for 'every faithful soldier', the letter promises that the Emperor will place the city of Constantinople under the jurisdiction of the Latins. Contrary to the suggestions and promises in the 'letter', however, Alexius was reportedly alarmed to learn in 1096 that the armies of the First Crusade, a teeming horde of ill-disciplined folk of varying military abilities, had arrived at the shores of the Bosphorus and descended upon Byzantium.<sup>15</sup>

A century later, the armies of the Fourth Crusade were to receive a real request for relief from the Byzantine Empire. In 1202 Prince Alexius of Constantinople visited Philip of Germany, proposing that the Crusaders help him dethrone his uncle, the Emperor Alexius, who had in turn usurped it from Prince Alexius' father Isaac. To make the request more attractive, the young prince offered to submit the Eastern Church to the authority of Rome and to repay the Crusaders with large quantities of money and supplies as well as adding ten thousand of his own troops to the effort to conquer Egypt,<sup>16</sup> which was the explicit object of the Fourth Crusade. The Latins were eager to aid the supposedly helpless Eastern Empire and to gain valuable rewards and political influence in the region. But when Prince Alexius, now Alexius IV, failed to fulfil all the terms of his agreement, the Crusaders

attacked Constantinople in retribution. Far from conquering Egypt and establishing a solid Christian dominance in the Near East, the Fourth Crusade did not advance beyond the borders of Christendom; it ended, instead, with the Latin conquest and pillage of Constantinople in 1204, when a Latin emperor, Count Baldwin of Flanders, was established for the first time on the throne of the Eastern Empire.

As in the historical Fourth Crusade, the enemy during Guy's sojourn in Constantinople quickly shifts from Saracen to Greek. Despite Emperor Ernis' warm welcome of Guy's help in destroying the Saracens, the Emperor's steward, Morgadour, is less friendly. Jealous of the attention (and the promise of the princess's hand in marriage) Guy receives from the Emperor, Morgadour treacherously plots against him. He encourages the hero to visit the princess, unsupervised, in her chambers, trying to incite the Emperor to turn on Guy; when the Emperor remains unconcerned for his daughter's chastity, Morgadour succeeds in convincing Guy that the Emperor plans to kill him. On the verge of leaving his host to join the Emperor's Saracen enemies, Guy encounters Ernis and resolves their misunderstanding; the fact remains, however, that Guy is prepared to defect to the infidel camp and attack Constantinople, the very city for which he had recently sacrificed the lives of many of his companions.

This incident recalls the tensions between historical Crusaders and Byzantine emperors, whose 'natural' Christian alliance against the Turks was undermined by mutual mistrust. Beginning with the First Crusade, many Crusade armies feared that the Eastern Christians would turn on them: stereotypes of the 'treacherous Greek' persisted throughout the centuries of chronicles and other literature written in response to the Crusades. One of the first events that seemed to support Latin suspicion of the Greeks occurred early in the campaigns of the First Crusade, when Alexius I, concerned for the stability of his Empire, negotiated a surrender of the city of Nicaea to the Greeks under the nose of the Latin army, who had hoped to plunder the city for its wealth.<sup>17</sup> Alexius' failure to aid the besieged and starving Crusaders after their capture of Antioch in 1098<sup>18</sup> and the Emperor's intercepted letters to the Egyptian Fatimids<sup>19</sup> further established the Crusaders' distrust of the Greeks.<sup>20</sup> Likewise, in the romance, Guy is easily persuaded of the Emperor's duplicity and his evil intentions. Thus the hero betrays the Greeks before he can, as he thinks, be betrayed by them. In this instance, however, Guy is mistaken in his mistrust of the Emperor; the real danger here is not that the Emperor plots against him, but that the Emperor has no control over his ranks, rendering him ineffective against

internal as well as external threats. The Emperor's crime is incompetence rather than malevolence.

Though Christian knights fighting with Saracens against other Christians is not unheard of in medieval history, it is uncommon in Middle English literature; in *Guy's* case, I would argue, Guy's near defection implies that the hero has been lured off course by the wily Greeks. As well as making the hasty and condemnable, though at last averted, decision to fight alongside Saracens and against Christians, Guy has been diverted from his service to Felice and his goal of returning to England victorious. The fact that Guy even considers changing his loyalties implies that he has lingered away from home for too long, allowing his primarily military role at Constantinople to blur into desire for power and leaving England vulnerable to foreign attack. Guy has, by this time, become contaminated by his lengthy stay at Constantinople; still developing into the mature knight he will become, Guy's contact with the Greeks poisons him with unorthodox ideas and values. Indeed, poisoning is an unmanly tactic for which the Greeks were notorious among Latin Christians. Greeks were thought to operate not through strength or skill, but through cunning. Anna Comnena, princess of Byzantium, recognises the Crusaders' suspicion of poisoning at the beginning of the First Crusade when Bohemond arrives at the Imperial court: served both raw and cooked meat, the Crusader chooses to have the raw food prepared for him by one of his own men, admitting that he 'was afraid [Alexius I] might arrange to kill [him] by putting a dose of poison in the food'.<sup>21</sup> Such a characterisation of Greeks is neatly represented in the romance by the figure of Morgadour, who, in fact, poisons Guy's reputation, threatening his honour and his life.

The history of the First and Fourth Crusades is particularly important to the present discussion because *Guy* incorporates elements of the historical events of the previous two centuries, reworking them to appeal to its contemporary audiences and revising historical outcomes into 'happy endings'. *Guy of Warwick*, like the architects of the Crusades, fantasises about rescuing a vulnerable Constantinople from the infidel and from the Byzantines' own internal moral corruption and incompetence. By echoing Alexius I's 'letter' and Alexius IV's plea to Germany, the romance creates the illusion of an Eastern Empire complicit in her own conquest by the West – a figurative damsel-in-distress who will marry and submit to her rescuer. Constantinople, however, is not the only vulnerable woman in this segment of the romance. By conjuring Clarice as a flesh-and-blood princess who must marry in order to secure the future of the Byzantine Empire, *Guy*

reimagines the politics of conquering the rescued territories and establishing a Western emperor there – a solution that, in the romance, the Byzantine Emperor himself suggests. Ernis draws the audience's attention to the parallel positions of his daughter and his Empire by promising to reward Guy's defeat of the Saracens with Clarice's hand and half of his territory as a package deal: 'zif þou mizt me of hem wreke, / & þe felouns out of mi lond do reke, / Mine feyr douhter þou schalt habbe, / & half mi lond, wiþ-ouren gabbe' (A 2885–8).

The romance's conflation of Clarice and Constantinople plays once again on old Crusade imagery. Pope Urban, for instance, evoked the damsel-in-distress image during his crusading address at Clermont, in which he encouraged the West to embark on the First Crusade: 'Jerusalem is the navel of the world; the land is fruitful above all others, like another paradise of delights ... She seeks therefore and desires to be liberated, and does not cease to implore you to come to her aid.'<sup>22</sup> By portraying Clarice and Constantinople as two halves – the literal and the figurative – of the same feminine trope, *Guy* connects the hero's goal with that of the Crusades; furthermore, the romance replaces Jerusalem with Constantinople because, in the popular imagination as well as in Crusades literature, Constantinople is, much more than the Holy City, the land of milk and honey.<sup>23</sup>

By the thirteenth century, however, Constantinople had been ravished of her riches by the Fourth Crusade, leaving the Latins morally compromised by the destruction and carnage they left in their wake. *Guy* imagines Constantinople in all her glory, before her deflowering by the West, though the imminence of this deflowering may be alluded to by the sexual availability of Clarice, who could bring Guy all the riches of Byzantium through the more legitimate means of a conjugal union rather than military force.<sup>24</sup> Such a reimagining of the circumstances that led to the Western conquest of Constantinople invites the romance's audience to reconsider the terrible outcome of the historical Fourth Crusade, suggesting that the East was not only part of her own downfall, but even desirous of her conquest.

Honoured by Ernis' flattery and enticed by the lovely Clarice, Guy initially accepts the Emperor's invitation to marry his daughter and lingers in Constantinople for a time. He even goes to church to marry Clarice, but suddenly falls ill with a malady that signals the untenability of his acceptance of the Emperor's offer. Guy recognises that his illness is symbolic, sensing that his marriage to Clarice would make him culpable for deserting his true English love, Felice. Guy is thus threatened not only by the infamous treachery of the Greeks as

figured in Morgadour, but also by their 'feminine wiles' in the character of Clarice.<sup>25</sup> The East's allure is a feminine, sexual presence – unsuspected, but all the more dangerous because of its subtle appeal to the hero's emotions and vanity rather than his honour and military skill.

The temptation to marry Clarice and inherit her father's empire nearly causes Guy to break his oath to Felice and desert his homeland, but the greater threat to Guy in this situation is the danger of re-enacting one of the greatest calamities of the Crusades: the Latin conquest of Constantinople. For the Crusaders who took Constantinople at the beginning of the thirteenth century, the rewards were clear: for the nobles, the possibility of lands and titles as well as reunification of the Eastern and Latin churches. More importantly, and for the majority of the Crusaders, the glory of Constantinople lay in its riches – monetary, cultural, and reliquary treasure. Of all the disasters committed by Crusaders during the Middle Ages, the sack of Constantinople in 1204 was most horrifying to Europe and to Rome because of the brutality it inflicted not on the infidel, but on fellow Christians. As it became clear that this conquest would not resolve the break between the Eastern and Latin churches or ensure the safety of overland routes to the Holy Land, initial justifications for it waned. *Guy of Warwick* replays the choice the Crusaders faced in 1204: to accept the losses of war and turn the other cheek on real or imagined acts of treason on the part of the Greeks, or to stay in Constantinople and take control of the richest city in Christendom. The Crusaders chose to capture the city; in order to recuperate the West, however, the romance hero must reject the obvious appeals of becoming, like Baldwin of Flanders, the first Latin Emperor of the East. Unlike Baldwin and the other Crusaders, Guy recognises that the Greeks would not accept him as their Emperor, even if Ernis would (A 4435–44).

If Guy's illness on his wedding day is not enough to convince him of the threat the East poses for him morally, another symbolic incident reveals to him the dangers of remaining in Constantinople. After defeating the Saracens, Guy goes out to explore the country, only to discover a dragon attacking a lion in the woods. In a scene that parallels Guy's victory over the Saracens, the hero saves the lion by stabbing the dragon through the throat and beheading it, much as he killed the Sultan besieging Constantinople. The lion, grateful for Guy's service, becomes the hero's faithful companion in a re-enactment of Chrétien de Troyes's *Yvain*, or *Le Chevalier au Lion*. In medieval European literature, lions traditionally symbolise Christ; in an English romance, they may be associated as well with Englishness, as are Richard the Lionheart

and the three lions on the standard of England, Richard's battle flag. Indeed, Guy is compared to a 'lyoun' repeatedly throughout the romance, alluding to his Englishness and his inherent nobility through connection with England's favourite 'king of the beasts' as well as its favourite Crusader king. Guy and his lion become inseparable after the incident in the forest, but one day Guy becomes distracted by the entertainments offered by the Emperor's court – eating with the Emperor, sitting with him and 'pley[ing] in compeynie' (A 4299–302) – and allows his lion to wander off. Guy returns to his lodgings without the lion, who is attacked and mortally wounded by the treacherous Morgadour.<sup>26</sup> Guy's English identity and his Christian morality have thus been compromised through his dalliance at Constantinople.

When Guy forgets about his duties to his faith and his country, represented by the lion, preferring instead the luxuries of the Eastern court, he risks both loyal companionship and his own moral integrity. He also puts England at risk, depriving it of its best champion: while Guy lingers in Byzantium, Ireland (in the form of a dragon) threatens to ravish Northumbria. The subtle allure of the East, combined with its murderous treachery, threatens Guy's English identity and his very soul. Though Guy avenges the death of his lion by killing Morgadour, he cannot save the faithful beast; like his decision to side with the Saracens against Ernis and his temptation to marry Clarice, this incident implies a weakness on Guy's part, indicating that Guy's reputation and his faith have been poisoned by the attraction of the monetary, territorial, and sensual wealth the East has to offer. Guy tries to shift his guilt to Ernis by admonishing him, "“Sebbe þou no migt nouzt waranti me, / Whar-to schuld y serui þe, / On oncoupe man in thi lond, / When þou no dost him bot schond?”” (A 4415–18); but the death of the lion forces Guy to realise that Constantinople is a dangerous place, spiritually as well as physically. "“Harm me is, & michel misdo; / þerfore ichil fram þe go, / & in oper cuntres serue y wile, / Per men wille zeld me mi while”” (A 4419–22), he decides, and takes leave of the Emperor, none too soon.

When Guy leaves Constantinople, refusing to marry Clarice and exposing the treachery within the Byzantine court, he enacts a fantasy of rejection in response to the East's invitations. Both Guy and the Latin leaders of the Fourth Crusade go to Constantinople, at least explicitly, to help a disempowered Emperor. But the romance responds to the West's ambivalence – even horror – about the conquest of Constantinople by rejecting the material and sensual rewards that both Alexius IV and Ernis offer in compensation.

Guy's experiences in Constantinople generate a clear set of traits that distinguish the Near East from the other lands he has visited. Together, these traits combine to form an identity that characterises the Eastern Empire and that infuses nearly everyone and every situation that Guy encounters there. The Christian East is ambiguous and friendly, but treacherous. It is feminine, sumptuous and luxurious; it has sexual appeal and the promise of great power and riches; it is vulnerable and desires Guy's protection, evoking the 'damsel in distress' trope of chivalric romance and making Guy's would-be marriage to Clarice appear, at least on the surface, a justifiable possibility. Despite all the East has to offer, however, Guy's sojourn there – like the conquest effected by the Fourth Crusade – is a diversion that threatens to lure him away from his goals and obligations in England as well as to the Roman Church. By purposefully and unnecessarily remaining on Eastern soil, Guy risks succumbing to the personality – that is, the representative characteristics that are developed through individuals rather than collectives in the romance – that the East engenders.

### *Impersonating the Muslim East: Saracens, giants and disguise*

If the personality of the *Christian* East is seductive and subtle, the *Muslim* East is masculine: threatening, militaristic and physically overwhelming. In the second half of the romance, after he has left Felice, Guy makes his way to the Holy Land as a pilgrim-knight to seek God's forgiveness. Here the threat of treachery is present, but minimal; Guy must worry instead about the super-human physical force of the enemy. The Muslim East is also racialised in a way that the Christian East was not. In Constantinople, the Greeks are distinguished by their flawed morality, different because they do not share Guy's English sense of honour – a code that includes models for both knightly behaviour, exemplified by the trusty Herhaud, and female modesty, as we see in Felice. Even the Saracens at Constantinople, when we see them, perform not so much as racial or ideological others, but as a collective army against which Guy must wage battle because it has attacked his ally. When individuals are singled out of this army, usually because of their rank, Guy dispatches them quickly, with little dialogue that might suggest a conflict beyond the politics of the battlefield. The Saracens Guy encounters in the Christian East are a military enemy, not primarily a spiritual one, and they seem no more nor less honourable than the Greeks he meets there.

Once Guy becomes God's knight, however, his conflict with the Saracens gains deeper significance, and the enemy is portrayed as physically and ethnically as well as spiritually alien. Guy's primary adventure in the Holy Land occurs when he encounters Earl Jonas of Durras who, with his fifteen sons, has been captured while driving the Saracen enemy away from Jerusalem and into Alexandria, their 'owhen lond' (A 52: 3). Jonas' captor, King Triamour of Alexandria,<sup>27</sup> in turn displeases the Sultan, who requires that Triamour find a champion to fight for him against Amoraunt, the gigantic, black, fiendish Saracen of Egypt. Triamour delegates this task to Jonas, who, at the time Guy meets him, has spent the last year searching for the English hero. Guy has concealed his identity since becoming a poor pilgrim, but offers to fight Amoraunt in order to save Jonas and his family from certain death.

Though Guy technically fights for Triamour, the text explicitly qualifies his action by stating that Guy takes up the challenge for the sake of Jonas, a Christian and defender of Jerusalem. Moreover, Triamour promises to free all his Christian captives and grant safe passage through his lands for all Christians if Guy wins. Like the Emperor of Constantinople's invitation and his offer to make Guy his heir, this scenario echoes a widespread Crusader fantasy; ostensibly, the First Crusade was launched in part because pilgrims were being killed and robbed on their way to and from the Holy Land.<sup>28</sup> Later Crusades were aimed at capturing Egypt, which was a military stronghold of the Muslim world and considered crucial to the fate of Jerusalem from the Third Crusade onward.<sup>29</sup> Since, in the romance, the Christians already tenuously control Jerusalem,<sup>30</sup> a diplomatic alliance with the King of Alexandria would be a strategically brilliant move on Guy's part.

Before such an alliance is guaranteed, of course, Guy must defeat Amoraunt. The descriptions of the giant are vivid, and they are emphasised by repetition – the audience learns of Amoraunt's physical appearance both when Jonas tells Guy of his troubles, and again when Guy himself encounters his adversary. The first description, which introduces Amoraunt as a 'blac' Saracen, focuses on his intimidating physical presence: 'Michel & griselich was pat gome / Wiþ ani god man to duelle. / He is so michel & vnrede, / Of his sizt a man may drede, / Wiþ tong as y þe telle. / As blac he is as brodes brend: / He semes as it were a fende, / þat comen were out of helle' (A 62: 5–12). When Guy comes face to face with his opponent, the giant no longer merely *seems* like a fiend; Guy's judgement is definitive: "It is," seyð Gij, "no mannes sone: / It is a deuel fram helle is come" (A 95: 10–11). The text focuses on three features that lead Guy to conclude that Amoraunt

must be a devil: his religion ('Saracen'), his colour (black), and his impressive size.

Amoraunt, like Morgadour, does play an unfair trick on Guy – he convinces Guy to let him have respite to drink from the river, then refuses to allow Guy to do the same – but treachery is not the giant's dominant trait. Rather, he is dangerous because of his physical superiority and his sheer determination. He hates Guy not simply because the hero is on the other side of a military conflict, but also because he is *English* and *Christian*, a proven enemy of his Saracen clan.<sup>31</sup> This clash, then, is characterised not so much as a territorial dispute, but as an ideological battle between right and wrong, between Christian and Muslim. The fact that Amoraunt focuses on Guy's identity as an Englishman suggests that this episode tests Guy not only as an individual, but as a representative of England and English identity.

Unlike the Saracens whom Guy fought in the Christian East, Amoraunt is recognisably different. His size is abnormal, and the text repeatedly emphasises the blackness of his skin and eyes. Already alien because of his religion, Amoraunt's size and colour mark him as racially and ethnically *not English* in a physical way that religion alone can not.<sup>32</sup> Here we see a blurring of the boundaries among ethnic, racial, territorial and national identities that suggests that Amoraunt is a representative, if extreme, example of the non-English, non-Christian, Eastern 'race'.<sup>33</sup> His personality, like the people and place he represents, is aggressive and physically domineering.

My contention that Amoraunt is representative of an Eastern identity type is supported by the fact that he has a double – he reappears later in the romance as Colbrond – to whom the text links him through verbal repetition. Having defeated Amoraunt and helped a friend in need in Germany, Guy returns to England, hoping to end his days in peaceful asceticism. Before he retires from his public life, however, Guy must fight one last foe: Colbrond, champion of the invading Danes. Colbrond is like Amoraunt in almost every way: he is from Africa, part of the Muslim Empire (the Auchinleck text specifies that Amoraunt is from Egypt, while the Caius version agrees that both are from 'ynd', which was sometimes associated with the horn of Africa), a giant with black skin, and Saracen. The two episodes share structural similarities: Colbrond is described twice, once when Guy learns about the giant's existence and the need for a champion to fight him, and again when Guy faces him in battle: 'He was so michel & so vnrede, / Pat non hors mizt him lede... / Al his armour was blac as piche. / Wel foule he was & loplliche, / A grisely gom to fede' (A 255:

4–5, 257: 7–9). Between the two descriptions in each case, Guy is enlisted as the giant's opponent, and the leaders of each side agree to terms that will dictate what the winners will gain and the losers will lose. The battle between Guy and Colbrond develops parallel to the encounter with Amoraunt, including Guy's horse being struck from under him and the giant calling for Guy's surrender; Guy even kills the two heathens in much the same way, striking off the arm or arms of each opponent, then beheading him.

Amoraunt and Colbrond, then, are essentially the same foe; the significant difference between them is that Guy fights the former in the East, the latter on home turf. In the East, Amoraunt represents an Eastern identity that may threaten Guy personally, but which does not threaten his ethnic/racial/national identity. Guy can leave Amoraunt and the East behind and return to his homeland, the place of his ethnic roots. But as a representative of the East in England itself, Colbrond poses a greater threat. This episode of *Guy of Warwick* remembers, of course, the Danish invasion of King Athelstan's England in the tenth century, the temporal setting of the romance. Colbrond, along with the Danes for whom he fights, seek to replace English identity with another, foreign identity by making the English subjects of Denmark, a domination expressed by English king Athelstan as 'þraldom' (A 239: 11) or servitude. In Alexandria, Guy fought Amoraunt to preserve the most fundamental identity – life – of a group of captives, Jonas and his sons; in England, Guy likewise fights for a fundamental identity – the freedom of his people, threatened with becoming thralls in their own land.

In light of these struggles to preserve the right and the ability to maintain distinct proto-national identities and freedoms, the racial and ethnic affiliations that are contested or affirmed in the *Guy* texts become even more important. Unlike the squabbles for land one finds in a typical ancestral romance, the conflicts involved when Guy faces his Eastern opponents (especially Colbrond) are not internal skirmishes between Englishmen; they are the expressions of ethnic difference and the desire to maintain that difference, that spatial separation from the other. The author of the English *Guy* is careful to provide the audience with the imaginative tools to visualise and conceptualise Guy's adversaries as fundamentally different, both in appearance and in character, from the English hero. Colour is rarely evoked in the romance, yet Amoraunt and Colbrond are uniquely and repeatedly referred to as black;<sup>34</sup> their blackness is an external indicator of their difference from Guy, and of their fiendish moral status.

Because blackness has, in this romance, taken on such strong ideo-

logical overtones, I would like to retrace my steps, through Colbrond and Amoraunt, back to the first episode in which blackness becomes an identity marker in *Guy of Warwick*. I have delayed discussing this episode because its significance is most easily recognised in retrospect. The events to which I refer take place very soon after Guy returns to Europe from his stay in Constantinople, just before he returns to England to slay the Irish dragon. While making his way through Germany, Guy rescues a wounded knight, Tirri, who soon becomes a fast friend. They survive several adventures together, most of which involve defending themselves against Duke Otoun of Pavia, Guy's and Tirri's old nemesis. Eventually, the Duke manages to capture Tirri, and locks him away in a dungeon. As a faithful friend, Guy must save Tirri, but without alerting the Duke, for he also holds Tirri's beloved Oisel as his prisoner. Guy undertakes the rescue by disguising himself as 'Yon', dying his hair and face black, and presenting himself to the Duke bearing the gift of a swift steed raised by a Saracen, his 'owen cosy' (A 6122). Conveniently, the Duke makes 'Yon' his jailer, allowing Guy to sneak Tirri away to safety without Otoun's knowledge. The hero then kills the Duke (who is on his way to church to marry Oisel), rescues the lady, and returns her to her lover, Tirri.

The episode reveals a side of Guy's personality that the audience has not yet observed: he is cunning, and operates not through force, but by manipulating the perceptions of those around him. I would suggest that this episode is, in fact, based on Guy's experiences in Constantinople, while foreshadowing his future conflicts with the black giants. Since Guy meets Tirri immediately after his sojourn in the Christian East, the obstacles he overcame there and the personalities with which he was in contact still exert an influence on him; thus, disguising himself as 'A man ... o fer cuntre' (A 6117) would seem a natural choice for penetrating Otoun's lair. Dying his face and hair black, Guy temporarily takes on an Eastern personality, ready to dissemble and deceive. Blackness here makes Guy difficult to identify, and gives him license to behave in a way that he has criticised in others. By intentionally taking on an Eastern identity for a short time, and for a noble purpose, Guy seems to absolve himself of any residual contamination that may linger in him as a result of the temptations he faced, and only partly overcame, in Constantinople.

The blackness of Guy's hair and skin, moreover, demonstrate visually for the Duke, as they will for the audience later, another identity marker he assumes in his disguise: Guy implicitly marks himself as a Saracen, or Muslim, by emphasising that the Saracen who raised his

stead is his cousin. Thus Guy prepares the reader to associate blackness with Islam and with infiltration. After all, Guy invades the Duke's country – indeed, his home – paralleling Amoraunt's infringement upon the Holy Land and Colbrond's invasion of England toward the end of the romance. It is through some form of invasion, then, that Guy faces all of his significant enemies: Guy defeats the Saracens at Constantinople because they have invaded Eastern Christendom; he overthrows Otoun by invading the Duke's home in disguise; he kills the Irish dragon, who has invaded Northumberland; he then overcomes Amoraunt, who is thrust in Guy's path because Jonas invades Alexandria in response to the Muslim invasion of Jerusalem; and finally, Guy repulses the invading Danes on English soil by overpowering Colbrond. Such invasions are important symbolically because they violate the sacred space and corporate integrity of the invaded. In each case, the invasion threatens to overturn the native ruler and to disrupt national, ethnic, or religious identities.

### Conclusion

*Guy of Warwick* engages with history through the transformative medium of fantasy, which allows the romance to reshape historical events its audiences found troubling and to provide satisfactory resolutions to historical errors committed during the Crusades. Equally importantly, the romance allows an exploration of both the hero's personal identity and England's national identity through Guy's contacts with the East. As suggested by the romance's diptych structure, the East becomes the locus of each of the two formative cycles in Guy's career as chivalric knight and knight of Christ.

I have suggested here that there are two Easts in *Guy of Warwick*, one Christian and the other Muslim, which the romance characterises differently through the personalities of archetypal individuals – on the one hand, the insidious Greeks represented by Morgadour the steward, Emperor Ernis, and his daughter Clarice; and on the other hand, the physically monstrous Saracen giants, Amoraunt and Colbrond. These 'personalities' of the East are in conflict with Guy and the English identity he represents. But Guy surmounts these conflicts through conquest of territories, individuals, and the temptations – power, riches, and sex – that the East offers him. I have only begun to indicate how these conflicts influence the romance's conceptualisation of English national identity, which still wants further study. This

theme and others have, unfortunately, been largely neglected by scholars of Middle English romance who find *Guy's* militarism and episodic structure unappealing. Through its fictional reworking of the Crusades, however, *Guy of Warwick* demonstrates that English identity in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries – a period when Englishness was becoming an increasingly important aspect of England's national identity – was contingent on both England's domination of other territories and peoples and its vulnerability to external threat. Read from this perspective, the romance invites today's readers to take a closer look at the sometimes conflicting multiple layers of identities one recognises here: the feminine, the masculine, the monstrous, the religious, the national, the territorial, the individual. Because *Guy of Warwick* has been read and discussed so little since the rise of cultural studies in academia, the romance remains open to new readings that explore this complex work within the broad social, political and literary context of its inception.

## Notes

I want to thank Geraldine Heng and Nicola McDonald for their feedback on this chapter throughout its development. I am also grateful to Elizabeth Scala and J. Patrick Bedell for suggestions on early drafts and to Marjorie Woods and Joan Holladay for encouragement as I researched the manuscript history of *Guy of Warwick*.

- 1 F. Jameson. 'Magical narratives: romance as genre', *New Literary History*, 7.1 (1975), 135–63; S. Knight, 'The social function of the Middle English romances', in David Aers (ed.), *Medieval Literature: Criticism, Ideology & History* (New York, 1986), pp. 99–122.
- 2 In *Chivalric Romances* (Bloomington, 1983), L. Ramsey suggests that the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* was composed between 1232 and 1242 (p. 48), while V. B. Richmond, following J. Wathelet-Willem, argues that the earliest *Guy* was written immediately after the Fourth Crusade; see Richmond, *The Legend of Guy of Warwick* (New York, 1996), p. 24.
- 3 V. B. Richmond and S. Crane each discuss in some detail the differences between the English *Guy* and its Anglo-Norman predecessors. See Crane, *Insular Romance: Politics, Faith, and Culture in Anglo-Norman and Middle English Literature* (Berkeley, 1986), pp. 1–17, 66–7, and Richmond, *The Legend of Guy*, pp. 37–49.
- 4 A few of the most important studies on the manuscript history of *Guy of Warwick* are L. A. Hibbard, *Mediaeval Romance in England* (New York, 1960), pp. 127–39; A. J. Bliss, 'Notes on the Auchinleck manuscript', *Speculum*, 26 (1951), 652–8; *The Auchinleck Manuscript*, *National Library of*

*Scotland Advocates' MS. 19.2.1*, eds D. Pearsall and I. C. Cunningham (London, 1977); T. Shonk, 'A study of the Auchinleck manuscript: bookmen and bookmaking in the early fourteenth century', *Speculum*, 60 (1985), 71–91; J. Frankis, 'Taste and patronage in late medieval England as reflected in versions of *Guy of Warwick*', *Medium Aevum*, 66 (1997), 80–93. For more detailed analysis of the romance's structure, see M. Mills, 'Structure and meaning in *Guy of Warwick*', in John Simons (ed.), *From Medieval to Medievalism* (Basingstoke, 1992), pp. 54–68, who argues for a tripartite rather than a bipartite structure to the romance; and J. Burton, 'Narrative patterning and *Guy of Warwick*', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 22 (1992), 105–16. S. Crane in *Insular Romance* and V. B. Richmond in *The Legend of Guy* both elaborate on the romance's popular appeal, and Richmond catalogues Guy's appearance in other works and media. For hagiographic and biblical references, see P. Price in 'Confessions of a goddess-killer: Guy of Warwick and comprehensive entertainment', in J. Weiss, J. Fellows and M. Dickson (eds), *Medieval Insular Romance: Translation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 93–110; R. Dalrymple, 'A liturgical allusion in "Guy of Warwick"', *Notes and Queries*, 45 (1998), 27–8; and Crane, *Insular Romance*, pp. 62–4, 92–117, 128–33. For discussions of *Guy's* socio-political interests, see T. Turville-Petre, *England the Nation* (Oxford, 1996), particularly pp. 108–41, and Crane, *Insular Romance*, pp. 1–12, 62–91. This list is not exhaustive, but is reasonably representative of current work on *Guy*.

- 5 The version of *Guy* in the Auchinleck manuscript (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Advocates' 19.2.1), compiled c. 1330 in or near London, has distinct advantages for the modern reader: it is the earliest extant version of the poem in Middle English, offers a relatively complete text, and is conveniently edited by J. Zupitza in *The Romance of Guy of Warwick*, EETS e.s. 42, 49, 59 (London, 1883–91). In addition, *Guy's* inclusion in a large compilation manuscript allows us to study the romance in context (for a full list of the contents of the Auchinleck manuscript, see Bliss, 'Notes', pp. 652–3). The two most complete later versions of the romance in Middle English may be found in Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107 and Cambridge University Library, MS Ff. 2. 38. The Auchinleck manuscript will be cited in this paper as 'A'.
- 6 I agree with Burton ('Narrative patterning') that the Auchinleck *Guy* is a single romance arranged as two parallel cycles. The break between the two parts is relatively insignificant: the second cycle continues on the same page and in the same column that complete the first cycle. There is no new item number, title, or illustration, all of which are common divisions between individual works in Auchinleck. *Reinbrun*, on the other hand, is marked as a separate romance in Auchinleck: it has a new original item number, its own title, and it begins with a large illustration.
- 7 Shonk suggests a bourgeois patron for the Auchinleck manuscript in 'A study of Auchinleck', p. 90, while Turville-Petre (*England the Nation*, p.

- 136) speculates that the book was commissioned by the Beauchamp family, who claimed to be descendants of Guy of Warwick.
- 8 Baldric of Dol's version of Urban's speech at Clermont highlights the 'brotherhood' of the Eastern and Western Churches by referring to Eastern Christians as 'fratrum nostrorum' and 'fratribus nostris'. See Baldrici, *Episcopi Dolensis in Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, 5 vols (Paris, 1841–95), vol. 4, p. 14.
  - 9 Paradoxically, such behaviour is represented by both Pope Urban, instigator of the First Crusade, and a dubious letter supposedly written by Alexius I as characteristic of *Muslim* atrocities against Christians. For Urban's representation of the Muslims' behaviour toward Christians, see Baldric of Dol, Guibert of Nogent, and Robert of Rheims in E. Peters (ed.), *The First Crusade*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia, 1998), pp. 29–31, 36–7, and 27, respectively. For the Latin, see *Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 4, pp. 12–14 (Baldric) and 140 (Guibert), and vol. 3, pp. 727–8 (Robert). For the letter purportedly from Alexius I, see *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens grecs*, 2 vols (Paris, 1875–81), vol. 2, pp. 53–4.
  - 10 Though the romance's focus on the merchants' riches *suggests*, rather than explicitly *promises*, compensation for acts of knightly prowess such as rescuing the Emperor of Constantinople, Felice has conditioned Guy to expect rewards for his knightly deeds by representing herself as the ultimate 'prize'; Guy rejects this dynamic in the second half of the romance. Not coincidentally, the depiction of the merchants echoes Fulcher of Chartres' enthusiastic description of Constantinople's riches in his *Chronicle of the First Crusade*: 'Oh, what an excellent and beautiful city! ... It is a great nuisance to recite what an opulence of all kinds of goods are found there; of gold, of silver, of many kinds of mantles, and of holy relics. In every season, merchants, in frequent sailings, bring to that place everything a man might need.' Peters (ed.), *The First Crusade*, p. 62. For the Latin, see *Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 3, p. 331.
  - 11 In *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (Chicago, 1980), J. Boswell discusses this letter in terms of its depictions of the Muslim other as sexually and ethnically deviant (p. 279). He reproduces the letter in English translation as Appendix 2, pp. 367–9.
  - 12 On Alexius' need for mercenary troops, see M. McGinty, *Fulcher of Chartres: Chronicle of the First Crusade* (Philadelphia, 1941), p. 15 (note 1) and S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1951–4, reprinted Harmondsworth, 1965), vol. 1, pp. 104–5, 107.
  - 13 For Urban's use of the 'call for help' from Constantinople, see the *Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres*, I. 3 in Peters (ed.), *The First Crusade*, p. 52. For the Latin, see *Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 3, p. 323.
  - 14 Boswell, *Christianity*, p. 368.
  - 15 *The Alexiad of Anna Comnena*, trans. E. R. A. Sewter (Harmondsworth, 1969), pp. 308–9.
  - 16 For the terms of Prince Alexius' agreement with the Fourth Crusaders,

- see Joinville and Villehardouin, *Chronicles of the Crusades*, trans. M. R. B. Shaw (Harmondsworth, 1963), p. 50. For the French, see Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. Faral (Paris, 1938), pp. 92, 94.
- 17 For a more detailed discussion of the capture of Nicaea and the so-called treachery of Alexius, see Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, pp. 175–82.
  - 18 On Alexius' abandonment of the Crusaders at Antioch, see Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, pp. 239–40; *The Alexiad*, trans. Sewter, pp. 345, 349; D. Munro, *The Kingdom of the Crusaders* (New York, 1935), p. 51.
  - 19 Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, pp. 272–3.
  - 20 The motif of the 'treacherous Greek' is repeated in histories of the Crusades well beyond the end of the First Crusade. According to Runciman (*History of the Crusades* vol. 2, pp. 25, 28) the Latins blamed Alexius when they were attacked by the Turks and when they ran short of food and water during the Crusade of 1101. Over the course of the Second Crusade (1147–49), the Greeks were again accused of various treacheries, including killing Frederick Barbarossa and not following through on offers of monetary assistance (Munro, *Kingdom of the Crusaders*, pp. 136, 141, 198). In Ambrose's *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, ed. G. Paris (Paris, 1897), the Greeks are characterised as 'faus' (line 740), as 'gent colverte' and worse than Saracens (lines 1434–35), and they attempt to kill the titular hero, Richard, with poison arrows (lines 1925–26). References to the treachery of the Greeks in literature of the Fourth Crusade (1199–1204), during which Constantinople was taken by the Latins, are numerous; see, for example, Joinville and Villehardouin, *Chronicles*, pp. 80, 115, and p. 44 and 84 for internal treason (the French may be found in G. de Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. Jean Dufournet (Paris, 1969), pp. 87, 127, 91 and 44, respectively); E. Peters, *Christian Society and the Crusades, 1198–1229* (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 13–14, and p. 9 for treason within the Byzantine Empire; Robert of Clari, *The Conquest of Constantinople*, trans. Edgar Holmes McNeal (New York, 1936), pp. 83–6 (for the French, see Robert de Clari, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. Philippe Lauer (Paris, 1956), pp. 59–62).
  - 21 *The Alexiad*, trans. Sewter, p. 328.
  - 22 The quote is taken from Robert of Rheims' version of Urban's Clermont address, translated by D. Munro, reprinted in Peters (ed.), *First Crusade*, p. 28. For the Latin, see *Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 3, p. 729.
  - 23 Fulcher of Chartres, for instance, describes both Constantinople and Jerusalem in his Chronicle. His description of Constantinople corresponds nicely with Urban's descriptions of Jerusalem, an earthly paradise overflowing with riches and wonderful sights. Fulcher's impression of Jerusalem, however, is moderate, drawing the reader's attention to the rocky terrain, the lack of reliable natural water sources, and the modest size of the city. For Fulcher on Constantinople, see Peters (ed.), *The First Crusade*, p. 62. For the Latin, see *Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 3, pp. 331–2.

- For Fulcher's description of Jerusalem, see Peters (ed.), *The First Crusade*, pp. 87–9. For the Latin, see *Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 3, pp. 355–7.
- 24 The deflowering metaphor used here applies not only to Clarice's sexual availability through marriage, but also to the crimes perpetrated upon the women of Constantinople when that city fell to the Latins in 1204. See Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. 3, p. 123.
- 25 In 'Cannibalism, the First Crusade, and the genesis of medieval romance' (*differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 10 (1998), 98–174), Geraldine Heng argues that the 'Romani' referred to as 'womanish' by Geoffrey of Monmouth are, in fact, Greeks. See *The Historia Regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth I: Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 568*, ed. Neil Wright (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 128–9. Here Geoffrey explicitly links the Greeks with femininity or effeminacy. Implicitly, chroniclers of the Crusades often make this connection as well, frequently by citing the Greek aversion to hand-to-hand battle.
- 26 This episode, in which Guy's lion is killed by a Greek traitor, seems to invert a historical event of the Crusade of 1101. According to Runciman, the Crusaders killed Alexius I's pet lion during their brief riot in Constantinople (*History of the Crusades*, vol. 2, p. 20). If the killing of Guy's lion is symbolic of his temporary separation from Christ, the death of Alexius' lion may also be read as evidence of his problematic break with the Roman Church.
- 27 Triamour's name, which translates roughly as 'three loves', most probably refers to the trinity of gods attributed to Islam in many medieval romances: Apollo, Ternagant, and Mahoun (Mohammed).
- 28 Both Urban and the false letter of Alexius I cite the difficulty, even the horror, of the pilgrimage to the Holy Land as a reason for the West to venture East and 'liberate' Jerusalem as well as persecuted Christians, both Eastern and European. See, for instance, Guibert of Nogent's version of Urban's address in Peters (ed.), *First Crusade*, pp. 36–7. For the Latin, see *Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 4, pp. 139–40. See also Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, pp. 78–9, 98. Other contemporary romances also deal with this problem of waylaid pilgrims, including, for example, *Richard Coeur de Lion*, which shares many themes with *Guy*.
- 29 For the importance of Egypt in the Crusades, see Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. 3, pp. 110–11, 151.
- 30 In reality, Christians had not held Jerusalem since Saladin recaptured the Holy City for the Muslims in 1187. Christians were never to regain direct control of the Holy City. In the tenth century, which is when, historically, the romance is set, Christians were still over a century away from taking Jerusalem for the first time.
- 31 Amoraunt presents himself as a relative of the Sultan whom Guy killed at Constantinople, thus associating himself explicitly with the threat against Eastern Christianity.
- 32 In *Guy of Warwick*, there are no examples in which religion itself acts as a

physical marker. There are rare instances in medieval English literature, however, for which this is not the case; in the *King of Tars*, which also appears in the Auchinleck manuscript, religious orientation determines the physical appearances of both the Sultan and his son.

- 33 For a discussion of 'ethnic nationalism' in medieval England, see Turville-Petre, *England the Nation*, pp. 16–17. Turville-Petre devotes an entire chapter to expressions of nationalism in the Auchinleck manuscript, including *Guy of Warwick*.
- 34 There are only two references to the colour black not discussed here: the Saracens Guy fights in Constantinople are briefly alluded to as black, but only when the discussion is about something else – the treasure that Guy took from them. The Irish dragon that Guy kills just before he marries Felice is also described as black. The thematic correlation between this dragon, which also invades England from a nearby country, and Colbrond / the Danes is probably not coincidental.