

Postgraduate English

www.dur.ac.uk/postgraduate.english

ISSN 1756-9761

Issue 18

September 2008

Editors: Maddy Callaghan and Shane Collins

*Of Device as Device: The Narrative
Functioning of Armorial Displays in
Froissart's Chronicles*

Michael Huxtable*

* Durham University

Of Device as Device: The Narrative Functioning of Armorial Displays in Froissart's Chronicles

Michael Huxtable
Durham University

Postgraduate English, Issue 18, September 2008

In terms of socio-cultural history, the *Chroniques* or *Chronicles* of French poet and historiographer Jean Froissart (c.1337-1410) provide important access to the medieval perception of armory, and to the growth of the armorial function of the herald during the fourteenth century. Moreover, they also provide us with a fascinating example, or set of examples, of the codification of narrative by a great medieval writer.

Ostensibly written to inspire young knights to follow recent exemplars of chivalric honour, [1]. Froissart's *Chronicles* have tended to receive criticism for their ideological focus and socially elitist view of episodes and events. [2] However, more recent commentators (in part reflecting concerns of the current age) have also found a sophisticated depth and range in the work, and evidence of a writer capable of using complex shifts in perspective to retell events (weighing their potential as "stories"), and further, a discrete sense of irony. [3]

It is widely accepted that Froissart began writing the work in around 1369, its first book relating events from 1322 (leading to the accession of Edward III), for which he relied upon a particular named source, Jean Le Bel canon of St Lambert of Liège, and a participant in the campaigns he narrated for his own *Chronicles*. [4] For his later material, Froissart drew on personal experiences and information collected from conversations with others directly involved in events (notably heralds). Sir John Chandos' herald ("Chandos Herald"), the writer of a poetic chronicle recording the life of his master's lord (the Black Prince), was a particularly authoritative source for Froissart, both as an historian and literary "transformer" of events into forms of more palatable historiography. [5] Given the

blending of source materials, hearsay and personal impression going into the work, Froissart is rightly regarded by modern historians as an unreliable resource for matters of fact, and must be read with caution regarding minor details such as dates and numbers involved in battles. [6] However unreliable he was as an historian, Froissart remains an evocative and highly engaging writer, as one might expect from his ability with verse forms and themes. [7] In the *Chronicles* he exerts masterful control over the narrative, also utilizing invented dialogues in order to dramatize events. However, what in particular makes the *Chronicles* the subject of a literary essay, and its appeal to those interested in representations of visual perception in literature, [8] is its powerful articulation of the medieval perceptual world, and further, the semi-performative reconstruction of this in the service of recording “history”. Froissart has been aptly described by Brereton as “deeply illuminating on the mental attitudes of his century”; [9] specifically for this critic he evokes the period’s perceptual mode of being and attitudes extremely effectively. Froissart’s sensitivity to the language of visibility, coupled with his desire to invest events with feeling and memorability, has left us with a valuable record of “lived” armorial practices and their metaphorical phenomenology, as experienced first-hand by perceivers operating within a medieval, yet co-constructed “reality” of visual meaningfulness.

Froissart’s earliest mentioning of an armorial display occurs in his account of the youthful Edward III’s campaign against the Scots in 1327. His source for this episode, Jean Le Bel, primarily had a soldier’s eye for an enemy battle-banner, and Froissart retains the detail in order to record the leaders of the Scots by their coats of arms. Thus the Earl of Moray bears “...argent three oreillers gules”, and Sir James Douglas bears “azure on a chief argent three mullets gules.” [10] The use of accurate blazon here indicates how (and throughout the work) heraldic identity was a key aspect of perceptual meaning for a court war reporter such as Froissart. References to coats of arms, banners, pennons and heraldic activities in the *Chronicles* are too numerous to discuss individually, but picking out a few of the most significant ones it is possible to explore Froissart’s creative

understanding of armory as a narrative device operating within particular contexts and employed towards particular narrative ends. I would divide his archetypal textual descriptions into four types: heralds and their activities; [11] arms and identity in battle (at both the level of individuals and within wider strategic situations); [12] arms and identity as politics, [13] and armorial identity pertaining to chivalry as ideology. [14] The categories overlap such that examples fall into more than one group, e.g., Froissart's account of the coronation of Henry Bolingbroke (see Appendix A: 32-36) is clearly a description of a political event involving ideological overtones, within which numerous heralds are recorded doing significant work.

Firstly, Froissart witnessed and describes many individual heralds operating within roles matching those typically outlined for fourteenth-century heraldry. Heraldry are reported proclaiming the King's words to his subjects (A2: Edward III's instigation of the Order of the Garter, and A36: Henry IV's champion's challenge to any who might oppose his coronation); they operate as messengers between opposing armies and make challenges and proposals of battle (e.g. A17: John of Gaunt's herald's failed attempts to arrange a battle with the French); and have their more recent role as "specialized perceivers" of arms attested to in situations where they are called upon to identify knights by their shields (e.g. A5: heralds identify the dead by their arms after the Battle of Crécy, and A30, Froissart seeks March Herald to help him identify the coat of arms of Henry Crystede). This aspect of a herald's work, whilst involving using accurate *blazon* (e.g., A30), does not make the accurate description of arms the preserve of heralds alone. Froissart establishes armorial identities of individual knights without recourse to heralds on various occasions. [15] Froissart may have obtained information for the precise form of words to use for his armorial descriptions from heralds, or may have had an heraldic authority confirm the details of such descriptions in these passages, but the extent of his heraldic reliance cannot be proven, and, indeed, as the case of Henry Crystede (A30) shows, Froissart was not

averse to directly thanking his heraldic sources when he did require exact armorial information.

The possible reasons Froissart included detailed *blazon* of particular individuals' arms and not others make for interesting speculation. From examples already mentioned it seems clear Froissart set down armorial details as a record for posterity only if the bearers were deemed in some way worthy of remembrance and imitation – be this for honourable or dishonourable reasons. Thus the Earl of Moray and Sir James Douglas were key figures in the wars with Scotland and required immediate and official recognition. The knights who jousting at the beginning of the battle of Poitiers (Sir Eustace d'Aubrecicourt and Sir Louis de Recombes) were clearly less significant, but stood out for Froissart as memorable examples of “true” chivalry in action – as of course did his greatest exemplar of knighthood, Sir Geoffrey de Charny, who fell at Poitiers with the French “Oriflamme” (standard) in his hands (A13). By contrast, Froissart also accurately reports the arms of the dastardly Bohemian knight, Herr Hans, at the Tournament at Saint-Inglevert (A28). Here the heraldic identification is given to serve a different didactic purpose: to punish a negative example of chivalry by publicly identifying and shaming the perpetrator. Froissart further records the arms of one Henry Crystede (A30) in gratitude for his personal kindnesses: an act of recognition which, given the relative scarcity of full *blazon* in the *Chronicles*, suggests the author felt genuinely indebted to, and grateful for Crystede's help, citing him therefore as exemplifying chivalrous conduct towards a writer.

Froissart, following his heraldic sources, most frequently and emphatically employs armory and its perceptions for description and codification of battles between individuals and armies. Hence the location and progress of an army's banners, standards and pennons, at the strategic level, define its essential status on the field of battle. Froissart describes how at the Battle of Caen (1346) the arrival of the English was witnessed by the townsfolk:

When they of the town of Caen, who were ready in the field, saw these three battles coming in good order, with their banners and standards waving in the wind, and the archers, the which they had not been accustomed to see, they were sore afraid and fled away toward the town without any order or good array for all that the constable could do. [16]

The ‘good order’, archers, and an array of banners heralding an approaching storm are deemed the cause of mass flight. At the other end of the spectrum, a description of banners in retreat visually encodes defeat in his depiction of the Battle of Poitiers (1356): “The King [of France] fully realized that his men were in danger. He saw their ranks wavering and breaking and the banners and pennons falling or moving back under the weight of the enemy’s assault” (A12). Between such extremes of victory and defeat are descriptions of banners functioning in complex tactical situations, e.g., when marching to the Siege of Breteil, the Marshal’s banners are noted as the limit beyond which men in the advancing army could not pass, on pain of death, in order to maintain discipline (A7). (The soldiery were capable of charging recklessly into battle and giving away their side’s tactical advantage.) Multiple (nineteen) standards bearing identical arms are reported used to conceal the location of the King of France at Poitiers (A8); and during skirmishes within major battles the unfurling of individual banners and pennons are highlighted in order to express an individual’s intention to stand and fight, as at Limoges (A6); and also, again at Poitiers, after the battle’s ending in an English victory, Sir John Chandos is described encouraging the King to raise his banner to rally his scattered men. Chandos’ words, albeit invented or enhanced by Froissart, encapsulate and idealize the military importance of armorial displays on the battlefield: “The day, thank God, is yours. I can see no French banners or pennons or any body capable of reforming” (A14). Whilst such armorial descriptions offered a basic means of summarizing military actions and their strategic meaning, they were also a medium capable of exciting emotions and wonderment in Froissart and his readership. The deeper impact of armorial displays is evident in his account of a naval conflict off Winchelsea in 1350 (A6).

Froissart describes the Spanish ships as “...so powerful and splendid that they made a beautiful sight. (...) On the masts also were streamers bearing their various colours and emblems which waved and fluttered in the wind.” The visual effect is, however, derived from a military and nationalist *raison d'être*: “If the English were thirsting for a fight, they appeared to be even more so...”

Armory also serves an important part in numerous political incidents reported in Froissart's *Chronicles*. At a foundation level, it is employed to declare personal or factional authority, and symbolizes the power or claim to power of an individual over a geographical area. Hence after his account of the Battle of Caen (1346), Froissart describes how the English Marshall rode with his banner through the streets “and had it proclaimed in the king's name that none should dare ... to start a fire, kill a man or rape a woman” (A4). This stipulation apparently had the effect of pacifying the conquered townsfolk. A more complex political situation is encapsulated at Poitiers, in a passage in which Froissart (clearly writing with dramatic effect in mind) reports how the Black Prince, while charging towards the enemy “glanced right towards a small bush and saw under it the dead body of Sir Robert de Duras with his banner beside him – it was a French banner with a red saltaire – and a dozen of his followers beside him” (A11). The later significance of this banner is both political and complicated, and it is a testament to Froissart's approach as story-teller that the detail is subtly imparted here, to be recalled later (as a memory trigger) when the wider political situation has been developed. For any armorially perceptive reader the red saltaire would have had an immediate impact. The presence of Robert de Duras, killed in battle fighting for the French (certified by his arms) reveals that the Church's peace envoys cannot be trusted. Robert de Duras, who had previously attempted to negotiate between the opposing armies on behalf of Cardinal de Périgord, departed prior to the battle and fought for the French: contravening the rules of war regarding peace negotiators.

A further telling combination of the political aspect of armorial display with its function as a narrative device is seen in Froissart's account and comments on the preparation of the French fleet intended to invade England in 1386. One passage

in particular indicates the passionate and competitive attitude of knights towards armory in the late fourteenth century:

The great lords vied with one another to make lavish preparations and to embellish their ships with their badges and coats-of-arms. Painters certainly had a prosperous time. They were paid whatever they liked to ask and they refused to give any reductions. Banners, pennons and silken streamers of really surpassing beauty were made. The masts were painted from top to bottom and many, to advertise their wealth and power, had them covered with fine gold-leaf, over which were painted the arms of the lords to whom the ships belonged. I was told in particular that Sir Guy de La Trémoille had his personal ship magnificently decorated and that the devices and paintings which were done on it cost over two thousand francs. The great lords did everything that could possibly be thought of to beautify their ships, and it was all paid for by poor people throughout France, for the taxes levied for this expedition were so great that the richest complained bitterly and the poor tried to escape from them (A20).

The anecdote of Sir Guy de La Trémoille embedded here highlights the great efforts and expense (over two thousand francs) that might be poured into armorial displays in order to establish public visual significance, and thereby the political significance of the bearer. The passage also demonstrates how armory was for Froissart the elite identity motif *par excellence* for his wider narrative purposes: it was the primary means by which personal prestige was publicly displayed, and, since involving competition in its use, also reflected the political struggles for position going on throughout the courts of Europe. Furthermore, the armorial system enhanced broad differences between social-economic groups; Froissart's noting the increased tax burden caused by the beautification of the ships perhaps suggests that his social sympathies were mixed. The tone is ambiguous while the sense is clear: the populace at large paid for the richest members of the society to indulge in their competition of visually spectacular self-aggrandizement. It is possible that Froissart was increasingly sensitive to the notion that armory *per se*

bore a wider message of political oppression and profligacy for those outside the social elites.

Froissart develops the socio-political aspect to the visual armorial code in his account of the Peasants' Revolt in 1381 (see A18-19). Here he describes how after the peasants had been granted the protection and symbolic patronage of the King's banners they were orderly and rational, but when the banners were withdrawn they became a mob. ("It may be said that as soon as the royal banners had been removed, those bad men became just a mob" A19.) For Froissart's perception, the withdrawal of the King's banners symbolically enacted both the disordering effect on the third estate caused by the removal of royal authority and the King's duplicity in changing his mind. Thus Froissart's treatment of banners often provides a key to interpreting internal political situations. His sympathies in the above mentioned situation are once again possibly split: his attitude to the social disorder is unremittingly negative (most explicitly demonstrated in his account of the behaviour of the "Jacquerie" [17]) and he clearly sees the leaders of the revolt as evil men, and yet he is sympathetic towards the attitude of the poor to the rich (A20) and unswervingly records how the young King Richard II revoked his letters of pardon, dishonourably breaking his word to his peasant petitioners.

Most significantly, Froissart's prolonged description of Henry Bolingbroke's Coronation in 1399 serves as testament to his perception of and use of armory as a narrative tool in relation to the political hierarchies of fourteenth century Europe (A31-35). The account is carefully constructed to draw attention to the symbolic displays of each echelon of society in order to emphasize the most splendid and opulent of all, the new (albeit usurping) King. The day before the coronation, the King wearing "a short doublet of cloth-of-gold in the German style," and "mounted on a white charger," also wearing "the blue garter on his left leg",

...rode right through the city of London and was escorted to Westminster by a great number of nobles with their men wearing their various liveries and badges, and all the burgesses, Lombards and merchants of London,

and all the grand masters of the guilds, each guild decked out with its particular emblems” (A33).

Later that night he bathed, and in the morning made his confession and attended three masses (following rituals of physical and spiritual ablution established via works such as Ramon Llull’s *Libre de l’orde de cavalleria*, c.1280)) before being escorted from the Palace to Westminster Abbey by representatives from the elites – of Church and State – clad in vibrant costume: “The dukes, earls and barons had long scarlet robes and long mantles trimmed with miniver, and large hats lined with the same fur.” The hierarchical nature of this display is re-emphasized when Froissart notes that, “The dukes and earls had three bars of miniver about a foot long on their left shoulders, and the barons only two. All the others, knights and squires, had robes of scarlet livery-cloth” (A34). Froissart also notes that the procession featured “a canopy of indigo-coloured silk supported on four silver rods and with four jingling golden bells” carried over the Duke’s head, and that the Duke’s eldest son bore the Sword of the Church, and Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland and Constable of England, the Sword of Justice. Along with these men came the Earl of Westmorland, Marshal of England, carrying the royal sceptre. The descriptions of the displays unite, demonstrating a visual hierarchy of symbolic colours and costume: the association of imperial purple coupled with the heraldic and alchemical supremacies of white, gold and silver forming a background for the demonstration of State and Church authority (embodied in the sword and sceptre). Finally, in Froissart’s atmospheric, dramatic account, we are presented with the transition of the man into King enacted by changing costume: “Before the altar his royal robes were taken off, leaving him naked to the waist, and he was anointed in six places, on his head, his chest, on both shoulders, on his back between the shoulders, and on his hands.” Henry’s removal of his secular robes of authority before any divinely sanctioned vestments could be granted and worn balances out the focus on displays of hierarchal secular powers presented previously. Moreover, to enact his new role as rightful King (a title carrying divine rights and responsibilities) Froissart notes Henry is dressed “in

ecclesiastical robes like a deacon; crimson velvet shoes like those of a prelate were put on his feet and then spurs with points and no rowels.” The symbolism of the account is emphasised throughout the drawing, blessing, sheathing and girding of the Sword of Justice; a process which reaches a crescendo at the moment of Henry’s coronation: “Next the crown of St Edward, which has three arches, was brought and blessed and placed on the King’s head by the Archbishop” (A35). The political meaning of the ceremony is thus visually enacted and reconstructed as a perfectly ordered, working mechanism of the hierarchical realities of the medieval political world operating within the hierarchically conceived cosmology. The identity of the King is, in the same way as his knights, visually attested to by his dress and display, but operates as the ultimate expression of systematic armorial significances.

Most importantly for this paper, however, in his account of the 1399 coronation Froissart clearly imbues the armorial and costume symbolism with vitality and meaning from a perspective steeped in the literature of chivalry. Thus the *Chronicles* are at their most “romance-like” and Froissart at his most poetic as a historiographer, when presenting the activities and speech of knights in terms of the ideologies of secular and spiritual knighthood. Another fine example of this propensity (as we noted previously) is provided in the report of an unchivalrous act at the tournament at Saint Inglevert (A28). Indeed, the entire tournament, which very understandably attracted Froissart’s attention as a writer, seems designed to demonstrate chivalric ideals and to operate as if part of a romance. The three knights instigating the event do so by issuing a formal invitation in which they promise fair play: “Nor shall there be any other unfair advantage, fraud trickery or evil design, nor anything not approved by those appointed by both sides to guard the lists.” [18] They pitch crimson tents with their shields hanging outside to be struck by challengers – a romance motif prevalent from the twelfth century. [19] The knights employ another romance-like method of challenging other knights, so that those wishing a trial of arms have a choice of combats: “At the entrance to each tent were hung two shields emblazoned with

the arms of the particular knight, one a shield of peace and the other a shield of war (A27).” If the shield of peace is struck the joust is fought with lighter and less lethal weaponry. If the war shield is struck, the joust is fought with fully sharpened battle weapons. [20] Hereafter, the jousts Froissart describes involve combatants fighting in the more dangerous, or more honourable, “war” mode. Froissart was clearly at pains to represent his knights instructively: in terms of the ideals dramatised in the popular fictions of his day. Thus a knight’s ability in combat and his virtues determined his status as either worthy or unworthy; an approach also supported by didactic works such as Geoffroi de Charny’s *Le Livre de Chevalrie* (c.1351). The men involved in the tournament at Saint Inglevert have their moral characters assessed by the jousts described, and easily compare with countless joust descriptions and moral epithets from popular romances. Unchivalrous conduct leads to a failure in arms: Froissart’s anti-hero, Herr Hans, who delivers a “foul blow” on Sir Boucicaut the Younger, (one of the three tournament organisers) is at first courteously excused and allowed to continue without the forfeit of his horse and armour (“a desire to please the English”). However, and with rather suspicious poetic justice, in his next joust, sparring with Sir Regnault de Roye (another of the organisers), Herr Hans suffers a total and humiliating defeat: “Sir Regnault de Roye...hit him so hard that he lifted him right out of the saddle and sent him flying to the ground with such force that they thought he was killed” (A28). The honour of the situation is resolved and Froissart comments, “The English were very pleased that he [Hans] had suffered this defeat, because of the unchivalrous way in which he had jousted on his first course”(A28). The arms of the unchivalrous knight, who, crucially, received his just deserts, are recorded by Froissart as an example to all: “argent, three gryphons’ feet sable with azure claws.”

In another romance-like episode, Froissart foregrounds a convergence of symbolism in treating the rivalry between Sir John Chandos and Sir Jean de Clermont at the battle of Poitiers:

These knights, [Sir John Chandos and Sir Jean de Clermont] who were young and in love ... for that must certainly be the explanation ... were both wearing on their left arms the same emblem of a lady in blue embroidered in a sunbeam... Sir Jean was by no means pleased to see his emblem on Sir Chandos and he pulled up dead in front of him and said: ‘...Since when have you been wearing my emblem?’ (A9)

Whilst it is not specified that the men love the same woman, this is implied by their matching emblems. Moreover, Jean de Clermont is killed in later fighting, a fate which Froissart suggests (evoking an air of intentional ambiguity akin to a romance) was in some way connected with his earlier quarrel with Chandos. The link is clearly intended to provoke a reader’s remembrance of other romantic rivalries between lovesick knights. One is tempted to assume Froissart wished his patron’s rivalry and success to be associated with literary archetypes such as Sir Lancelot and King Arthur, Tristram and King Mark, Arcite and Palamon, and as such was employing a dramatic form of “heraldic flattery”.^[21] Moreover, of the emblems themselves, the “lady in blue” most likely signifies the Virgin Mary, her sunbeam divine blessedness. As such, Mary’s battlefield armorial presence, borne by a knight (or two in this case), corresponds with the motif as found in romances from Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *History of the Kings of Britain*,^[22] to Sir Gawain in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.^[23] In such works Mary’s image on a shield functioned to focus the bearer’s mind on her blessedness, and so helped (if piously remembered) preserve knightly chastity and purity. Froissart’s use of a similar episode, even if grounded in fact (and of course the historical Chandos and Clermont may have chosen simultaneously to emulate the romance motif that day), utilizes a fictional resonance and re-directs the reader towards a deeper, spiritual and ideological reading of the situation.

It seems therefore that the interplay of armorial significances and chivalric virtues and vices in Froissart’s depiction of events in the *Chronicles* is such that the work reads, in many places, like a romance or edifying work of chivalry. A final example of Froissart’s employment of a heightened literary technique (and many

could have been chosen) is his account of the Battle of Otterburn (1386). The dramatic focus of the episode is the capture of Sir Henry Percy's pennon and the faction's subsequent desire for its recovery (A22-23). Froissart strengthens the moment of eventual victory by foregrounding the Scots determination not to lose their banner. After the death of its owner (the Earl of Douglas) his banner is again born aloft, giving his men the resolve needed to finally route their enemy. The deliberate emphasis on the banners and pennons, operating fundamentally as identity tokens of chivalric honour, is redolent of the armorial ideology rooted in books of chivalry from that of Ramon Llull and the unknown author of *L'Ordene de Chevalrie* (c.1225) to its most contemporary expression, *Le Livre de Chivalerie* of Geoffroi de Charny (c.1351). Charny himself, "the wisest and bravest knight of them all" was, as we have seen previously, pivotal as a living and dying example for Froissart. His heroic death at Poitiers bearing the French "Oriflamme", which Froissart records giving him the full glory of his blazon (A13: "gules, three ineschuteons argent"), provides one of the greatest, most dramatic, moments for medieval chivalry: both as an historical event and legendary demonstration of the latent ideology informing much of the period's fiction. The portrayal of Charny's end offers a perfect point of transition between the factual and meta-factual concerns of Froissart as a writer.

To conclude: Froissart employed armory both as a narrative device and to assist in the characterization of his (real) protagonists. As a historiographer, Froissart reflected the elite of the period's acute sense of pride in public identity and ideology. However, arguably, he also reveals a more complex response to his perceptual world with regard to the excesses of secular chivalry: he may well have disliked the extremes of vanity and costliness apparent in some displays (e.g. for the preparations to invade England in 1386). Any evidence for such an attitude must be balanced, however, by the demonstrable fact that Froissart revelled in the visual beauty, symbolism, dramatic effects and literary resonances of hereditary armory. Froissart was sensitive to it both as a political instrument and a poetic

device for story-telling; a form of discourse in which he, along with the upper echelons of his society, was a culturally invested, sophisticated proponent.

Endnotes

[1] Afin que les grans merveilles et li biau fait d'armes qui sont avenu par les grans guerres de France et d'Engleterre et des royaumes voisins, dont li roy et leurs consaulz sont cause, soient notablement registré et, ou tamps present et à venir, veu et cogneu je me voel ensonnier de l'ordonner et mettre en prose selonch le vraie information que j'ay eu des vaillans hommes, chevaliers et escuiers, qui les ont aidiés à acroistre, et ossi de aucuns rois d'armes et leurs mareschus qui par droit sont et doivent estre juste inquisiteur et rapporteur de tels besongnes." Jean Froissart, *Chroniques*, Livres I et II, Éditions et texts présentés et commentés par Peter F. Ainsworth et George T. Diller, Lettres Gothiques, Le Livre de Poche (Paris: Librairie Générale Français, 2001) Prologue p.71.

[In order that the honourable enterprises, noble adventures and deeds of arms which took place during the wars waged by France and England should be fittingly related and preserved for posterity, so that brave men should be inspired thereby to follow such examples, I wish to place on record these matters of great renown.] Jean Froissart, *Chronicles*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey Brereton (London: Penguin, 1968, 1978) Prologue p.37.

[2] See Philippe Contamine, "Froissart: Art Militaire, pratique et conception de la Guerre" in J. J. N. Palmer, ed. *Froissart: Historian* (Woodbridge: Boydell P, 1981) 132-34. "Froissart entend fournir aux jeunes gentilshommes, aux écuyers débutant dans le métier des armes, qu'ils soient riches ou pauvres, "matere et exemple", il veut leur procurer des modèles, des héros pour s'y référer ou s'y comparer. Les "matere et exemple", il veut leur procurer des modèles, des héros pour s'y référer ou s'y comparer. Les *Chroniques* sont et seront la "memore des bons et li recors des preus."

[3] See George T. Diller, *Attitudes chevaleresques et Réalités politiques chez Froissart: Microlectures du premier livres des Chroniques* (Geneva: Droz, 1984);

Peter Ainsworth, *Jean Froissart and the Fabric of History: Truth, Myth and Fiction in the Chroniques* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1990), and Michel Zink, *Froissart et le temps* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1998).

[4] Jean Le Bel is cited in Froissart's Prologue. Le Bel's *Chronicle* survives in one manuscript, the text of which is available edited by J. Viard and E. Déprez (Paris: Société de l'Histoire de France, 1904).

[5] See Chandos Herald's work published in Richard Barber's edition and translation, *The Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince: from contemporary letters, diaries and chronicles, including Chandos Herald's Life of the Black Prince* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press; Rochester, NY: Boydell and Brewer, 1979, reprinted 1986, 1997 and 2002).

[6] For example, Froissart's dating of the foundation of the Order of the Blue Garter is remarkably inaccurate – he puts it at 1344, i.e., well before Edward III's campaign in France with its victories at Crécy and Calais, and further suggests that the original number of knights was forty not twenty six (see *Chronicles*, trans. and ed., Geoffrey Brereton 66-67. On the veracity or otherwise of Froissart's *Chronicles* see esp. Ainsworth (1990).

[7] Froissart's poetic output includes “Le paradis d'amour” (c.1361-2), “Le joli mois de mai” (c. 1363), “Dit dou bleu chevalier”, “Dit de la marguerite” (c.1364), “L'espinette amoureuse” (c. 1369-70), “La prison amoureuse” (c. 1371-2) and “Le joli buisson de Jonece” (c. 1373).

[8] This article originally formed part of a chapter of a thesis on chromatic perception and colour language in medieval literature.

[9] Froissart, *Chronicles*, ed. Brereton, Book I, p. 18. In this sense Froissart's approach to writing history captures Sidney's later description of the historiographer in *The Defence of Poesy* (1581): “And even historiographers, although their lips sound of things done, and verity be written in their foreheads, have been glad to borrow both fashion and perchance weight of the poets. So

Herodotus entitled his history by the name of the nine Muses; and both he and all the rest that followed him either stole or usurped of poetry their passionate describing of passions, the many particularities of battles which no man could affirm, or, if that be denied me, long orations put in the mouths of great kings and captains, which it is certain they never pronounced” (Sir Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesy* ll. 79-86).

[10] Froissart, *Chronicles*, ed. Brereton, Book I, p. 47.

[11] See Appendix A, (2), (17), (30) and (36). All quotations in the Appendix are given in Beresford’s English translation simply for immediate comprehension.

[12] Appendix A (1), (3), (6), (7), (8), (10,) (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (20), (22), (23) and (24).

[13] Appendix A (4), (11), (15), (16), (18), (19), (20), (21), (25), (26), (31), (32), (33), (34) and (35).

[14] Appendix A (9), (10), (13), (16), (20), (22), (23), (24), (27), (28), (29), (32), (33), (34) and (35).

[15] See e.g. A1: describing the Earl of Moray and Sir James Douglas using Jean Le Bel as source; A10: at the start of the Battle of Poitiers identifying two knights who open proceedings by an exchange of blows that is described very much like a tournament joust; A13: recording the arms of Geoffrey de Charny after his chivalrous demise defending the King’s standard, and A28: identifying a knight competing at the Tournament at Saint-Inglevert.

[16] Si tretost que chil bourgeois de le ville de Kem veirent approcier ces Englès qui venoient en trois batailles drut et sieret, et perchurent ces banières et ces pennons à grant fuison bauloier et venteler, et oïrent ces arciers ruire qu’il n’avoient point acoustumé de veir ne de sentir, si furent si effraet et si desconfi d’yaus meismes, que tout cil dou monde ne les euissent mies retenus qu’il ne se fuissent mis à la fuite. Si se retraisent cescuns vies leur ville, sans arroi, vosist li connestables ou non. (See Appendix A3)

[17] Froissart, *Chronicles*, ed. Brereton, Book I, pp. 151-155.

[18] Froissart, *Chronicles*, ed. Brereton, Book IV, p. 373.

[19] See Chrétien's *Le Chevalier de la Charette* l. 5546 for an example of a knight leaving his shield outside his tent.

[20] The difference between peace and war arms was exemplified by the Black Prince: his war arms combined the symbols of France (fleurs de lys) and England (leopards); his peace arms depicted three white ostrich feathers (royal symbols) on a field of black with the motto "Ich Dien" ("I serve"). The arms are mentioned in his Will and can be seen alternating on the sides of his tomb in Canterbury cathedral. See Anthony Wagner, *Historic Heraldry of Britain* (Oxford: OUP, 1939, 1948; rpt. London: Phillimore, 1972) 48-49.

[21] Heraldic flattery is the use of real arms in a fiction, or fictional or legendary arms in reality.

[22] King Arthur was the first bearer of the image on his shield, "Pridwen". See Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, IX.4.

[23] Sir Gawain in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ll. 647-9.

[24] It is thought that Froissart's totals are mistaken. Brereton notes that according to an English eye witness, a Michael de Northburgh, writing in a letter after the battle (a letter published in R. Barber's *Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince*) about 1500 men at arms were slain.

[25] Noted as a tactic used to confuse the enemy (see Brereton p. 127), but considering the pains gone to in the pursuit of public honour by King John, and Froissart's apparent indifference to this apparently unchivalrous action, perhaps it may also be read as a reference to the presence of other members of the royal house.

Appendix ‘A’: Heraldic and Armorial Incidents in Froissart’s *Chronicles*

French quotations from Jean Froissart, *Chroniques*, Livres I et II, Éditions et texts présentés et commentés par Peter F. Ainsworth et George T. Diller, Lettres Gothiques, Le Livre de Poche (Paris: Librairie Générale Français, 2001); Jean Froissart, *Chroniques*, Livres III et IV, Éditions et texts présentés et commentés par Peter F. Ainsworth et Alberto Varvaro, Lettres Gothiques, Le Livre de Poche (Paris: Librairie Générale Français, 2004); English translations are from Jean Froissart, *Chronicles*, translated and edited by Geoffrey Brereton (London: Penguin, 1968, 1978).

(1)

...li rois Robers d’Escoce, qui estoit moult preus, estoit adonc durement viex et chargiés de le grosse maladie. Si leur avoit donnel à chapitaines un moult gentil prince et vaillant en armes, c’est assavoir le conte de Moret qui portoit un escut d’argent à trios orilliers de geules, et monsieur Guillaume de Douglas, que on tenoit pour le plus hardi et le plus entreprenant de tout les deus pays, et portoit un escut d’asur à un chief d’argent et trios estoilles de geules dedens l’argent. Et estoient cil doi signeur li [p.120] plus haut baron et li plus puissant de tout le royaume d’Escoce, et li plus renommé en biaux fais d’armes et en grans proèces. (Premier Livre, Les Écossais ravagent le Northumberland, pp.119-20)

[Their king, Robert Bruce, being too old and ill to go with them, had appointed as their leaders the Earl of Moray, whose arms were argent three oreillers gules and Sir James Douglas, who bore for arms a shield azure on a chief argent three mullets gules. These two were the highest and most powerful lords of the kingdom of Scotland and the most famous for their feats of arms and great exploits.]

(Book I; The Scots Invade England – 1327, p.47)

(2)

King Edward, therefore, determined to establish an order of knighthood, consisting of himself, his sons, and the most gallant knights in Christendom, to the number of forty. He ordered it to be denominated “knights of the blue garter,” and that the feast should be celebrated every year, at Windsor, upon St. George’s day. ... He then issued his proclamation for this feast by his heralds, whom he sent to France, Scotland, Burgundy, Hainault, Flanders, Brabant, and the empire of Germany, and offered to all knights and squires, that might come to this ceremony, passports to last for fifteen days after it was over.

(Book I; The Order of the Garter – 1344, p.66)

Si appocièrent durement le grosse ville de Kem et ces gens d’armes qui tout s’estoient trait sus les camps, et par samblant assés en bon convenant. Si tretost que chil bourgeois de le ville de Kem veirent appocier ces Englès qui venoient en trois batailles drut et sieret, et perchurent ces banières et ces pennons à grant fuison bauloier et venteler, et oïrent ces archiers ruire qu’il n’avoient point acoustumé de veir ne de sentir, si furent si effraet et si desconfi d’y aus meismes, que tout cil dou monde ne les euissent mies retenus qu’il ne se fuissent mis à la fuite. Si se retraisent cescuns vies leur ville, sans arroi, vosist li connestables ou non.

(Premier Livre, Édouard III devant Caen, p.548)

(3)

[Then they drew toward Caen with their battles in good array, and so approached the good town of Caen. When they of the town, who were ready in the field, saw these three battles coming in good order, with their banners and standards waving in the wind, and the archers, the which they had not been accustomed to see, they were sore afraid and fled away toward the town without any order or good array, for all that the constable could do: then the Englishmen pursued them eagerly.]

(Book I; The Campaign of Crécy; Battle of Caen – 1346, p.74)

(4)

Then Sir Godfrey [the Marshall] with his banner rode from street to street, and had it proclaimed in the king's name, that none should dare, on pain of the gallows, to start a fire, kill a man or rape a woman. This proclamation reassured the townspeople and they allowed some of the English into their homes, without attempting to harm them.

(Book I; The Campaign of Crécy; after the Battle of Caen – 1346, p.76)

(5)

Two gallant knights, Sir Reginald Cobham and Sir Richard Stafford, were instructed to go out, taking with them three heralds to identify the dead by their arms and two clerks to write down their names. They were amazed at the numbers they found. ... Eleven princes lay dead on the field, eighty bannerets, twelve hundred ordinary knights and about thirty thousand other men. [\[24\]](#)

(Book I; The Campaign of Crécy; Battle of Crécy – 1346, p.95)

(6)

There were forty big ships [Spanish] all sailing together, so powerful and splendid that they made a beautiful sight. ... On the masts also were streamers bearing their various colours and emblems which waved and fluttered in the wind. If the English were thirsting for a fight, they appeared to be even more so, and this proved to be the case as you will hear.

(Book I; Sea Battle off Winchelsea – 1350, p. 114)

(7)

Orders were given by the Prince [of Wales] that without special authority no one was to ride out ahead of the Marshals' banners, on pain of death.

(Book I; Seige of Breuil and Poitiers Campaign- 1356, p.127)

(8)

King John of France was there, with nineteen others bearing similar arms. [\[25\]](#) He had placed his eldest son (the Duke of Normandy) in the charge of the Lord of

Saint-Venant, Sir Jean de Landas and Sir Thibaut de Voudenay and his three younger sons, Louis, Jean and Philippe, in the care of other good knights and squires. The king's sovereign banner was carried by Sir Goeffrey de Charny, as the wisest and bravest knight of them all.

(Book I; Seige of Breuil and Poitiers Campaign- 1356, p.129)

(9)

These knights, [Sir John Chandos and Jean de Clermont] who were young and in love ... were both wearing on their left arms the same emblem of a lady in blue embroidered in a sunbeam...Sir Jean was by no means pleased to see his emblem on Sir Chandos and he pulled up dead in front of him and said: '...Since when have you been wearing my emblem?'

(Book I; Battle of Poitiers – 1356, p.132)

(10)

Sir Eustace d'Aubrecicourt lowered his lance and gripped his shield and spurred his horse out between the armies. A German knight called Sir Louis de Recombes, whose arms were argent, five roses gules, while Sir Eustace's were ermine, two humets gules, came out from the Count of Nassau's detachment to which he belonged, and lowered his lance to meet him.

(Book I; Battle of Poitiers – 1356, p.134)

(11)

As the Prince with his banner-bearer was riding into the enemy followed by his men, he glanced right towards a small bush and saw under it the dead body of Sir Robert de Duras with his banner beside him – it was a French banner with a red saltaire – and a dozen of his followers lying around.

(Book I; Battle of Poitiers – 1356, p.136)

(12)

The King [of France] fully realized that his men were in danger. He saw their ranks wavering and breaking and the banners and pennons falling or moving back under the weight of the enemy's assault.

(Book I; Battle of Poitiers – 1356, p.139)

(13)

Meanwhile Sir Geoffroy de Charny had been fighting gallantly near the King. The whole of the hunt was upon him, because he was carrying the King's master-banner. He also has his own banner in the field, gules, three ineschuteons argent. ... Sir Geoffroy de Charny was killed, with the banner of France in his hands.

(Book I; Battle of Poitiers – 1356, p.140)

(14)

So Sir John Chandos, who had never left his side, said to him [Black Prince]: 'Sire, it would be a good thing to halt here and raise you banner on this bush to rally your men who are getting very scattered. The day, thank God, is yours. I can see no French banners or pennons or any body capable of reforming. ... The Prince acted on this suggestion and had his banner raised on a tall bush. ... the knights of his chamber hurried to him.

(Book I; Battle of Poitiers – 1356, p.141)

(15)

But the Count of Foix and the Captal de Buch and their men who were ready armed, formed up in the marketplace and then moved to the gates of the market and flung them open. There they faced the villeins, small and dark and very poorly armed, confronting them with the banners of the Count of Foix and the Duke of Orleans and the pennon of the Captal de Buch, and holding lances and swords in their hands, fully prepared to defend themselves and to protect the market-place.

(Book I; Consequences of Poitiers, p.154)

(16)

As for the knights who commanded in Limoges, Sir Jean de Villemur, Sir Hugues de la Roche, and Roger de Beau fort, son of the Count of Beaufort, when they saw the disaster which had overtaken them, they said: ‘ There’s no hope for us, but we’ll sell our lives dearly, as knights ought to do? ... They took up position in a square with their backs against an old wall, and there Sir Jean and Sir Hugues unfurled their banners and put themselves in a posture of defence.

(Book I; The Sack of Limoges -1370, p.178)

(17)

So the Dukes of Lancaster and Brittany campaigned across the kingdom of France at the head of their men, never finding anyone to meet them in a real battle, though they asked nothing better. Many times they sent their heralds to the commanders who were pursuing them, demanding battle and proposing various arrangements. But the French refused to listen; none of the challenges and proposals that the English sent to them came to anything.

(Book I; John of Gaunt’s Fruitless Expedition -1373, p.191)

(18)

‘ ...I will have letters written at once and sealed with my Great Seal for them to take back with them, granting you all that you ask freely, faithfully and absolutely. And in order to reassure you still more, I will order my banners to be sent to you in each bailiwick, castlewick and borough. You will find no hitch in any of this, for I will never go back on my word. ... I pardon you everything you have done until now, provided that you follow my banners and go back to your own places in the way I told you.’ All of them answered: ‘Yes!’

(Book II; The Peasants’ Revolt – 1381, p. 221)

(19)

Sir Robert Knollys argued first that they should go and fight them and kill them all, but the King refused to agree, saying that he would not have that done. 'But,' said the King, 'I want to have my banners back. We will see how they behave when we ask for them. In any case, by peaceful means or not, I want them back.' ... It may be said that as soon as the royal banners had been removed, those bad men became just a mob. Most of them threw down their bows and they broke formation and started back for London.

(Book II; *The Peasants' Revolt* – 1381, p.228)

(20)

The great lords vied with one another to make lavish preparations and to embellish their ships with their badges and coats-of-arms. Painters certainly had a prosperous time. They were paid whatever they liked to ask and they refused to give any reductions. Banners, pennons and silken streamers of really surpassing beauty were made. The masts were painted from top to bottom and many, to advertise their wealth and power, had them covered with fine gold-leaf, over which were painted the arms of the lords to whom the ships belonged. I was told in particular that Sir Guy de La Trémoille had his personal ship magnificently decorated and that the devices and paintings which were done on it cost over two thousand francs. The great lords did everything that could possibly be thought of to beautify their ships, and it was all paid for by poor people throughout France, for the taxes levied for this expedition were so great that the richest complained bitterly and the poor tried to escape from them.

(Book III; Preparations for Invasion of England – 1386, p. 305)

(21)

The Duke (of Gloucester) sent some of his knights to test the depth of the ford ... Then they rode back to the Duke of Gloucester and told him: '... we have seen the Duke of Ireland's dispositions. His men are drawn up in good order. We do not know whether the King is with them, but his banners are there. We saw no other

banners except his showing the arms of France and England.’ The Duke answered: ‘God be with us then. We have some share in those arms, my brother and I. Let’s ride forward in the name of God and St George, for I want to have a closer look at them.’

(Book III; Richard II’s Struggle with his Uncles – 1387-8, pp. 323-4)

(22)

There was much skilled fighting with lance and sword and on one occasion there was a long hand-to-hand combat between the Earl of Douglas and Sir Henry Percy. By force of arms the Earl captured Sir Henry’s pennon, to his great annoyance and that of the other English, and Douglas said to him : I shall take this piece of your trappings back to Scotland and put it up on my castle at Dalkeith, right at the top, so that it can be seen a long way off. ‘By God,’ said Sir Henry, ‘you shall never get it out of Northumberland. You can count on that, so don’t boast about it.’ ‘All right,’ Earl Douglas then said, ‘come and get your pennon back tonight. I will plant it in front of my tent and we’ll see if you can take it away from there.’

(Book III; The Battle of Otterburn – 1388, p.339)

(23)

Henry Percy and his brother Ralph, who were so angry with the Earl because of the loss of their pennon outside Newcastle, made towards him, shouting their own cry. Great feats of arms were performed when the two bannerets and their men found themselves face to face. As I said, the English were in such strength and fought so well at this first stage, that they drove the Scots back. Two Scottish knights who were there, called Sir Patrick Hepburn and his son, also named Patrick fought splendidly alongside their commander’s banner. But for them it would certainly have been taken. But they defended it so stoutly, thrusting and dealing such mighty blows until more of their men could come to the rescue, that they and their heirs are still held in honour for it.

(Book III; The Battle of Otterburn – 1388, p.341)

(24)

Sir John Sinclair asked the Earl how it went with him. ‘Pretty badly, said the Earl. But God be praised, not many of my ancestors have died in their beds. I ask you this: try to avenge me. I know I’m dying; my heart keeps stopping so often.

Walter, and you, John Sinclair, raise my banner again’ (it was indeed lying on the ground, with the gallant guile who bore it dead beside it...) ‘raise my banner,’ he said ‘and shout Douglas! And tell neither friend nor foe of the state I am in. If our enemies knew of it they would be encouraged, and our friends would lose heart.’

(Book III; The Battle of Otterburn – 1388, pp.344-5)

(25)

At the first Gate of Saint-Denis, which is the entry to Paris and is called the Bastide, there was the representation of a starry sky and in this small children dressed as angels sang softly and harmoniously. Among them, acted by living people, was a person representing Our Lady, holding a baby in her arms. The baby was playing with a little mill made out of a large walnut. The starry canopy was high and richly emblazoned with the arms of France and Bavaria, with a shining gold sun which darted out its beams. This gleaming sun was the King’s emblem for the festivities and the jousts. The Queen and the ladies looked at these things with great pleasure as they came through the gate, and so did everyone else when they passed by there.

(Book IV; Queen Isabella’s Entry into Paris – 1389, p.352)

(26)

In the middle of the great hall a castle had been set up, twenty feet square and forty feet high. It had a tower at each of the Four corners and a much higher one in the middle. The castle represented the city of Troy, and the middle tower the citadel of Ilium. On it were pennons bearing the arms of the Trojans, such as King Priam, the knightly Hector his son and his other children, as well as the kings and princes who were besieged in Troy with them. This castle moved on wheels which

turned very ingeniously inside it. Other men came to attack the castle in an assault-tower which was also mounted on ingeniously hidden wheels, with none of the mechanism showing. On this were the arms of the kings of Greece and other countries who once laid siege to Troy.

(Book IV; Queen Isabella's Entry into Paris – 1389, pp.357-8)

(27)

At the entrance to each tent were hung two shields emblazoned with the arms of the particular knight, one a shield of peace and the other a shield of war. The understanding was that whoever wished to run a course against any of them should touch one of the shields, or send someone to touch it, or both shields if he liked. He would then be provided with the opponent and the choice of joust he had asked for...

(Book IV; Tournament at Saint-Ingelvert – 1390, pp.373-4)

(28)

Next there came forward a knight from Bohemia, belonging to the Queen of England's personal guard, whose name was Herr Hans. He was considered a good jouster, strong and tough. His arms were argent, three gryphons' feet sable with azure claws. The Bohemian knight dealt a foul blow which was strongly condemned, for he struck my lord Boucicaut's helm with an ugly sideways thrust before riding on. The English saw clearly that he was at fault and knew that he had forfeited his horse and armour if the French insisted on it. The French and English held a long discussion together about that improper thrust, but finally the three knights excused him, from a desire to please the English. ... [Herr Hans is beaten in his next joust.] The English were very pleased that he had suffered this defeat because of the unchivalrous way in which he had jousting on his first course.

(Book IV; Tournament at Saint-Ingelvert – 1390, pp. 378-9)

(29)

'About two days before our king intended to make them [four Irish kings] knights, they were visited by the Earl of Ormonde, who knows their language well because

some of his lands lie along Irish border. ... He expounded point by point and article by article the manner in which a knight should conduct himself and the virtues and obligations of chivalry, and explained how those who undertook them entered the order.' [from Froissart's report of Henry Crystede's words concerning Richard II's expedition to Ireland.]

(Book IV; The English in Ireland – 1394/5, pp.415-6)

(30)

Later, we [Froissart and Henry Crystede] took leave of each other and I went at once to find March Herald. I said to him: 'March, tell me what are the arms of Henry Crystede, for I found him most friendly and obliging and he kindly described to me the King's expedition to Ireland and the condition of those four Irish kings whom he had, he says, under his guidance for over a fortnight. March replied: 'His arms are a chevron gules on a field argent, with three besants gules, two above the chevron and one below.' All these things I put down in writing in order not to forget them.

(Book IV; The English in Ireland – 1394/5, pp.416-7)

(31)

Not long after the Earl of Salisbury's return to England, King Richard had it announced throughout his kingdom and as far as Scotland that a tournament was to be held at Windsor, in which forty home knights and forty squires would challenge all comers. They were to be clothed in green with the device of a white falcon. ... The feast was held. The Queen came in full state, but very few lords attended, for at least two-thirds of the English knights and squires were strongly hostile to the King...

(Book IV; The Downfall of Richard II – 1397-1400, p.440)

(32)

On the Saturday before his coronation, the Duke of Lancaster left Westminster and went to the Tower of London with a large number of followers. That night all

the squires who were to be knighted the next day kept vigil. There were forty-six of them and each had his room and his bath in which he bathed that night. The next morning the Duke of Lancaster made them knights while mass was being sung and gave them long green tunics with narrow sleeves trimmed with miniver like those of prelates. Over their left shoulders they wore a double cord of white silk with white hanging tassels.

(Book IV; Coronation of Bolingbroke – 1399, p.463)

(33)

...The King had put on a short doublet of cloth-of-gold in the German style. He was mounted on a white charger and wore the blue garter on his left leg. He rode right through the city of London and was escorted to Westminster by a great number of nobles with their men wearing their various liveries and badges, and all the burgesses, Lombards and merchants of London, and all the grand masters of the guilds, each guild decked out with its particular emblems.

(Book IV; Coronation of Bolingbroke – 1399, p.464)

(34)

That night the Duke of Lancaster was bathed. As soon as he rose the next morning, he made confession and heard three masses, as his custom was. Then all the prelates there assembled, with numerous other clergy, came in procession from Westminster Abbey to the Palace, to take the King back with them. They returned to the Abbey with the King following, and all the nobles with him. The dukes, earls and barons had long scarlet robes and long mantles trimmed with miniver, and large hats lined with the same fur. The dukes and earls had three bars of miniver about a foot long on their left shoulders, and the barons only two. All the others, knights and squires, had robes of scarlet livery-cloth. All the way from the Palace to the Abbey a canopy of indigo-coloured silk supported on four silver rods and with four jingling golden bells was carried over the Duke's head by four citizens of Dover, as was their right. On one side of him was borne the Sword of the Church and on the other the Sword of Justice. The first was carried by his

eldest son the Prince of Wales and the second by Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland and Constable of England, for the Earl of Rutland had been deprived of that office. The Earl of Westmorland, Marshal of England, carried the sceptre.

(Book IV; Coronation of Bolingbroke – 1399, p.464)

(35)

At about nine o'clock the whole procession entered the Abbey, in the middle of which was a throne upholstered in cloth-of-gold standing on a high platform covered with crimson cloth. On this the Duke mounted and took his seat. He was now in royal state, except that he was wearing neither the cap nor the crown. The Arch bishop of Canterbury then mounted the platform and at each of the four corners of it in turn explained to the people how God had sent them a man to be their lord and king. He then asked if they were all willing that he should be anointed and crowned king. They unanimously answered yes, stretching out their hands to pledge him their loyalty and obedience. When this had been done, the Duke came down from the throne and went to the altar to be consecrated. Two arch bishops and ten bishops were there to perform the ceremony. Before the altar his royal robes were taken off, leaving him naked to the waist, and he was anointed in six places, on his head, his chest, on both shoulders, on his back between the shoulders, and on his hands. Then a cap was put on his head and meanwhile the clergy chanted the litany and the office which is used for consecrating a font. The King was then dressed in ecclesiastical robes like a deacon; crimson velvet shoes like those of a prelate were put on his feet and then spurs with points and no rowels. The Sword of Justice was drawn from its sheath, blessed and handed to the King, who re-sheathed it. It was then girded on him by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Next the crown of St Edward, which has three arches, was brought and blessed and placed on the King's head by the Archbishop. After mass had been sung, the King left the Abbey in this regalia and found outside the Constable of England with his lieutenant and the Marshal of England,

who together cleared the way for the return to the Palace.

(Book IV; Coronation of Bolingbroke – 1399, pp. 464-5)

(36)

Halfway through dinner there came in a knight of the name of Dymoke, in full armour and riding a horse, with both of them, horse and rider, covered in mail with crimson trappings. The knight was ready armed to take up a challenge and another knight went before Him carrying his lance. He wore a naked sword at one side and a dagger at the other, and he handed the King a parchment saying that if any knight, squire or gentleman cared to say or maintain that King Henry was not the rightful king, he was ready to fight him there and then in the King's presence or whenever it pleased the King to appoint a day. The King had this challenge cried by a herald-at-arms at six different places in the hall, but no one came forward.

(Book IV; Coronation of Bolingbroke – 1399, p.466)

Works Cited

Froissart, Jean. *Chroniques: Livres I et II*. Ed. Peter F. Ainsworth and George T.Diller. Lettres Gothiques. Le Livre de Poche. Paris: Librairie Générale Français, 2001.

---. *Chroniques: Livres III et IV*. Éd. Peter F. Ainsworth and Alberto Varvaro. Lettres Gothiques. Le Livre de Poche. Paris: Librairie Générale Français, 2004.

---. *Chronicles*. Trans. and ed. Geoffrey Brereton. London: Penguin, 1978.

Ainsworth, Peter F. *Jean Froissart and the Fabric of History: Truth, Myth, and Fiction in the Chroniques*. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1990.

Barber, Richard, trans. and ed. *The Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince from Contemporary Letters, Diaries and Chronicles, including Chandos Herald's Life of the Black Prince*. Woodbridge: The Boydell P, 1979; rpt. 2002.

Contamine, Philippe. "Froissart: Art Militaire, pratique et conception de la Guerre." *Froissart: Historian*. Ed. J. J. N. Palmer. Woodbridge: Boydell P, 1981. 132-34.

Diller, George T. *Attitudes Chevaleresques et Réalités Politiques chez Froissart: Microlectures du Premier Livres des Chroniques*. Geneva: Droz, 1984.

Geoffroi de Charny. *The Book of Chivalry of Geoffroi de Charny: Text, Context and Translation*. Ed. Richard W. Kauper and Elspeth Kennedy. Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1996.

Llull, Ramon. *The Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry: Translated and Printed by William Caxton from a French version of Ramon Lull's "Le Libre Del Ordre De Cauayleria", Together with Adam Loutfut's Scottish Transcript* (Harleian MS. 6149), Early English Text Society, Original Series, 168. Ed. Alfred T. P. Byles. London: OUP-Humphrey Milford, 1926.

L'Ordene de Chevalerie. Ed. Roy Temple House. Diss. Chicago, 1918. Rpt. in *Bulletin of the University of Oklahoma*, NS 162 (Feb. 1919), Extension Series, 48, pp. 1-6.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Ed. and trans. W. R. J. Barron. Revised edition. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998, 2001.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *The Defence of Poesy. Sir Philip Sidney: The Major Works*. Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: OUP, 2002.

Zink, Michel. *Froissart et le Temps*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998.

First Response

"A lucid, authoritative and sophisticated account of the employment of heraldry and armory as a narrative device in Froissart. Some explicit comparisons with other writers of the period might help strengthen the case for Froissart's distinctiveness."