HENRY VI's OLD BLUE GOWN

THE ENGLISH COURT UNDER THE LANCASTRIANS AND YORKISTS

by David Starkey

THE HISTORY OF the English court is like a book begun halfway through. For the Tudors, the Stuarts and, though more patchily, the Hanoverians, we know both the broad picture and much of the detail. For the earlier fifteenth century, however, there is a virtual blank. This has not prevented historians from speculating. Some doubt whether the Lancastrians had a court at all.[1] Most, however, do not go so far. But almost everybody agrees on a simple contrast between the Lancastrian court, which was 'shabby and indigent', and the Yorkist, which was magnificent.[2] One school attributes the contrast to Edward IV's imitation of his brother-in-law Charles the Bold, the opulent duke of Burgundy.[3] But the 'Burgundianization' of the English court, as it is called, has proved difficult to pin down in practice: just what aspects of Burgundy were imitated; just what English practices changed? No one seems sure.

This is not, clearly, a satisfactory state of affairs. The principal reason for it is the apparent lack of documentation. Under Edward IV there is a spate of household legislation, centring on the 'Black Book'. It has been edited and published by A. R. Myers and its existence goes far in itself to suggest that the reign was a period of reform and renewal.[4] Henry VI's much longer reign, in contrast, produces only two slim household regulations. And both of them seem to deal with particular circumstances: those of 1445 with his impending marriage and those of 1454 with the onset of his first bout of insanity.[5] This record too paints its own picture: the thinness hints at lack of concern, while its episodic nature suggests fire-fighting in a sequence of crises.

This article tries to make a fresh start. It challenges the evidence on which the picture of 'shabby indigence' of the Lancastrian court is based. And it draws attention to the very different judgments which contemporary foreign observers formed of Henry VI's court, which they flattered, most sincerely, by imitation. The body of the article then goes on to redate the first half of a major household text, the so-called *Ryalle Book*, to the Lancastrian period. The result is to show that instead of contrast there was continuity between the Lancastrian court and the Yorkist—just as, as we have long realized, there was continuity between the Yorkist and the Tudor. This rediscovery and reappraisal of the 'missing link' of the earlier fifteenth-century court points to a broader continuity also: between the medieval royal household and the early-modern one. There were important shifts, of course, in the way that the king's service became at once more private and more social. But these shifts occurred in the context of a substantial continuity of ceremony. Nor was this continuity seriously challenged by the Reformation. Instead, the ceremonies endured. And, as they were those of high medieval sacerdotal monarchy, they conditioned the Royal Supremacy and, through it, the whole development of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English politics and religion.[6]

---

[1] *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. V. J. Scattergood and J. W. Sherborne (London, 1983); G. R. Elton, 'Tudor Government: Points of Contact III. The Court', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th s. 26 (1976), 212; D. A. L. Morgan, 'The House of Policy' in *The English Court*, ed. D. Starkey (London, 1987), pp. 25–70.

[2] A. R. Myers, *The Household of Edward IV: the Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478* (Manchester, 1959), p. 5.

[3] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, pp. 3–5; G. Kipling, *The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance* (The Hague, 1977).

[4] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*.

[5] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, pp. 7–10, 63–75; *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England*, ed. N. H. Nicolas, 7 vols. (London, 1834–7) VI (1443–1461), 220–33.

* * *

First, then, the evidence for the 'shabby indigence' of the Lancastrian court. This rests, it turns out, on a single incident. It took place on 11 April 1471. This was Sheer or Maundy Thursday, that is, Thursday in Holy Week, the day before Good Friday. And it was the last day of the 'Readeption' or second reign of King Henry VI.[7]

Henry's first reign had ended ten years previously, in March 1461, when his throne had been usurped by his cousin, Edward IV of York. Personal disaster followed political, and in 1465 Edward captured and imprisoned Henry. But in the summer of 1470 a faction of disaffected Yorkists, led by Richard Neville, the Kingmaker earl of Warwick and Edward's own brother, George, duke of Clarence met with Margaret of Anjou, Henry's queen, in France and settled their differences. Warwick and Clarence invaded England. Edward fled into exile in Flanders and Henry was released from the Tower and restored or 'readepted' to the kingship. But now in the spring of 1471 the Readeption regime was on the brink of collapse. Edward had landed and was nearing London. Clarence was reconciled to his brother. Warwick was still building up his strength in the Midlands and Queen Margaret's army had not yet disembarked on the Dorset coast.

In these desperate circumstances, George Neville, the Kingmaker's brother, who was archbishop of York and lord chancellor, tried to rouse the Londoners' loyalty for Henry and stiffen their resolve to resist. He did so by the traditional means of showing the king to the people. The royal procession left the bishop of London's palace to the north of St Paul's and marched east along Cheapside and Cornhill before turning and coming back to the palace by Candlewick (later Cannon) Street and Watling Street.[8] The archbishop led the king by the hand and Lord Zouch bore the royal sword. It was a brave attempt. But it did not work.

The author of *The Great Chronicle of London* tells us why. Zouch was 'old and Inpotent'. The number of gentlemen preceding the king was 'small', and only a 'small Company of servyng men' walked after him. The carrying of a long pole

---

[6] I should here pay tribute to the work of Dr Fiona Kisby, whose Ph.D. dissertation 'The Royal Household Chapel in Early-Tudor London' (University of London, 1996) first focused attention on the rituals and ceremonies of the Tudor court, rather than its institutional structure, with which my own generation of scholars was concerned. I am also grateful for her practical help and advice in the writing of the present article.

[7] *The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (London, 1938), p. 215.

[8] A. Prockter and R. Taylor, *The A to Z of Elizabethan London*, London Topographical Society Publication no. 122 (London, 1979) 8, 10, 21, 23, 36.

topped with two foxes' tails (a customary sign of defiance and derision) was undignified. But the chronicler's severest criticism was reserved for the king's own appearance. 'And evyr he was shewid In a long blew goune of velvet' — 'as thouwth', he added sniffily, 'he hadd noo moo to chaunge wt'.

The last gamble had failed. 'More lyker a play than the shewyng of a prynce to wynne mennys hertys', the procession lost rather than gained support. Even before it regained the palace, Edward's outriders were entering the suburbs. Henry's remaining supporters fled to save their own skins, leaving the king alone in the palace to face his enemy.

No one would claim that the final moments of the Lancastrian court were a success. The more important question is whether they were typical. The question has really only to be posed for the answer to be clear. The procession was rustled up during the dying minutes of a rickety coalition regime. The king himself had been weakened by years of mental illness. And the sudden alteration from an imprisonment, in which he 'was noght worschipfully arayed as a prince, and noght so clenly kepte as schuld seme suche a Prynce',[9] to a restoration to the full panoply of sovereignty, might well have disorientated a stronger mind. Finally, there is even a word to be said about the 'long blew goune of velvet'. Blue was the royal colour of mourning. Blue robes were to be worn by the king on All Hallows Day (1 November), for the interments of his father, mother and queen, and on 'all solemne dayes'.[10] Good Friday was one of these; so too, probably, was Sheer or Maundy Thursday, the day of that last, ill-fated procession of a Lancastrian king.

So this rushed event for a feeble-minded king on a day that mingled solemn festival and military crisis was typical of nothing but itself. It can hardly offer a basis for generalization about the court of a dynasty which reigned for sixty years and carried English power to its apogee in Europe. And yet, extraordinarily, that is what a whole generation of historians has done.

A. R. Myers, J. R. Lander, J. Gillingham and C. D. Ross all cite this incident and, in particular, the king's blue velvet gown.[11] And they use it in the same way: to present Henry VI as a king dangerously indifferent to outward display — both for himself and, by extension, for his entourage. Such display, called 'magnificence' by contemporaries, was central to the success of late medieval kingship. Henry failed in this, as he failed in the other key duties of kingship. He was a shabby king at the centre of an apology for a court. But all of this was reversed by his Yorkist usurper. Edward IV was a fine figure of a man and he delighted in setting off his person with fine clothes. His household was similarly splendidly equipped. So the English court was reborn (or perhaps even born) in the brief twenty-five years of Yorkist England.

---

[9] John Warkworth, *A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of King Edward the Fourth*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, Camden Society o. s. 10 (London, 1839), 11.

[10] *The Antiquarian Repertory*, ed. F. Grose, 4 vols. (London, 1807–9) [hereafter cited as *AR*] I, 309, 327–9; *A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household*, published by the Society of Antiquaries of London (London, 1790) [hereafter cited as *HO*], p. 119.

[11] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, p. 5; J. R. Lander, *Government and Community: England 1450–1509* (London, 1980), p. 270; J. Gillingham, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1981), p. 195; C. D. Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1974), pp. 11, 257.

Edward's achievement was even more remarkable once the element of cost is taken into account. Magnificence is one thing; paying for it another. But Edward, apparently, achieved all this by spending *less* on himself and his household than Henry VI had done. Henry's was an extravagant indigence; Edward's an economical magnificence. To achieve more for less is the hope of governments throughout the ages. It is often promised and almost never done. How did Edward discover the elusive formula? The answer, apparently, is that he borrowed from our European neighbours. Edward IV's sister Margaret was duchess of Burgundy. And it was in Burgundy (in particular in the town palace of Louis de la Gruthuyse in Bruges) that Edward found refuge in his months of exile in 1470–1. He was so impressed by the orderly magnificence he saw there that, on his return, he commissioned, through one of his servants, an account of the Burgundian court from Olivier de la Marche. De la Marche was a senior master of the household to Edward's brother-in-law, Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, and the oracle on the Burgundian court. His account survives and is supposed to have been the basis for a Burgundianization of the English court.

Less than ten years later, however, Yorkist England had torn itself apart and Henry VII, the self-proclaimed heir of Lancaster, sat on the English throne. But Henry's Queen, Elizabeth, was Edward IV's eldest daughter and members of her family remained dominant figures at court. They carried forward the achievement of the Burgundianized Yorkist court into Tudor England. The political stability of the new regime and the Tudors' own fondness for display proved fertile soil and the Burgundian/Yorkist seeds took root, sprouted, and flourished into the magnificent and (on this reading) novel spectacle of the Tudor court.

Such is the current explanation for the origins of the early-modern English court.[12] It all springs, essentially, from Henry VI's blue velvet gown. I have already shown that this garment and the pageant in which it was worn cannot bear the construction put upon them. But there is another point which tells powerfully in the same direction.

Courts, as modern historians with their obsession with domestic politics too easily forget, existed at least as much to impress other, foreign courts as their own subjects. A shabby, indigent court, such as historians paint Henry VI's, would have failed this test and languished in provincial obscurity. The reality, however, was different. In 1445, a Portuguese nobleman, Count Alvaro Vaz d'Almada, visited the English court. He was received as an honoured guest and made both a knight of the Garter and count of Avranches in Normandy. Alvaro then returned to Portugal, where, three years later, the young King Alfonso V assumed the government. Alvaro became one of his advisers. One of Alvaro's first acts was to write to William Say, the newly appointed dean of the English chapel royal, for an account of the chapel. Say obliged by producing the handbook ('forma siue ordinacio') known as the *Liber Regie Capelle*. Alvaro's intention was to present the account to Alfonso, to serve as a model for the ceremonies of the Portuguese court. The intention, almost certainly, was never fulfilled as Alvaro was killed in 1449. But the *Liber Regie Capelle* survives as — so far — the most important and indeed the only account of the Lancastrian court.[13]

It is of course possible that the count, coming from remote Portugal, was an easily impressed guest. The same can hardly be said of members of the house of Gonzaga, the rulers of the wealthy city of Mantua. But they were at least as sedulous imitators of Lancastrian ceremony and pageantry. Contacts between the Gonzaga and the Lancastrians went back to the late fourteenth century and a Lancastrian livery collar, with its motif of linked letters of S, was listed among the Gonzaga possessions as early as 1416. So, when Henry VI declared himself of age in 1436, it was only natural for the connexion to be renewed. Another livery collar was presented to Gianfrancesco Gonzaga. And in October Henry wrote to authorize Gianfrancesco himself to present fifty SS collars to as many noblemen of suitable rank. The permission was gratefully received. Only three years earlier, in 1433, Gianfrancesco had been made marquess of Mantua by the Emperor Sigismund, Henry V's ally. Now the king of England and France, second among European rulers in rank but first in power, had admitted him to a share in his knightly fellowship. Gianfrancesco, who, like all the Gonzagas, was adept at immortalizing his claims to princely status in art aud architecture, hastened to record the event. A hall in the palace at Mantua was chosen and Antonio Pisanello commissioned to paint it in a carefully worked-out scheme. The walls were edged with a decorative border made up of the SS collar, the swan pendant (another Lancastrian badge) and the marigold, which was one of the Gonzagas' own emblems. The principal scene of the fresco shows a tournament, which also features the SS device in the horse trappings of some of the participants. The meaning of the scene has not been elucidated. But most likely it represents the tournament in which Gianfrancesco distributed the Lancastrian livery to his chosen intimates. A mid-fifteenth-century hawk-hood, decorated with the same emblems, has also been discovered in the palace.[14]

The fresco was never finished and was soon covered over. Perhaps it was Gianfrancesco's death in 1444 that supervened; perhaps the waning of Lancastrian prestige in the 1450s with the loss of France abroad and rebellion at home. But the rediscovery and restoration of the fresco serves as a vivid reminder of a brief but brilliant epoch in the history of the English court. It is also a reminder of how far our judgment and that of contemporaries is at variance. Recent historians have crudely praised the Yorkist court and equally crudely denegrated the Lancastrian. Contemporaries did the opposite. It was Edward IV of York, as we have seen, who was the passive party, impressed by the merely ducal court of Burgundy and seeking information about it. On the other hand, the Lancastrian court, presiding over the dual monarchy of France and England, was itself a pan-European model, attracting would-be emulators from Portugal to Italy. When it comes to a disagreement between modern and contemporary judgment, at least on a question of the relative prestige of courts, there is no doubt that contemporary opinion is in the right. It remains now to offer documentary proof and, in so doing, to rewrite the history of the English court in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

---

[12] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, pp. 1–13 first formulated the argument; he also provides the basis for all subsequent accounts.

[13] *Liber Regie Capelle*, ed. W. Ullmann, Henry Bradshaw Society 92 (London, 1961), 10–13.

[14] Ilaria Toesca, 'Lancaster and Gonzaga: the Collar of SS at Mantua' in *Splendours of the Gonzaga*, ed. D. Chambers and J. Martineau, catalogue of an exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum (London, 1981), pp. 1–2 and items 5–11 (pp. 105–7).

The key document is the relatively well known *Ryalle Book*. It was printed as long ago as the early nineteenth century in the collections edited by Francis Grose and known as *The Antiquarian Repertory* (1807–9).[15] The manuscript from which he printed was described by the editor as once having been in the possession of Peter Le Neve, the early eighteenth-century antiquary and herald. The original survives and has been identified by Kay Staniland as British Library (BL), Additional MS 38174.[16] The text consists of a more-or-less comprehensive ceremonial of the English court. Court ritual revolved round the 'days of estate'. These were high feast days of the church which were also marked by particular royal ceremony. There were two main *foci* of ceremony: the king's attendance at mass in the chapel royal and, as these were literally feasts days, in which food of unusual quantity and quality was served to large numbers of guests, dinner in the king's hall or chamber.

Dinner on a day of estate was marked by the presence of a bishop on the king's right hand, and one or two lords of the king's blood on his left, the use of gilt or solid gold vessels and cups (with covers for the cups for the king and the bishop), and heavy linen table-cloths and towels. Using his rod of office, the officiating gentleman usher folded the table-linen into an elaborate pattern of pleats, known as 'the estate', on which the king dried his hands at the end of the meal. Such a meal is the subject of the illustration which prefaces the manuscript of Edward IV's 'Black Book'.[17] At the end of the day, after evensong, there was a 'void' or dessert, in which spiced sweetmeats were eaten off special spice-plates and wine drunk out of elaborate cups. The void was a much more social occasion than dinner. At dinner, as we have seen, etiquette limited the king's company to the bishop and one or two nobles of high rank. The queen sometimes dined in the king's chamber as well. But her royal status dictated that, when she did, she had to sit alone at her own table. None of these arrangements allowed for much by way of table-talk. For even at the king's table conversation was made difficult by the large gap which etiquette again demanded be placed between the king and his guests. The void, on the other hand, was taken standing up and was attended by a more numerous and varied company.

At least once during the day of estate the king attended mass. He went in solemn procession to and from the chapel; enacted special rituals as part of the rite; wore particular robes and colours and, once a year, the crown itself and most of the coronation regalia. Each of these elements — the rituals, robes and colours — varied with the particular day. The *Ryalle Book* lists the days and describes the ceremonies. The *rites de passage* in the life-cycle of the king, his queen, his mother, his children and other close relations were also days of estate. The ceremonies for these events — births and baptisms, marriages, deaths and coronations — are described. Finally, the minute gradations of honourable service due to other members of the royal family apart from the king are catalogued and analysed.

Taken as a whole the *Ryalle Book* provides a comprehensive and authoritative account of the ceremonies of the late-medieval English court. But the whole is more than the sum of its parts. For the parts are distinct and various. The first part is frequently opinionated and autobiographical. Often slipping into the first person, it offers advice and gives the reminiscences of a participant and eye-witness. Then comes a long account of the funeral ceremonies of the earl of Salisbury in 1463. This is a straightforward piece of reporting, very similar to the so-called 'Herald's Journals' which record the ceremonies of the court of Henry VII. The second part of the *Ryalle Book*, which follows the funeral account, recapitulates much of the material of the first. But the tone is different and more official. The first person is used only rarely; instead whole sections look like formal regulations. Finally, there is a sort of appendix giving the text of oaths of allegiance and office.

These differences of tone and content, together with the substantial degree of duplication between the first and second parts, strongly suggest that the text is the work of several different hands. This impression is reinforced when we turn to the question of dating.

Staniland dates the MS to 1491–3.[18] The last item in the *Ryalle Book* certainly belongs to Henry VII's reign since it is the form of an oath to be sworn by members of the chamber 'vnto our sonerene Lord Kynge Herry the vij. kinge of Englond and off Fraunce, and lord of Irlond'.[19] And a date anterior to 1493 for the whole MS is plausible since, as we shall see, the substance of the *Ryalle Book* was incorporated into a household ordinance issued by Henry VII on 31 December of that year.[20] A dating to Henry VII's reign was also proposed by Le Neve in his notes on the MS. He cited the mention of Henry VII in the last article; he also supported the assertion with references to 'several [other] parts of the book where King Henry is named'.[21] 'King Henry' is indeed frequently mentioned elsewhere. But it is certain that the individual meant was not the first Tudor; instead the name refers to the three successive Henries of the house of Lancaster: Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI.

Here it is necessary to remember our rough division of the *Ryalle Book* into parts. For the references to the Lancastrian kings all come in the first part. Then there is the funeral account. This belongs to 1463, which was the second regnal year of Edward IV, whose name duly appears. The second part of the *Ryalle Book*, which follows the funeral account, also seems to belong to Edward IV's reign. Finally, the last item in the *Ryalle Book* is an oath to Henry VII. In other words the various parts of the *Ryalle Book* are not only distinct in character, they also seem to fall into a chronological sequence. This hypothesis of distinct parts written over at least four decades at least must now be tested.

---

[15] *AR* I, 296–341.

[16] K. Staniland, 'Royal Entry into the World' in *England in the Fifteenth Century*, Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium, ed. D. Williams (Woodbridge, 1987), pp. 297–313 (p. 299 n. 8).

[17] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, plate 1.

[18] Staniland, 'Royal Entry', p. 299 n. 8.

[19] *AR* I, 340–1.

[20] *HO*, pp. 109–33. The ordinance is there misdated to 1494.

[21] *AR* I, n. on pp. 296–7.

First, the Lancastrian part. The first two kings of that House are referred to specifically, by their ordinal numbers. The writer describes the horse trappers in the cortège when the body of 'king Henry the vth' was brought over out of France;[22] he also discusses the practice 'in king Henry vth days' of keeping the day of estate. The king had his own sewer (the officer responsible for the service of food), who was always a knight. Only knights carried the king's dishes, and all the vessels in which he was served were gold. The queen and the bishop who ate with the royal couple were served off silver-gilt, so that 'no siluer that day on the bord was sene'. On other days, however, formality was relaxed after dinner and the serious business of kingship resumed. 'Also kinge Henry the iiijth and kinge Henry the vth they vsed euery day that none estat was kept' to have a cushion laid on the cupboard or sideboard, where the king 'wold lene by the space of an houre or more' to receive petitions and complaints from 'whomesoeuer wold come'.[23]

These clearly are reminiscences of an earlier age. But what of the one specific reference to 'kinge Henry the vith', who is described as ordering his father's funeral horse-trappers to be given to Westminster Abbey and made into two sets of vestments?[24] Is this a past tense too, or a sort of historic present that reflects the writer's own experience?

Other clues point clearly to the historic present. Take for instance the extraordinary passage which discusses who, if anyone, should sleep in the chamber when the king and queen lie together. The writer recalls that, on those occasions 'I sawe neuer no person lie in the same chambre, sauynge in king Henry dais the lord Say wt his chambreleyne'. But Saye, the writer adds 'was remevid in a schort sesone of his logginge'.[25] This passage can be dated precisely. 'The lord Say' is James Fiennes. He was one of Henry VI's closest attendants and intimates. He had served in the boy-king's household; accompanied him to France for his coronation and finally in 1447 was made in quick succession Lord Saye and Sele and lord chamberlain of the household.[26] The 'chambreleyne', on the other hand, is William de la Pole, duke of Suffolk, who was both Saye's departmental overlord as great chamberlain or chamberlain of England and his political patron.[27] Saye probably resigned the chamberlainship of the household on his appointment as lord treasurer in 1449 and, in any event, was summarily executed the following year in Cade's Revolt. So the passage must refer to events that fell in the three years separating Fiennes's creation and appointment in 1447 and his resignation and/or death in 1449/50.[28]

None of the couplings between Henry and his wife that Fiennes witnessed bore fruit. But in 1453, eight years after the marriage, a son, Edward, was born. This leads to the second datable reference. In March 1454 the infant was created prince of Wales. The *Ryalle Book* gives two closely related accounts of the creation of a prince of Wales, the one in the first part, the other in the second. Both describe the ceremony of investiture and list the insignia used: a sword, a cap of estate and a coronet, a ring and a rod of gold. The first account then explains the meaning of each item of the insignia; the second limits itself to the significance of the sword, which, as the fuller account of the first version has it, is girded on the prince 'because the Prince, assone as he is born, is duke of Cornwalle, and in token of yt h'is duke wtout creacion, the swerd is first set on hyme'.[29] This reference to the sword is one of the most important in the whole text.

For in 1454 precedent was being set, not followed. A brief survey of previous princes and their investitures will make the point. The first prince of Wales, Edward, son of Edward I, was never duke of Cornwall. The second prince of Wales, Edward, the Black Prince, eldest son of Edward III, *was* duke of Cornwall. But he was so, not by birth, but by formal creation in 1337 at the age of six. The ceremony, which was the first creation of a duke in England, took place in parliament and was by girding with a sword. Six years later in 1343 he was invested as prince of Wales. Since he was already a duke by creation, there was no question of girding him with a sword a second time; instead he simply underwent princely investiture with a coronet, a gold ring and a silver rod. The next prince of Wales was the future Henry V, who had become heir apparent only by virtue of his father's usurpation. This explains the fact that all three titles associated with the place of heir apparent — the earldom of Chester, the dukedom of Cornwall and the principality of Wales — were conferred on him at once on 15 October 1399, two days after his father's coronation. But, despite the multiplicity of titles, he was invested only with the princely coronet, ring and rod. So Edward, Henry VI's son, was the first heir apparent to be regarded as duke of Cornwall from birth. And he was the first in token of this fact to be girded with the sword, as well as the other princely insignia.[30] The fact that this innovation is incorporated into the *Ryalle Book* once more dates its first part to Henry VI's reign. Indeed, there is some likelihood that the first of the two schemes for the creation of a prince is the actual formulary used in organizing the ceremony of 1454.

---

[22] *AR* I, 311.

[23] *AR* I, 314.

[24] *AR* I, 311.

[25] *AR* I, 313.

[26] R. A. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI* (London, 1981), pp. 233, 285.

[27] G. E. Cokayne, *The Complete Peerage*, new edition revised by V. Gibbs and later H. A. Doubleday, 13 vols. (London, 1910–49) [hereafter *GEC*] XII/1, 443–8. The plethora of chamberlains at this time emerges clearly in the wardrobe accounts. In 1446–8 the duke of Gloucester appears as chamberlain of England; William de la Pole, then marquess of Suffolk, as acting deputy ('immediate'); Ralph Butler, Lord Sudeley as chamberlain of the household and Saye as his acting deputy. Following Gloucester's death in 1447, Suffolk and Saye replaced the erstwhile holders of the established posts (Public Record Office [PRO], E101/409/16, fo. 33v). I owe this reference to the kindness of my former research student, Dr Shelagh Mitchell. I am also very grateful to my colleague at Fitzwilliam College, Dr Rosemary Horrox, for her comments on the difficulties of dating this passage.

[28] The reference to Saye and Sele as chamberlain is noted in L. Campbell and F. Steer, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the College of Arms. Collections*, I vol. [others planned] (London, 1988) I, 124–5 in the notes to another copy of the *Ryalle Book*, MS M 8, fos. 27v–56v. The dating to Henry VI's reign is also deduced but it is assumed that the section is an interpolation in a text of Henry VII's reign. The evidence for the dating of other passages in the first section of the text rules this out.

[29] *AR* I, 309–10, 338–9.

[30] J. E. Powell and K. Wallis, *The House of Lords in the Middle Ages* (London, 1968), pp. 244 [1301], 327 [1337], 351 [1343], 427 [1399], 498 [1454].

A further section of the first part of the *Ryalle Book* seems to bear a similar relationship to another actual court ceremony of Henry VI's reign. It is headed 'As ffor the Ressauynge off a Quene, and her Crownacion'.[31] On examination, this looks like the formulary used to organize the reception of Margaret of Anjou when she arrived in England in 1445 to become Henry VI's queen. The king must nominate certain noblemen and noblewomen to meet his future wife 'at the see sidde', states the *Ryalle Book*. Margaret was received at Southampton on 10 April. The future queen was then, the *Ryalle Book* continues, to be conveyed to the palace where the wedding would take place. 'Also it muste be vndirstoud whethere the Kinge wilbe weddid priuely or opinly'. In 1445 the former option was chosen and Margaret was taken to Titchfield Abbey in the New Forest, where the marriage took place in comparative seclusion on 22 April. Then Margaret made her entrée into London on 28 May; on the 29th she was borne in state in her litter from the Tower to Westminster and the following day, Sunday, 30 May, she was crowned. Then came three days of celebratory jousts, as the *Ryalle Book* specified. Throughout, the ceremonies were of the most splendid with John Lydgate, the laureate of the Lancastrians, writing the verses for the pageants. And throughout, the outline in the *Ryalle Book* and the actual programme of the festivities paralleled each other closely.[32]

The marriage was the climacteric of the Lancastrian court: by itself it should put to rest any notions about the court's lack of splendour or decorum. It was also the moment which generated some of the principal Lancastrian court records. I have already suggested that one of the preparatory documents finds itself preserved in the *Ryalle Book*. More important, however, was the likely impact of the ceremonies on one of the observers. For it seems not to have been noticed that the visit of the Portuguese Count Alvaro, which led directly to the commissioning of the *Liber Regie Capelle*, coincided with the royal marriage. Alvaro's main purpose, of course, was to received the Garter for himself and as proxy for his master, Alfonso V of Portugal. But Alfonso, as great-grandson of John of Gaunt through his second marriage to Constance of Castille, was also a relation of the Lancastrian family. This is why the thirteen-year-old was in line for the Garter in the first place.[33] It also makes it virtually certain that his envoy was invited to the coronation if not to the semi-private wedding. If he did witness the coronation and associated festivities in London and Westminster, it would explain why Alvaro was so impressed with English royal ceremonial; it would also account for the coverage of the *Liber Regie Capelle*. For this includes, as well as the description of the personnel and ceremonies of the chapel itself, a series of formularies: for the coronation, for the coronation of the queen alone (as in 1445), for a royal baptism, and for the purification of

---

[31] *AR* I, 302–4.

[32] Cf. Griffiths, *Henry VI*, pp. 487–9; *Great Chronicle*, ed. Thomas and Thornley, pp. 177–8.

[33] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, p. 896; E. Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London, 1672), p. 711.

the queen after giving birth. Material relating to the queen, in short, seems remarkably prominent, as we might expect of a book compiled in the aftermath of a royal wedding.[34]

But to return to the *Ryalle Book*. It is now clear that the material of the first half of the text can be dated firmly to the 1440s and 1450s. The references to particular events are precise; moreover, the writer several times makes explicit his status as an eye-witness. 'I haue seen', he writes, or more emphatically, 'neuer saw I'. The most remarkable of these autobiographical passages is where the author, writing in the first person, records his memories of New Year's Day at the court of Henry VI and Queen Margaret. New Year's Day, not Christmas Day, was then (as it remained throughout the Tudor period) the principal day for gift-giving. 'I haue seen', the writer recalled, 'the Kinge and the Quene as in the mornynge to arise rathere [earlier] then eny oyr day' to receive their gifts. They then stayed in their chamber longer than usual — lying, as a final touch, 'in yr beddes as longe as it plessithe them to ressaue yr yefts'. We think of Henry VI and Queen Margaret as Shakespeare's tragic couple; here we see them (still in their thirties) behaving like excited children on Christmas morning, up early and inspecting presents in bed.[35]

The writer also shifts into the first person at the end of the formulary for the queen's reception: 'I remytt', he writes, 'my sympille boke to siche as hathe it in experiens, then I haue for to refforme it'.[36] This deference to the judgment of the expert may be merely courteous pretence or it may be real. If real, it suggests that the accounts are not formularies, written before the event, but precedents, written afterwards for the guidance of future generations.

Be that as it may, the writer is aware, as an experienced and conscientious officer would be, of the existence of such official formularies and explicitly calls attention to them: 'I say you the forme at what tym ye Quene wt childe shall take hir chambre and what person shall do hire seruis, that is in acte; and so is the purificacion done; and as for the cristynynge of a prince or a princesse, the forme thereof is enacte; etca'.[37] It is immediately striking that this list of 'formes' that are 'enacte' corresponds closely to the contents of the 'ordinance' included at the end of the second part of the *Ryalle Book*. 'Ordinance', the section begins, 'for the Quene to take hire chambre' [that is, to commence her confinement], and ffor the appareillinge and arrainge aswelle yrof, as of oyr places; and so for cristenynge of ye King's son and daughture'.[38] The list of 'formes . . . enacte' also covers two of the same topics as the Latin 'formae' (for baptism and purification) in the *Liber Regie Capelle*.[39] It seems certain that the author of the first part of the *Ryalle Book* was thinking of these or other similar texts.

But not only does the author of the first part vouch for the existence of an official court formulary, he also gives us the name of its custodian. 'The book whiche all thes things bene enactid in', he recalls, 'was wont allwey to be in ye houssold of the last man yt I vndirstand that had it was Hampton, squyere for the body in all thes offices and maters'.[40] 'Hampton' was John Hampton, Henry VI's favourite esquire of the body. The squires were then the king's most intimate body servants, dressing and undressing him as the later gentlemen of the privy chamber were wont to do.[41] Hampton had been with the king since his boyhood; he was his companion in his sports and recreations; he played an important part in setting up the king's favourite foundation of Eton; he went over to France to escort Margaret to her marriage in England. Thereafter, he became as intimate with the queen as with the king, serving her as her master of the horse. And he accumulated patronage and popular odium in equal measure.[42] The evidence of the *Ryalle Book* adds another role to Hampton's career. He seems to have been the chief organizer of court routine and ceremony: responsible for 'all thes offices and maters' and custodian of the book of precedents and orders on which court life was based. In short, he fulfilled the task of deputy to the lord chamberlain, later formalized as the post of vice-chamberlain.

---

[34] *Liber Regie Capelle*, ed. Ullmann, chapters XIII (Forma Baptizandi . . .), XIV (Forma et Solennitas Purificacionis Regine), p. 107 (section beginning 'Die, quo regina sola coronanda est . . .).

[35] *AR* I, 313.

[36] *AR* I, 304.

[37] *AR* I, 313.

[38] *AR* I, 333.

[39] See note 16 above.

It is now time to sum up our conclusions about the first part of the *Ryalle Book*. Its author was a long-serving gentleman usher of Henry VI. But, as he refers to 'king Henry dais', he wrote after his master was dead or, at least, had ceased to be king.[43] He also wrote at a time when he feared that his specialist lore was at risk of loss through ignorance and indifference. 'Forasmyche', he began, 'as ther is now but litill knowlege in the sittinge in estate of the Dukes, Erles, and Barons off this Realme of Englond in the presence of oure Souereyne Lorde the Kynge, he beinge in his Estat', he had compiled 'thes Articles here folowinge'.[44] His text continues to p. 314 of the printed edition. There then follow two paragraphs. The first offers directly addressed advice to 'Syre' to do nothing of importance without the advice and authority of the lord chamberlain; the second mentions the location of Henry VI's book of orders in the hands of John Hampton. These sound like concluding remarks and represent, I think, the end of the first part of the text. And they are followed immediately by an account of the funeral of Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury, which took place in January 1463.[45]

This would fix the composition of the first part of the *Ryalle Book* to the two years between the proclamation of Edward IV as king on 4 March 1461 and Salisbury's funeral at the beginning of 1463. These months would have been the time of maximum uncertainty as to proper court etiquette. The new king was a usurper, young (a few days short of his nineteenth birthday) and, as his father had been executed in December 1460, endowed with only a few weeks' experience in leading a noble, let alone a royal, entourage. At the same time, the elaborate forms of Lancastrian court ritual had probably atrophied in the last few years.

---

[40] *AR* I, 314.

[41] *AR* I, 306.

[42] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, pp. 55, 246, 250, 291, 308–9, 360.

[43] *AR* I, 313.

[44] *AR* I, 296.

[45] *GEC* XI, 397–8; *AR* I, 314.

Henry VI's court abandoned the capital in 1456 and retreated to the heartland of the duchy of Lancaster estates in the Midlands.[46] The king, self-exiled from his own capital, was also a stranger to his wits; the queen increasingly assumed the role of a provincial war-lord. In these circumstances it seems likely that some at least of the elaborate and costly forms of the *Ryalle Book* were abandoned: certainly, all of the dateable precedents cited by its author antedate the time of troubles which had begun with the first battle of St Albans in 1455.

It is of course possible that the anonymous author of the first part of the *Ryalle Book* wrote it at his own initiative. But, bearing in mind the scale of the enterprise, it seems unlikely. There is also a strong indication to the contrary in the text. It comes in the penultimate paragraph. 'Syre one thinge', the author writes (or rather says, as the turn of language strongly suggests dictation), 'I vsed alway, and I wold counselle you, yf my lord chambreleyne were p'esent, I neuer did no gret thinge in myne office but by his avice'.[47] The text is thus addressed to a particular individual, who, the most plausible assumption must be, also commissioned it. It is impossible to be sure of his identity. But, once again, the author's advice offers a clue. It is addressed to someone who had succeeded to his position in the new regime and who, like him, had to work in close co-operation with the lord chamberlain. In other words, we should look to a senior Yorkist gentleman usher. One name leaps to mind.

Roger Ree or Ray was a long-standing servant of Richard, duke of York, rising through the ranks from a yeoman or valet of the duke's chamber in 1439 to usher in 1451.[48] In 1448 Ree, commanding a posse of York's tenants, intervened forcibly in an Essex land dispute which pitted his master against the court favourite, the duke of Suffolk. He played a similar strong-arm role in York's first abortive coup at Dartford in Kent in 1452 and had to sue for a royal pardon afterwards.[49] In-and-between, in 1450, Ree had been York's principal envoy to court in the last stages of the negotiations which ended with the duke's abandoning his position as king's lieutenant in Ireland and returning, fatefully, to intervene in English politics in the aftermath of Cade's Revolt.[50] Ree, in short, had been one of York's closest and most confidential household servants. When York's son became king, Ree was one of those transferred from his old place in the ducal household to the equivalent one in the royal household. By 1461 he was an usher of the chamber; by 1471 he was a knight of the body and the king's principal body servant. This fact emerges from the household Ordinances of 1471. The Ordinances divided the knights and esquires for the body into two attendances or rotas, each of which was to serve for eight weeks at a time, starting on 31 October. Ree was to be 'deputie to my Lord chamberlaine' in both of the rotas. He was also head of the quorum of five, made up of two gentlemen ushers, two yeomen ushers, and Ree himself, who were to 'be allwaie attending vpon us'.[51] Not surprisingly, Ree's authority on matters of court etiquette was common knowledge. In 1468 Ree, as was usual with leading courtiers of his social status, was made sheriff of Norfolk. The following July he met the mayor of Norwich and told him of Queen Elizabeth Woodville's impending arrival in the city. He refused to deal with the details of her reception (recommending instead that the corporation sought guidance from their confrères in London). But he did give the excellent advice that 'she woll desire to ben resseyved and attendid as wurshepfully as evir was Quene a forn hir'.[52]

---

[46] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, p. 772.

[47] *AR* I, 314.

[48] P. A. Johnson, *Duke Richard of York* (Oxford, 1988), p. 237.

[49] Johnson, *Richard of York*, pp. 72, 117 n. 67.

[50] J. R. Lander, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1965), p. 63.

[51] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, pp. 199–200, 262.

So Ree was the senior Yorkist gentleman usher of the chamber. He became deputy to the lord chamberlain. And he was regarded as an authority on court procedure. This makes him the most likely addressee of the first half of the text (pp. 296–314 of the printed edition). I would also suspect that he was responsible for the addition of the second half of the text (pp. 314–39) in the course of Edward IV's reign. The result is the Yorkist version of the 'book whiche all thes things bene enactid in', which was held under Henry VI by John Hampton, whose effective successor Ree was.

It is now time to turn in more detail to the second part of the *Ryalle Book*. The dividing line between the two parts, as we have seen, is the precedent of Salisbury's funeral. After it, there comes a fresh start. Le Neve recognized as much when he noted at this point: 'Here begin again the Services at the Court'.[53] The new material starts with further detailed regulations for the service of the king's dinner and supper. There follow formularies for the coronation and the marriage of the king's daughter, with both ceremonies being seen from the point of view of the ushers. Next are provisions for the king's washing at the end of a meal; a strange, apparently interpolated, paragraph on the responsibilities and perquisites of the sergeant purveyor; a court catechism of twenty-one questions and answers on the finer points of precedence for the ceremonies of a day of estate; the rules for a 'void' or desert of spices and wine; the procedures for the creation of knights of the Bath; the placing of the king's board; the calendar of days of estate and the practices to be followed on them. Especially full treatment is given to New Year's Day and Twelfth Night, or Epiphany, when the king wore his crown and was vested almost as for his coronation. Finally, come formularies for the order of the Garter and its ceremonies, for the delivery of the queen and the birth of a prince or princess and for the creation of the prince of Wales.[54] Much of this material — the creation of the prince, the ceremonies surrounding the queen's pregnancy and a royal birth, the 'void' and New Year's Day — duplicates similar sections in the first part of the text. This could, of course, be the result of careless or unsystematic compilation. But the scale of duplication suggests the explanation we have offered here: that the material before the Salisbury funeral is the ex-usher's recollections of the Lancastrian court; while the sections following, on the other hand, represent the practice of its Yorkist successor.

---

[52] *The Paston Letters*, ed. J. Gairdner, 6 vols. (London, 1904) IV, 307; V, 34.

[53] *AR* I, 317.

[54] *AR* I, 317–39.

And, as we would expect, bearing in mind the lapse of time, there are small but significant variations between the Lancastrian and Yorkist material. In some instances there is more elaboration. The arrangements for a royal christening in the Lancastrian part, for instance, make no specific recommendations about the choice of font. In the equivalent section in the Yorkist part, however, it is specified that 'the ffont of siluer beynge in Crist's chirche at Canterbery, be sent for, or els a newe made to the same entent, to be conseruid and kept in siche place as it shall plesse the Kinge for semblable case hereaftur'.[55] The Canterbury font, which was made of massy silver, had been bought by Christchurch in 1447 from a London goldsmith for the sum of £14. The date may be significant. The marriage of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou had taken place only two years earlier and the monks may have had their eye on the main chance of offering the font for the baptism of the hoped-for prince.[56] Whether it was indeed used in 1453 for the christening of Edward, the couple's only child, is unclear. But the reputation it enjoyed under Edward IV would suggest that it was.

The change in the protocol for New Year's Day was even greater. Under Henry VI, there was a high level of informality, with the king and queen apparently sitting up in bed to receive their presents.[57] By the time of Edward IV the presentation of gifts had become more formal. The king seems to have sat *on* his bed, rather than *in* it, and a ritualized exchange of words was prescribed. As soon as the king was ready, the usher guarding the chamber door was to say, 'Sire, here is a yerris yefte comynge from the Quene'. Then, in his turn, the king was to reply, 'Let it com in, Sire', and the queen's messenger entered with the gift. The queen's messenger was followed by messengers bringing gifts from other members of the royal family and the court, in order of precedence of the giver. Once the gifts had been presented, the messengers were given money rewards by the treasurer of the chamber. In each case, the amount of the reward was graded according to rank, by a double scale that reflected the status of both the giver and the messenger. A similar procedure was followed for the queen's New Year gifts, save that her rewards tended to be smaller than the king's.[58]

The second part of the *Ryalle Book* also contains an elaborate formulary for the ceremonies of Twelfth Day, or Epiphany (6 January). On this day alone the king was to wear the full regalia, which was specified in minute detail. His dress was to be the 'robes rialle', consisting of kirtle, surcoat, furred hood and mantle with a long train and tied in front with a rich lace. On his arms were to be placed the 'armylls', or coronation bracelets 'of gold, sett full of riche stones'. In his right hand he bore the sceptre; in his left the orb and on his head the crown itself. Curiously, the 'armylls' were to be treated with special reverence. 'And no temp'alle man to touche it, but the Kinge hymselue'. Instead, the esquire of the body was to bring the 'armylls' to the king 'in a faire kerchief', and the king was to 'put them on hym sleue'.[59] The special sanctity accorded the 'armylls' has a clear explanation. The other items of regalia used by the king on Epiphany — the crown, the orb and the sceptre — were part of a duplicate set kept in the jewel house. They were not the actual instruments of the coronation which were kept in Westminster Abbey and were used only for the service. But the Abbey regalia contained no 'armylls'. Instead, the jewel house pair were used. So alone of the court set of regalia the 'armylls' had figured in the coronation and been blessed with the resonant words of the service. 'Receive', the king was told as the abbot of Westminster placed the 'armylls' and their linking stole on him, 'ye Armill of sincerity and wisdom, as a token of God's embraceing: whereby all thy workes may be defended against thy enemies both bodily and ghostly, through Christ or Lord. Amen'. Hence the fact that the bracelets were untouchable by any merely 'temp'alle' — that is, unconsecrated — hand. Thus arrayed, almost as magnificently as for his coronation itself, the monarch followed in the steps of the three kings on the first epiphany and offered gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh on the altar of the chapel royal.[60]

---

[55] *AR* I, 334.

[56] Staniland, 'Royal Entry', p. 303 n. 33.

[57] *AR* I, 313.

[58] *AR* I, 330.

At first sight this, too, looks like progressive elaboration. But it may be the opposite. For the Lancastrian *Liber Regie Capelle* of the late 1440s provides for the king to wear his crown on many more occasions — not only at Epiphany but at Christmas, Easter, Whitsun, All Saints' and both of the feasts of St Edward.[61] In the *Ryalle Book*, however, all of these, apart from Epiphany, are demoted to days of estate in which the king wore, not his crown, but his cap of estate.[62] But, we may guess, what the *Ryalle Book* lost in the number of crown-wearings it made up for in the splendour of the Epiphany ceremonies.

We should expect the new, unique prominence of Epiphany to leave some mark in the record. For the reign of Edward IV, there seems to be no account of the ceremonies; for Edward's usurping brother, Richard III, on the other hand, there is striking testimony to the impact of the occasion. It was Epiphany 1485. That very day the king had received news that Henry, earl of Richmond would certainly launch an invasion in the coming year. But Richard defied his enemies in the splendour of the festival. 'The king', according to the eye-witness Crowland chronicler, 'appeared on Epiphany wearing his crown' in the great hall at Westminster 'as though at his original coronation'.[63]

But of course the need to invest an occasion with peculiar solemnity could lead the king to wear his crown at other times as well. These special ceremonies also tended to be arranged on days of estate, since these provided both a liturgical context and (since they were the most heavily attended days at court) a ready-made audience as well. One such occasion took place on St Edward's Day, 13 October 1472. A week previously, the first parliament since Edward IV's restoration to the throne had convened. Now the king resolved to thank publicly all those who had helped him back to his own again. He went crowned in procession to the parliament chamber, and there, wearing his cap of estate, listened to a eulogy by the speaker of his family, friends and supporters. Then, resuming his crown, he created his host and protector in his exile, Louis de la Gruthuyse, earl of Winchester. There followed another solemn procession in which the new earl and the king and queen, both crowned, went to Westminster Abbey to offer gifts at the shrine of St Edward, king, confessor and namesake of Edward IV himself, whose saint's day it was.[64] Another similar occasion was the creation of the future Henry VIII as duke of York on All Saints' Day, 1 November 1494. Once again the king, Henry VII, wore his crown and went in procession with the queen, Elizabeth of York, also crowned, and his mother, Lady Margaret Beaufort, with 'a rich cournall'.[65] The effect, in other words, of one of these special ceremonies was to turn the day of estate, for the nonce, hack into the crown-wearing it had formerly been.

But the most interesting parallel between the second part of the *Ryalle Book* and an actual ceremony of the Yorkist court relates, once again, to the creation of the prince of Wales. The investiture of the previous prince of Wales, Edward, son of Henry VI, had, as we have seen, created a precedent. Novelly, the infant was regarded as duke of Cornwall from his birth on 13 October 1453. So when he was made prince of Wales six months later in March 1454, he was first girded with the sword 'in token of yt h'is duke wtout creacion'. The author of the Yorkist second part of the *Ryalle Book* was well aware of the earlier precedent, which he rehearses. And, in normal circumstances, there is no doubt it would have been followed for the investiture of Edward IV's own first-born son. But the circumstances were not normal. For the younger Edward was born on 2 November 1470. His father was an exile in the Netherlands; his mother was a refugee in the Sanctuary at Westminster Abbey, where the boy was born; Henry VI sat once more on his throne and his son, another Edward, whose own creation as prince of Wales had established the precedent for future investitures, was a promising young man who was on the point of returning to England to reclaim his inheritance. All, of course, was changed with Edward IV's return and triumph at the battle of Tewkesbury on 4 May 1471. Henry VI and Prince Edward were murdered and the house of Lancaster destroyed.

By June Edward was secure enough to give thought to his son's status and, on the 26th, he was invested as prince of Wales and earl of Chester. Despite the fact that the baby was only nine months old, the investiture (if we believe the words of the charter) was in full form: 'by girding with the sword, and by the handing over and placing of a circlet on his head, a gold ring on his finger and a gold rod in his hand'. All this, the charter claimed, was 'as is customary'. And indeed it apparently followed the precedent of 1454 to the letter. But there was one crucial difference. The circumstances of the boy's birth made it impossible to regard him as having been born duke of Cornwall. Instead, he was vested with the duchy by charter on 17 July—that is, three weeks *after* his investiture as prince.[66] This sequence made nonsense of the role of the sword in his princely installation. It had been introduced in 1454 to symbolize the fact that the Lancastrian prince was already duke of Cornwall by birth; in 1471, if it meant anything at all, it either symbolized a separate notional investiture of the Yorkist prince with the earldom of Chester or perhaps his duty of defending his territories as well as ruling them. Anyway, it was a ceremonial illiteracy. It was felt to be such by the author of the second part of the *Ryalle Book* and he made his feelings plain in the comment he appended to his account of the proper protocol. 'The creacion of a prince is myche at the plesure of the Kynge, hou he will haue it done, notwtstonding thoughe it ought to be the contrary, as well in yt othere things as in that at all tymes his prerogatif must be had'.[67] The English is contorted but the thought is plain: 'there is a protocol which has been broken. Such is the king's prerogative. Still, it is a pity'.

---

[59] *AR* I, 328.

[60] A. J. Collins, *Jewels and Plate of Queen Elizabeth I* (London, 1955), pp. 15–16; *The Manner of the Coronation of King Charles I*, ed. C. Wordsworth, Bradshaw Society 2 (London, 1892), 38.

[61] *Liber Regie Capelle*, pp. 64–5.

[62] *AR* I, 327–8.

[63] *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations: 1459–1486*, ed. N. Pronay and J. Cox, Richard III and Yorkist History Trust (London, 1986), p. 173.

[64] 'Narratives of the Arrival of Louis de Bruges', ed. F. Madden, *Archaeologia* 26 (1836), 265–86.

[65] *Letters and Papers of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII*, ed. J. Gairdner, 2 vols. (London, 1861–3) I, 391–3.

In ordinary circumstances, however, Edward IV was as eager to observe proper form as the most protocol-bound of his gentlemen ushers. This gave the *Ryalle Book* its authoritative role. Indeed, its authority underpins the other household ordinances of Edward IV's reign, just as its existence is presumed by their wording. For instance, §10 of the Ordinance of 1471, 'Making the bedd', requires the attendance of one of the knights of the body and one of the gentlemen ushers at the nightly making of the royal bed. However, their actual role in the ceremony, including the final sprinkling of holy water on the finished bed, is only described in the equivalent section of the *Ryalle Book*, 'As ffor the makynge off the Kyng's Bedde'.[68] §§9 and 11 of the 1471 Ordinance deal further with the duties of the ushers and esquires of the body. The first gives one of the esquires responsibility for the king's 'cubbard' on which his 'all night' or night-cap of wine was prepared; the second assigns responsibility for setting the night watch. Both are paralleled in the section of the *Ryalle Book* which sets out the duties of 'The Squyeres ffor the Body'.[69] Similarly, the draft Ordinance of 1478 stipulates that, each day, the king be served wafers and fresh fruit, according to the season; the *Ryalle Book* describes the serving of them in greater detail and assigns the task to the servants of the spicery and wafery, who were to bring the fruit and wafers to the door of the king's chamber.[70] There is, in short, a fairly clear and consistent division of function between the *Ryalle Book* and the various ordinances: the former sets out the general rules; the latter remind key individuals of the existence of the rules, require their observance and prescribe penalties for default.

The ordinances defer similarly to the other main corpus of household regulation we have identified—the 'forma siue ordinacio' for the chapel royal. §5 of the Ordinance of 1478, for instance, stipulates that 'the chapell' be 'guyded according to suche ordenaunces and good custumes as hertofore hath ben vsed and ben commytted to the deane of the same'.[71] There is every reason to believe that these ecclesiastical 'ordenaunces and good custumes' were as dependent on Lancastrian precedent as their secular equivalents have proved to be.

At first sight it seems strange that the household of the dethroned Henry VI of Lancaster should have been seen as a model for the new Yorkist court. But the dynastic revolutions from 1399 onwards follow a common pattern. The legitimacy of the previous dynasty is hotly repudiated. At the same time, its ceremonial forms, even where they were innovations, are carefully imitated. The result was a ratcheting-up of English royal ceremonial, as each new dynasty continued with earlier forms while adding embellishments of its own to assert its superior claims.

The *Ryalle Book* is, almost certainly, the key text in this process of transmission. It contains, as we have seen, a careful record of Lancastrian court practice, as well as unambiguous references to particular, formally 'enacted' procedures. This record is commissioned after Henry VI's fall, almost certainly by a leading Yorkist gentleman usher. It then becomes the basis of an equivalent Yorkist compilation. But the Yorkist text is seen as complementing the Lancastrian, not replacing it. And it is the two, bound together as the first and second parts of the *Ryalle Book*, that are authoritative. But the process of tradition does not stop there. For, as we have seen, the last item in the *Ryalle Book* is an oath to Henry VII. Later, seventeenth-century copies of the *Ryalle Book* also exist which claim to have been transcribed from a book in the keeping of successive Tudor lords chamberlain. The transcript is headed: 'The booke of Henry Erle of Arundell Lord chamberlain to king Henry theight and copie of a black booke of his Matie called the Booke of Sir Giles Dawbney chamberlayne to kyng Henry the viith'.[72] Arundel was lord chamberlain from 1546 until his forced resignation in 1550; Giles, Lord Daubeney from 1495 to his death in 1508. As well as his official concern with the records of his position, Arundel also had the interest of the passionate bibliophile and collector. Strikingly, in view of my argument of transmission from one dynasty to another, the homage and oaths at the end of this Tudor office copy of the *Ryalle Book* refer to King Edward and 'Edward iiiith and the quene and their issue'.

There seems no reason to doubt that the original of this text of the *Ryalle Book* once formed part of the archives of the Tudor lord chamberlain's department. But, if the addressee of the oaths is anything to go by, it was the Yorkist copy of the *Ryalle Book*. What is probably the official Tudor version is somewhat different. In the *Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household* there is an order headed 'Articles appointed by the Kinge our Soveraigne Lord Henry the Seventh, at his palace at Westminster, the last day of December, in the ninth yeare of his most noble raigne' (that is, 1493).[73] The text begins with five short items dealing with the attendance and duties of the knights and esquires for the body and the gentlemen ushers; there then follows a version of the *Ryalle Book*. But the text has been heavily edited: the more personal remarks in the original are cut; the text is rearranged in a more logical order and the most flagrant duplications are removed.

---

[66] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, 1278–1504, ed. J. Strachey and others, 6 vols. (London, 1767–77) VI, 9, 12–15.

[67] *AR* I, 339.

[68] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, p. 200; *AR* I, 301–2.

[69] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, p. 200; *AR* I, 306.

[70] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, p. 209; *AR* I, 307.

[71] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, p. 213.

[72] BL, Harley MS 4107, fos. 100–133. Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS B.47, fos. 6–6v and fos. 8–37, has a similar heading and contents.

[73] *HO*, pp. 109–33.

However, these fine distinctions of official and unofficial texts are not, probably, very important. The chief authority for ceremonial remained the individual and collective memory of the gentlemen ushers, reinforced with such precedents of particular events as they had written down. The result is a striking resemblance between the *Ryalle Book* and the collections of one or more mid-sixteenth-century gentlemen ushers analysed by Fiona Kisby.[74] Though separated by a hundred years, both are a mixture of precedents and personal recollections. And both are a product of similar circumstances. The *Ryalle Book* deals with the handing-down of ceremonial from Lancaster to York and thence to Tudor; the mid-sixteenth-century book with a similar transmission across the Tudors themselves, from Henry VIII to each of his children. This process of transmission, though informal, was remarkably efficacious and left little room or need for foreign influence.

Which brings us finally to the question of Burgundy. Now it is certainly true that both Edward IV and his subjects were profoundly impressed by their experiences of the Burgundian court. The king had witnessed it at first hand during his brief exile in 1470–1. Two years previously, a group of his leading subjects had accompanied Edward's sister Margaret of York for her wedding at Bruges to Charles the Bold. It was the kind of occasion when all courts set out to impress. And the Burgundians certainly succeeded. One of the party was John Paston. He wrote home to his mother with his reactions: 'And as for the Dwkys coort . . . I bert never of non lyek to it, save Kyng Artourys cort'.[75]

Soon after his recovery of the throne in 1471 Edward turned to the reconstruction of his household. He sought inspiration from two sources. The first was the past. The 'Black Book' shows that he looked back to the regulations of his predecessors, in particular to Edward III, whom he particularly revered as both his namesake and direct dynastic progenitor. His other model, naturally enough, was the splendid court of his contemporary and brother-in-law, Charles of Burgundy. For his information be went beyond mere observation and turned to the authority on Burgundian court protocol, Olivier de la Marche. De la Marche himself explains the circumstances.[76] Edward was planning the 1475 invasion of France. As he wished 'se monstrer en son estat grant Roy et puissant' [to show himself by his state a great and powerful king], he sent the victualler of Calais to de la Marche to ask for a written account of the household of Burgundy in both peace and war. De la Marche was serving with the duke in the lengthy seige of Neuss and he took advantage of the enforced leisure to compose 'l'estat de la maison du Duc Charles de Bourgoingne, dit le Hardy'. The 'estat' also makes clear that a copy of Charles 'ordonnances' for war had reached England even earlier.[77]

So there is no doubt that Edward IV was well informed on Burgundy. The 'ordonnances' for war were the duke's own composition, over which he had laboured mightly; while de la Marche's own 'l'estat de la maison du Duc Charles de Bourgoingne, dit le Hardy' is both exhaustive and exhausting. So much so, that, when de la Marche later sent a copy of it to the Emperor Maximilian, he prefaced it with a sort of executive summary entitled 'Advis des grans officiers que doit avoir ung roy et de leur povoir et entreprise'.[78] But did Edward actually make use of this information to Bugundianize his own court? As he had gone to considerable trouble to obtain it, the assumption is that he did. The evidence, however, tells a different story. Here de la Marche's relentless detail comes into its own. For it enables us to make precise comparisons between ceremonies and official duties in the Burgundian court and their English equivalents — if, that is, we can find them.

'L'estat de la maison' begins with the organization of the duke's chapel, since, as de la Marche piously observes, all things should commence with the service of God.[79] But the whole treatment only takes up two printed pages out of the ninety-four of the whole text. This is in sharp contrast to the *Ryalle Book*, where the ritual calendar of the chapel royal forms the axis round which almost all ceremonial revolves. Instead, in the Burgundian court the main forum for the display of ducal power and authority was the public audience for justice, which took place twice a week, on Mondays and Fridays after dinner. De la Marche lovingly describes the 'ceremonies et pompes' with which it was invested. The duke came into the hall where the audience was prepared, accompanied by his whole court. He sat in his chair, which was richly covered in cloth of gold and placed on a carpeted dais, three steps high. In front of the duke was a small bench, at which knelt two masters of requests, the usher and a secretary who acted as registrar. Behind the secretary, a clerk filed the petitions by threading them on a cord. On either side of the chamber were benches, on which sat in order of precedence princes of the blood, ambassadors, knights of the Golden Fleece, and the grand pensionaries or chief provincial magistrates. Behind the duke stood the esquires of the chamber. At the lower end of the hall was the 'parquet'. This means the 'bar' of a court in modern French. It was a large platform, surrounded with rails and benches and covered in tapestry with the duke's arms. Less senior officials sat on these benches, while esquires of the duke's military household stood in ranks outside the rails on either side of the 'parquet'. At the end of the 'parquet', facing the duke, were men-at-arms of the guard; ushers guarded the doors and sergeants-at-arms with their maces on their shoulders stood at the foot of the entrance to the 'parquet'. Once everyone was seated, the doors at either end of the hall were thrown open. Petitioners entered at the lower end; presented their petitions to the officials on the bench who read them in order, and then left by the doors at the upper end behind the duke.[80]

---

[74] BL, Add MS 71009 and see Kisby, 'The Royal Household Chapel', appendix seven (pp. 555–64). Dr Kisby is at present editing the MS for the Camden Society.

[75] Gairdner, *Paston Letters* IV, 297–8.

[76] O. de la Marche, *Mémoires*, ed. H. Beaune and J. d'Arbaumont. 4 vols. (Paris, 1888) [hereafter *Mémoires*] IV, 154.

[77] *Mémoires* IV, 84.

[78] *Mémoires* IV, 1–94, 153–7.

[79] *Mémoires* IV, 2–3.

The ceremony was conducted by the duke's masters of the household, one of the most senior of whom was de la Marche himself. He took justifiable pride in the result. During the audience, he observes, 'chascun se taist et tient ordre'. But, impressive though it was, it was also primitive. The last time that English kings had habitually administered justice in person in the presence of their vassals was in the *curia regis* of the Anglo-Norman kings. The difference between the two key-note ceremonies of England and Burgundy thus points to a fundamental contrast between the kingdom and the duchy: the chapel rites and processions of England were the rituals of an ancient sacerdotal monarchy; the judicial audiences of Burgundy were the public face of a jumped-up ducal regime. The former of course was going through a bad patch; the latter seemed to be flourishing. Nevertheless, the fundamental differences between the two meant that serious Burgundianization of the English court would always have been difficult. A further comparison between 'l'estat de la maison', on the one hand, and Edward IV's own household regulations, on the other, will show that it was not even tried.

In both courts, the service of the ruler's food was a major ceremony. In Burgundy, it focused on the disposition of the *nef*. The *nef* was a great ship of silver which was borne to the table in solemn procession by the *sommelier* or butler. After the meal the *nef* would be filled with the scraps which were distributed by the almoner to the poor. But at this stage the *nef* contained a more honorific cargo: inside were the duke's silver trenchers, the small personal salt cellar, another small *nef* and the silver rod and piece of unicorn's horn which were used to test or 'assay' the duke's food for poison. The contents of the *nef* were arranged in due order on the table; then the pantler gave the towel which he had carried on his shoulder (having first reverently kissed it and bowed before it) to the chamberlain who in turn gave it to highest ranking person present. The duke then washed and dried his hands on the towel.[81] In England, the equivalent ceremonial was and remained radically different. There was no *nef*; instead the main honorific service centred on the washing of hands. Before the meal the washing corresponded closely to the Burgundian pattern.[82] But afterwards it was vastly more elaborated. First the almoner gathered up the table cloth with the scraps (contrast this again with Burgundy where the great *nef* was used as a container). Once the table was cleared a surnap or long towel of linen diaper was laid on the board and the wrinkles carefully smoothed out. Then, with a flourish, the officiating gentleman usher inserted his rod under the cloth and made a series of elaborate folds or pleats in front of the king. This pleating, corresponding to the elaborately folded napkin of the modern restaurant, was known as the 'estate'. The king now washed and dried himself on the pleated section of the towel or 'estate' and the towel was folded away.[83] In

---

[80] *Mémoires* IV, 4–7.
[81] *Mémoires* IV, 21–3.
[82] *AR* I, 307.
[83] *AR* I, 299, 322–1.

Burgundy at this stage of the meal the towel was simply held in front of the duke by the pantler at one end and the carver at the other.[84]

In both England and Burgundy it was the custom, particularly on important occasions, to follow the meal with a dessett of sweet wines and spiced sweetmeats. But it was handled quite differently. In Burgundy, the duke took his dessert at table; in England, the king always enjoyed his standing up. The 'Black Book' is insistent on the point: 'the bourde [shall be] auoyded [taken down] whan wafyrs come with ypocras or with other swete wynes. The king takith neuer at bourde of comfisez [spiced plums] and other spices but stonding'.[85] The fact that the king stood allowed for a quite different and more sociable etiquette from when he sat at table. The result was that these desserts became major events in themselves. They were known, from the 'voiding' or removing of the table as 'voids'. There were special utensils off which to eat the spices, known as spice-plates, and, bearing in mind that people of widely varying status were present, an elaborate etiquette governing the placing and replacing of the spice-plates and wine cups on the cupboard, according to the rank of the user.[86] There appears to have been no equivalent to the void in the Burgundian court. Even the royal and ducal beds were made differently. In England, a yeoman was 'to lep vpon the bedd and roll hym vpe and doun and assay the litter'. A canvas sheet was placed over the litter and the feather bed on top of that. The feather bed was then beaten to 'make it euyne and smothe'.[87] In Burgundy, however, the ducal bed was beaten *ex officio* by the quarter-master with his staff of office.[88]

In short, it was a case of other courts, other customs. De la Marche, who was both curious and knowledgeable about the ways of doing things in neighbouring courts, was well aware of this. For instance, his discussion of heralds includes the observation that the English heralds wore the escutcheon of the king's arms on their left sleeve whereas their Burgundian colleagues had the ducal arms on their right. De la Marche was so curious about the difference that he once asked an English herald for the explanation. He includes the reply, which is highly fanciful, in his text alongside his own, no less fanciful, explanation for the opposed Burgundian custom.[89] Similarly, he notes that the proper Burgundian usage for the head of the stables was simply 'écuyer' (esquire) and not 'écuyer de l'écurie' (esquire of the stable)—just as the holder of the equivalent post in France was called 'grand écuyer'. 'Mais je croy bien', de la Marche continues, 'que nous avons aprins ceste maniere de parler aux autres maisons de princes voisons'.[90] Wherever they had learned it, however, it was not in England, where the head of the royal stables was called the 'master of the horse'. Aware of these variations as he is, de la Marche goes out of his way to disabuse any reader who nevertheless believes in the power of general rules. 'Et aussi', he concludes his discussion of the ducal household, 'n'est pas à entendre que les ordres, les coustumes et les loix soient pardessuz les princes, mais les princes pardessuz elles pour en ordonner à leur bon plaisir, et sont communement les statutz des princes confermez et leurs conditions'.[91] 'And also, it is not to be understood that orders, customs and laws are above princes, but princes are above them to order them at their pleasure and usually the statutes of princes are agreeable to their circumstances'. It would be hard to think of a better reply to the proponents of Burgundianization than this, which comes from the the supreme authority on the Burgundian court. Instead, again to paraphrase de la Marche, the household statutes of English kings, agreeable to the circumstances of the English monarchy, continued across both dynastic revolutions and the passing crazes of foreign fashion. It seems strange to have expected anything else.

---

[84] *Mémoires* IV, 24–5.
[85] Myers, *Household of Edward IV*, p. 113.
[86] *AR* I, 312–3.
[87] *AR* I, 301.
[88] *Mémoires* IV, 79.
[89] *Mémoires* IV, 69–70.
[90] *Mémoires* IV, 58.

---

[91] *Mémoires* IV, 82.

APPENDIX

Handlist of Late Fifteenth- and Early Sixteenth-Century Regulations for the English Royal Household

Largely extracted, with permission, from an unpublished paper by Dr Anita Hewardine. Most of the notes on the dating and status of the orders are, however, mine. **D. S.**

1 The *Ryalle Book*

1.1 British Library (BL), Add MS 38174.
Not noted by Dr Hewardine. Printed in *The Antiquarian Repertory* (*AR*), ed. F. Grose, 4 vols. (London, 1807–9) I, 296–341. The MS is there described as having been in the possession of Peter Le Neve (1661–1729), Norroy king of arms, and some of his annotations are reproduced. The present location of the MS was identified by K. Staniland, 'Royal Entry into the World', in *England in the Fifteenth Century*, Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium, ed. D. Williams (Woodbridge, 1987), pp. 297–313 (p. 299, n. 8). In this MS the oath of the Chamber personnel at the end is sworn to 'our souerene Lord Kynge Herry the vij. kinge of Englond and off Fraunce, and lord of Irlond'.

1.2 College of Arms, MS M.8, fos. 27–56.
Not noted by Dr Hewardine. Another copy of the *Ryalle Book*. In this MS the oath of the Chamber personnel is sworn to 'our soveraigne Lord Henry the viijth' (fo. 56). See L. Campbell and F. Steer, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the College of Arms. Collections*, 1 vol. [others planned] (London, 1988) I, 123–6.

2 Articles of 31 December 1493, with the *Ryalle Book*

2.1 BL, Harley MS 4107, fos. 100–133.
The first items of Henry VII's Articles of 31 December 1493, concerning the duties of the knights and esquires of the body and the gentlemen ushers (see 3 below), appear at the beginning on fo. 102 ff. Then follows a copy of the *Ryalle Book*. The homage and oaths at the end refer to King Edward and 'Edward iiiith and the quene and their issue'. Fo. 100r is inscribed: 'The booke of Henry Erle of Arundell Lord chamberlain to king Henry theight and copie of a black booke of his Matie called the Booke of Sir Giles Dawbney chamberlayne to kyng Henry the viith'. Sir Giles Daubeney, later Lord Daubeney, was lord chamberlain to Henry VII from to 1495 until his death in 1508; Arundel was lord chamberlain to Henry VIII and Edward VI from 1546 to 1550. This note on ownership means that 2.1 is a copy of an official precedent book in the custody of successive lords chamberlain. It therefore establishes the official status of the *Ryalle Book*.

2.2 Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS B.47, fos. 6–37.
Not noted by Dr Hewardine. Appears to be another copy of **2.1**, with the same inscription of ownership.

3 **Articles of 31 December 1493, with the revised version of the *Ryalle Book***

3.1 BL, Harley MS 642, fos. 206–25 (orignally fos. 198–217).
Printed in *A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household* (*HO*), published by the Society of Antiquaries of London (London, 1790), pp. 109–33. Despite its composite nature, this has been generally assumed to be a single regulation. But **2.1**, **2.2** and **4.2**, fos. 56–7 (and the other versions of **4**) transcribe the first folios of **3.1** as a separate order. This would suggest that the Articles of 31 December 1493 consisted only of the brief orders relating to the knights and esquires of the body and the gentlemen ushers and that the version of the *Ryalle Book* which follows is an antiquarian addition (see **4** for a similar possibility).

4 Order of 25 December 1521

4.1 BL, Add MS 21116, fos. 1–37.
Unprinted, except for the abstract of the list of cupbearers, carvers and sewers on fo. 1 in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII* (*LP*), ed. J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner and R. H. Brodie, 21 vols. and addenda (London, 1862–1932) III ii, 1899. There follow detailed accounts of the duties of gentlemen ushers, yeomen ushers, yeomen of the crown, of the guard and of the chamber, groom porters, grooms and pages of the chamber and sewers, together with orders for the making of the king's bed, and for the ceremonies on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday. Most of the material on the duties of the various office-holders also appears in Articles of 4 February 1526 (see **5** below). David Starkey, 'The King's Privy Chamber, 1485–1547' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1973), pp. 18–22 demonstrates that **6** reproduces the text of a missing order of Henry VII's reign, probably dating from 1494–1501. **4** appears to draw on the same source. It may be, as Dr Hewardine thinks, a separately issued order. Alternatively, it may be an antiquarian compilation, only prefaced with the list of cupbearers, carvers and sewers for Christmas 1521. This seems to have been the assumption of the editors of *LP*, who, as noted above, print the list as a separate document in *LP*.

4.2 College of Arms, MS M.8, fos. 1–27.
Most of this is the same as **4.1**. It is written in a hand which Campbell and Steer, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the College of Arms* I, 123, 126–7 identify as probably that of Thomas Hawley (d. 1557), Clarenceux king of arms. Interpolated, however, as both Dr Hewardine and the *Catalogue* point out, are fos. 22–3 in a different hand, giving the order of precedence of lords and ladies and 'An oder to knowe how mannye women one Ladye shall have above another'. The *Catalogue* follows the second view of the text offered in **4.1** and treats it, by implication, as a compilation.

4.3 Royal Society, MS 61, fos. 1–47.
The same. In a late sixteenth-century hand.

4.4 Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS B.146, fos. 189–200.
Not noted by Dr Hewardine, but appears to be the same.

5 **The Eltham Ordinances, January 1526**

5.1 Bodleian Library, Laud MS Misc 597.
A finely written contemporary official copy, with the first line tricked with the king's arms and badges. The argument of G. R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 375, n. 4 in favour of PRO, LC5/178 is misconceived. See Starkey, 'King's Privy Chamber', p. 133, n. 1. Starkey 'King's Privy Chamber', pp. 133–81 also gives a full discussion of the genesis of the Ordinances and their subordinate regulations. The printed text of the Ordinances in *HO*, pp. 137–61, based on BL, Harley MS 642, is good enough for most purposes. But, for proper names, 5.1 should be consulted.

6 **Articles of 4 February 1526**

6.1 College of Arms, Arundel MS XVII/2, fos. 1–22.
Printed in *AR* II, 184–208 from 6.2. **6.1** is an surviving official text, written on parchment in a fine scribal hand, with a miniature of Henry VIII in the initial 'H', and probably in its original binding of leather with Henry VIII's arms and badges. It also claims to be 'sygned wyth hys mooste gracyous hande', though no such signature appears (fo. 3v). Fo. 1 is a cover-leaf inscribed: 'The booke of Henry Erle of Arundell, Lorde Chambrelaine to kyng Henry theight: and Copie of a Booke signed by his Maiestie, and delyuered vnto therle of Worcetour, somtyme Lord Chamberlaine to his highnes'. Charles Somerset, Lord Herbert and earl of Worcester, was lord chamberlain from 1508 to his death in April 1526, only two months after the date of the Articles. An official copy of the Articles would have been handed to him at the time of their enactment, or rather, since he was already moribund by February, to his designated successor, Thomas, Lord Sandys of the Vyne (BL, Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV [part 1], fos. 295–7). The copy then became part of the archives of the lord chamberlain's department, and passed into the custody of Arundel, lord chamberlain from 1546. It was thus a companion volume to **2** above. As Dr Hewardine comments, 'this . . . earl of Arundel's book was doubtless to be used in conjunction with **2** and did not

replace it'. And indeed the two are complementary: the *Ryalle Book* dealt with court ceremonial; the Articles of 4 February 1526 with the duties of each grade of chamber personnel. As noted in 4.1 above, the Articles appear to re-enact an earlier order of Henry VII's reign.

6.2 BL, Add MS 34319.

A copy of **6.1**, printed, as already noted, in *AR* II, 184–208. Like 1.1, which is also printed in *AR*, **6.2**, it belonged to Peter Le Neve, as the following note pencilled on fo. 1 suggests. 'From the binding I think this must have been one of Peter Le Neve's books. T. F. F. Yes. "Heralds and Minstrells" on f. 6 are in his autograph. T. F. F. It is clearly written in the same hand thoughout'. By 1808, when this 'very curious Manuscript' was printed, it was, according to the heading in *AR* II, 184, 'in the possession of Thomas Lloyd, Esq'.

7 BL, Harley MS 2210, fos. 5–22

This, as Dr Hewardine points out, is an antiquarian compilation incorporating material drawn from the reign of Edward IV (see A. R. Myers, *The Household of Edward IV: the Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478* (Manchester, 1959), pp. 198–230) and **4**.

David Starkey

Dr David Starkey is a Visiting Fellow of Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge and President of The Society for Court Studies. He has recently edited the first of three volumes of The Inventory of King Henry VIII *(Harvey Miller Publishers, 1998, ISBN 1-872501-89-3) and is currently preparing the next two volumes for publication. He is also writing a biography of Henry VIII and preparing a television series on Elizabeth I for Channel Four.*

KINGSHIP AND THE ROYAL ITINERARY

A STUDY OF THE PERIPATETIC HOUSEHOLD OF THE EARLY TUDOR KINGS 1485–1547

by Fiona Kisby

THE PERIPATETIC NATURE of kingship has long been known to historians of the English court. Indeed, a number of royal itineraries have been in print since the nineteenth century and several more exist in manuscript form.[1] It was not until relatively recently, however, that the characteristics and implications of the movements of the royal household were investigated.[2] Social and architectural historians have now examined the 'domestic itinerary' and established that frequent 'removings' were necessary to avoid the development of insanitary conditions in the royal houses. Scholars studying Renaissance spectacle and pageantry have shed light on the role of the 'progress itinerary', whereby representational displays of royal power were enacted during solemn entries into towns in distant parts of monarchs' realms.[3] However, one particular form, the 'festival itinerary' (the pattern of movement of the court based on seasonal variations, legal terms and the liturgical calendar), still remains largely neglected.[4] Yet this determined when and where 'the ritual year'—the annual round of sacred and secular ceremonies at the early-modern court largely performed by the personnel of the chapel royal—was celebrated.[5] The festive itinerary thus lay at the heart of kingship in this period, as it underpinned those ceremonial occasions which re-articulated symbolic relationships between ruler and ruled.[6]

It is the purpose of this article to draw attention to the fundamental role that the festival itinerary played in pre-modern England through a case-study of the

---

[1] G. Stretton, 'The Travelling Household in the Later Middle Ages', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 40 (1935), 75–107; W. Farrer, 'An Outline Itinerary of Henry I', *English Historical Review* 34 (1919), 303–82, 505–79; C. H. Hartshorne, 'Itinerary of Edward II, 1307–1327', *Collectanea Archaeologica* 1 (1861), 113–44; 'Itinerary of Henry VI' in B. Wolffe, *Henry VI* (London, 1981), pp. 361–71; R. Edwards, *The Itinerary of Richard III 1483–85* (1983); E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1903) IV, 75–116; W. R. B. Robinson, 'Princess Mary's Itinerary in the Marches of Wales, 1525–1527', *Historical Research* 71 (1998), 233–51. Unpublished itineraries: Henry VIII [London, Public Record Office (PRO), OBS 1/1419]; Henry VII [itinerary privately compiled by Margaret Condon, which is a more detailed and accurate version of that provided in G. Temperley, *Henry VII* (Cambridge, 1914), pp. 411–19. I am grateful to Ms Condon for allowing me to consult her work].

[2] M. Vale, 'The Evolution of the Princely Court in North West Europe 1270–1384', *The Court Historian*, 1, 3 (1996), 11–15 (p. 14).

[3] For example, see J. C. Meagher, 'The First Progress of Henry VII', *Renaissance Drama* n. s. 1 (1968), 45–73.

[4] The term is first used in E. H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae: a Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley, 1946), p. 97.

[5] For the organization, personnel and liturgy of the chapel see D. Baldwin, *The Chapel Royal: Ancient and Modern* (1990); F. Kisby, 'The Royal Household Chapel in Early-Tudor London, 1485–1547' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of London, 1996); 'Officers and Office-holding at the Early-Tudor Court: a Study of the Chapel Royal, 1485–1547', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* (forthcoming). Plans of the Tudor chapels can be found in S. Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England* (New Haven and London, 1993); the best introduction to the role of the chapel in secular ceremonial is W. Streitberger, *Court Revels, 1485–1559* (1994).

[6] F. Kisby, 'When the King Goeth a Procession: Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year and Religious Reforms at the Early-Tudor Court, 1485–1547' (forthcoming).