

THE FALL OF CAMELOT:

The fall of Camelot is a catastrophic event that accounts for the wars which marked the end of King Arthur's reign. Due to the persons involved, the fall has easily been blamed at the head of one figure or another, when in reality, that can be far from the case.

WHY CAN? If we are to take something, anything at all, some lesson from the fall of Camelot, to find its relevance in today's world, then blaming someone or some particularly action will give us nothing.

WHY TRY TO EVEN TAKE SOMETHING?

Without those lessons, those takeaways, those understanding of human behaviours, very little will be special about a legend that has defeated time as the mythology today does. It has lasted for so long that each time it is brought to the forefront, it serves a new purpose, a new audience. This is what is special about Arthurian works, it defeats time because it is ever-changing, and it is now in the time where it must change again, so that we can live within it, we can experience it, we can believe it, not for what it says, but for what it gives, what it leaves behind. It's footprint.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CAMELOT'S FALL

- ❖ Every one
- ❖ At the same time, No One.

LAUNCELOT: WHY HIM?

The standout Knight in Arthurian Mythology, Launcelot is the one figure that is constantly changing within the history. From the time of Chretien, to the work of Ciardi, Launcelot has been the variant that is always on the move. Why? Because he serves the different purposes of the different times. He is the one movable variable, because the mythology was never created to account for him.

In "The Voices Of The Fall Of Camelot", Launcelot has the biggest part to play for he is different once more. He is the leading figure in the challenge against the king. The same knight who had the secret relationship with Guenevere. But at the same time, he is also the king's best friend, and most loyal knight. He is the embodiment of Sacrifice. He is upheaval. He is aggression. He is duty, all in one. At the same time, he is also his own person, the selfish human that we all are. All this makes him the chosen one, the one to carry the cross, not for his people, or for himself, but for his king.

CIARDI:

Ciardi's work woke something up in Launcelot's character, which is what stands him out to me.

But nothing will stop me from saving Christ, His chosen, shall come out new, greatly diced, With my sacrifice, which is Heaven's due, Gone with me, like the Pandemonium few, I love you and now understand the cost, Of serving the king, the heaviest soul lost, - (lines 56 –61)



ARTHUR: WHO IS THE KING



The everlasting figure, the king has no change in any work, throughout time. He is the fixed point, and here, that remains the same. However, what is revealed here is the man behind the fixed point. The man who has grappled with the intensity of being that thing all his life. The man whose secret escape from that persona, ended up betraying him. In short, he lives up to his name, Arthur, the king who is always meant to know betrayal. But what do we ever make of those betrayals? What about them?

But what is once said, never to be known, As the king's blade stands, fighting for the throne, Is of the stateless heart, soaked to rage's bone, Of not the king great, but he that was thrown, To the old age, causes of the might great, Which receives, and deceives of night's great mate, That era of youth, life's first charity, Of inner peace, love's cleaner clarity, - (lines 13-20)

GUINEVERE: HAS SHE EVER BEEN DIFFERENT?

It is difficult to distinguish Guinevere, because she is almost always without a character. She is always a betrayer, a device eventually used to bring Arthur down? But what if we look deeper into her, within her? What can a queen in a male dominated world have that others don't?



Great Queen, why have you brought upon Camelot's doom? Are love and tainted souls not in God's room? (Lines 62 –63)

THE WHY? WHY OF IT ALL?



And was it worth it, King, that you do fight, So far away, when your blood of great might, (Lines 1-2)

Thou speakest like a man of great purpose, But of love, did thou say, "Secrecy follows? (Lines 32 – 33)

History has shown us that foolishness is the repetition of a particular action with the expectation of a different result. Therefore, it is of no use to go about Arthurian works as of the ways of the past. Not because they are foolish, but because like time, they are expired. New ways have come about, and pointing the finger will not help or teach us anything. Victim-blaming, finding the scapegoat, reveals nothing to us. It only satisfies our fears, for we fear what we do not understand, and are comforted when what we don't understand is simply termed, "evil". The complexity is the truth, but in a world of never-ending time, like this one it is only "A" truth, but one that suits the time now.

POINTS TO CONSIDER:

1. Would you prefer the simplification of situations for the comfort of it, or would you prefer the raw truth?
2. Put yourself in the King Arthurian world. Knowing what you do now, who would you be?
3. Would you still blame anyone for Camelot's fall. If so, why?

REFERENCES:

"V." YouTube, 16 June 2023,
Bradley, Laura. "Why Peter Dinklage Thinks Now Is the "Perfect Time to End" Game of Thrones." Vanity Fair, 22 January 2018,
Christoff, Peter. "The book that changed me: Hannah Arendt's Eichmann in Jerusalem and the problem of terrifying moral complacency." The Conversation, 22 November 2022,
"Critics Slam 'King Arthur: Legend of the Sword': 7 Worst Reviews of the Charlie Hunnam Action Flick." TooFab, 9 May 2017,
Debinski, Gabrielle. "Peter Dinklage to Play Cyrano in the New Group's Fall Season (Published 2019)." The New York Times, 23 May 2019,
"Mildrith of Liscumb | Historica Wiki | Fandom." Historica Wiki,
Bogdanov, Fanni. "The Evolution of the Theme of the Fall of Arthur's Kingdom." Edited by Edward D. Kennedy. Garland Publishing, Inc.; Routledge, New York, 1996. *
Fox-Friedman, Jeanne. "Howard Pyle and the Chivalric Order in America: King Arthur for Children." *Arthuriana*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1996, pp. 77-95.
Jankofsky, Klaus P. "Launcelot in Hell": John Ciardi's Medievalism." *Studies in Medievalism*, vol. 6, 1994, pp. 163-173.