Citation: McGoldrick, Lynne (1985) The literary manuscripts and literary patronage of the Beauchamp and Neville families in the Late Middle Ages, 1390-1500. Doctoral thesis, Newcastle Polytechnic.

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/15718/

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html

Some theses deposited to NRL up to and including 2006 were digitised by the British Library and made available online through the EThOS e-thesis online service. These records were added to NRL to maintain a central record of the University's research theses, as well as still appearing through the British Library's service. For more information about Northumbria University research theses, please visit University Library Online.
THE LITERARY MANUSCRIPTS AND LITERARY PATRONAGE OF THE BEAUCHAMP AND NEVILLE FAMILIES IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES,
c. 1390 - 1500

Lynne McGoldrick, M.A.

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
Council for National Academic Awards,
Newcastle Polytechnic
Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York

February 1985
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors, Professor Derek Pearsall and Dr. P.R. Coss, for their guidance and support during all stages of my research.

For assistance of various kinds, I am particularly grateful to Dr. A.I. Doyle, Elizabeth Urquhart, Miss R. Phizackerley, and J.D. Gilliver.
DECLARATION

While registered as a candidate for the degree of Ph.D. of the CNAA I have not been registered for any other award of the CNAA or a University.

Advanced studies undertaken in connection with this research included research seminars at the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York, the Department of English, University of Newcastle, and the School of English and History, Newcastle Polytechnic, and attendance at two Medieval Manuscript Conferences at York and the Northern Universities Medieval Conference at Lancaster.
CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

ABSTRACT 1

CHAPTER ONE Literature, Patronage and the Aristocracy 1

CHAPTER TWO The Beauchamp and the Neville Families 27

CHAPTER THREE The Beauchamp Manuscripts 70

CHAPTER FOUR The Neville Manuscripts 110

CHAPTER FIVE Literature, the Household and Family History 155

CHAPTER SIX Public Patronage: Lydgate, Hoccleve and Caxton 213

CONCLUSION 265

APPENDIX 1 Family Trees

APPENDIX 2 Miscellaneous References

APPENDIX 3 Manuscripts of Doubtful Ownership

BIBLIOGRAPHY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIHR</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.L.</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib. Nat.</td>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodl.</td>
<td>Bodleian (Library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNB</td>
<td>Dictionary of National Biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EETS</td>
<td>Early English Text Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR</td>
<td>English Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWCI</td>
<td>Journal of the Warburg and Cortauld Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLN</td>
<td>Modern Language Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR</td>
<td>Modern Language Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMLA</td>
<td>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Testamenta Eboracensia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRHS</td>
<td>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCH</td>
<td>Victoria County History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

L. McGoldrick, The Literary Manuscripts and Literary Patronage of the Beauchamp and Neville Families in the Late Middle Ages, c. 1390 - 1500

This thesis is an examination of the literary manuscripts and literary patronage of the Beauchamp and Neville families from the late fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century. The evidence for such a study is scattered among a number of primary and secondary sources including manuscripts, inventories, wills, editions of texts, and studies devoted to the art, history and literature of the medieval period in general.

The first chapter discusses the background to the study, including the education of the nobility in the later middle ages, their literary and cultural interests as shown by the evidence of extant manuscripts and books in wills, and noting critical work in this area. The second chapter outlines the historical and genealogical backgrounds of the two families, highlighting individual members of each family who figure in later chapters as patrons and owners of manuscripts, and giving a brief summary of the manuscripts and patronage of each family.

The third and fourth chapters deal respectively with the extant Beauchamp and the extant Neville manuscripts, paying particular attention to contents, provenance, language, and the circumstances in which a manuscript was commissioned or acquired.

The fifth and sixth chapters deal with different aspects of literary patronage. Chapter five concentrates on the Beauchamp family and their 'household' patronage, which focuses upon a number of cases where social and literary patronage coincide and household and commercial expertise are combined. An interest is noted here in family ancestry and history, particularly during times of political uncertainty. Chapter six is a discussion of the more 'public' patronage of members of the two families drawn from the examples of Hoccleve, Lydgate and Caxton, which suggest the continuing importance to many authors of signs of aristocratic approval or support, as well as a certain conventionality of aristocratic taste.
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE, PATRONAGE AND THE ARISTOCRACY

This thesis is a study of the literary manuscripts and literary patronage of the Beauchamp and Neville families from the late fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century. The evidence for such a study is incomplete and unevenly spread over the period, however it is still possible to fill in at least part of the picture and to draw from this some idea of the relationship between members of these two aristocratic families and the literature of the period.

There has been a considerable amount of attention directed towards the aristocracy in the later middle ages which has led to increased understanding of their role in national and local politics, political patronage, office-holding and social advancement, and although it is more difficult to document their literary interests, there is more material available for such a study, at least for prominent families, than has perhaps been appreciated.

However, before discussing the Beauchamp and Neville families, it is necessary to examine some of the work already done in the area of late medieval and in particular aristocratic literary culture.

It is difficult to proceed very far in studying the literary interests of aristocratic families without encountering a long-standing debate between literary historians regarding the social and cultural role of the nobility in the later middle ages. Briefly, it is generally acknowledged that from some time towards the end of the fourteenth century onwards, an important shift in the established and traditional patterns of literary culture was taking place. Increased literacy, availability of manuscripts, the growth and status of vernacular literature and an increase in the audience for literature, are variously seen as contributing towards or reflecting this change. Attempts to identify the sources of this transition and the forces shaping it have produced
differing interpretations, some of which are based not so much on the available evidence as on a need to slot the period into place between Chaucer and the Renaissance, and to account for the quality of its literature. Many of the interpretations are characterised by the division of the audience for late medieval literature into separate, identifiable groups, in particular, aristocratic (or courtly) and middle-class (or bourgeois), and some accounts have been couched in terminology more appropriate to sociological or political history than to literary history.

Jusserand voiced what became for a time a widely-held opinion when he talked of the death of Chaucer bringing an era to an end, signifying the beginning of an age of decline, decadence and a kind of cultural hibernation. The whole dismal process was however tempered by the rise of the middle class:

Le monde féodal finit; sa littérature s'éteint: mais dans le même temps, un double renouveau se prépare. Le plus difficile à observer, mais non le moins important prit naissance dans les couches moyennes et basses de la société. Pendant que les grandes familles s'entretuent, les petites prosperent ... ¹

By comparison Eleanor Hammond, while agreeing with the general diagnosis of an age of declining literary quality, did not yet envisage the emerging middle class audience as the saving grace of the age. For although the traditional aristocratic culture was stale, 'conservative and stereotyped', ² the new public 'was as uneducated morally and ethically as it was mentally. It brought to secular literature no high purpose, no faith in man, no sincerity'. ³ As a result, change was slow and the aristocracy remained dominant in cultural life long after they had ceased to be innovatory:

... in the absence of any fresh impulse, the earlier formulae continued to endure. Long after the introduction of printing, the expression of the people is still scarcely heard; the upper class code, with its didactics, its allegories, its translations, its verbal stereotypes, persists. However broken the aristocratic public politically, their taste regulates literary production. ⁴
Others have seen the fifteenth century as a century of swifter and more positive change. Schirmer noted that after the reign of Richard II, 'The burghers now also emerged as patrons of literature and a radical transformation of the reading public was set in motion', implying that the impetus for cultural change came from them. Yet there is uneasiness over the traditional tastes of this public and a reluctance to sacrifice the notion of a radical transformation and to acknowledge emulation of aristocratic tastes:

It may be supposed that the literary works suited to a world of knights and nobles were retained by the new bourgeoisie not only from a feeling for tradition, but also because they actually read them and held them in high esteem: the dream world made the harsh reality more tolerable.

H.S. Bennett, unlike Hammond, was more optimistic in his assessment of the period which he saw as 'an age interested in literature'. He was particularly interested in the growth of the new reading public and the ways in which they began to influence the writing and production of literature. It was for this group that cheaper manuscripts and miscellanies were compiled in increasing numbers and for them that practical, instructive, informative and educational literature was produced. However, he regarded the traditional aristocratic audience as a continuing and important part of the total picture, 'throughout the fifteenth century and beyond the court and the aristocracy continued to act as patrons of literature'. The overall contribution of the fifteenth century was its 'inclusiveness, enterprise, and literary good sense', which included the preservation of works from previous centuries.

The best-documented and most balanced account of the cultural background is that given by M.B. Parkes. He argued for an aristocracy with long-lasting influence:

The literate recreations of the cultured nobility had a profound effect upon the development of a literary public. They set a secular example of literate culture that other laymen sought to emulate.
Consequently, as literacy and availability of manuscripts increased, the growing audience of new readers moved towards emulating aristocratic taste rather than immediately developing its own independent traditions. The increase in the number of translations from French and Latin into English, as well as new works composed in the vernacular demonstrate this:

The majority of these translations not only reflect the pragmatic taste of the middle-class reader... but indicate that this growing class was extending its interests and becoming more cultivated.\textsuperscript{11}

While the tastes of the groups did not coincide absolutely, they shared the same desires to express their interests:

In collecting books, the gentry and the bourgeoisie followed the example of the magnates, but obviously on a much more modest scale.\textsuperscript{12}

The aristocracy too continued to develop their literary traditions through their interest in continental culture, as demonstrated by their purchase of manuscripts and books abroad, 'like the bourgeoisie, the court was extending its interests'.\textsuperscript{13}

This theme is taken up and amplified in R.F. Green's recent study of literature and the English court in the later middle ages. Green sought to direct attention towards the courtly and aristocratic connections of much of late medieval literature, and in so doing, to redress an imbalance as he saw it, in interpretations of the period. Referring to the influence of collections such as the Paston letters, he wrote:

The lack of more direct evidence about the social and cultural life of the court can easily lead us to rely too heavily upon these collections of domestic correspondence, tempting us to draw from them the mistaken conclusion that the dominant force in the literature of late medieval England was of bourgeois rather than courtly inspiration. This is in fact the view taken by such weighty authorities as Eleanor Hammond, H.S. Bennett, and Walter Schirmer.\textsuperscript{14}

However, with the possible exception of Schirmer, these 'weighty authorities' were not at all so certain or dogmatic in their interpretations as Green implied. The statement on the first page of his book
that, 'much of the literature of late medieval England was associated with the royal court is indisputable' needs qualifying and the nature of the association needs to be examined. He does however include a wealth of valuable material for a study of the literary culture of the period and of the nobility in particular, and provides the most recent assessment of the period and of the issues it raises.

Surprisingly, in view of the interest in the literature of the late middle ages and the debate previously mentioned, there has been little attention directed towards a systematic examination of the evidence for aristocratic culture in its own right. Such information often appears in the context of other studies, such as editions, or studies of the ownership or variants of a particular text, or in studies of manuscript production, illustration and distribution, as well as in general surveys of the period and in studies of prominent individuals who are not necessarily representative of the aristocracy. There is adequate material available to piece together a general picture of aristocratic culture in the late middle ages and it is worth spending some time discussing what is known about the aristocracy and their literary (and related) interests before concentrating on the Beauchamp and Neville families.

K.B. McFarlane began his essay on the education of the nobility by pointing to the fundamental need for some sort of education and literacy, if members of the nobility were to carry out their 'business' which was, 'to administer and improve the resources they had inherited or acquired; and to assist the king - with profit to themselves - in the negotia regni'. Further studies have increased our knowledge of the details of aristocratic education and of the forces which shaped it:

The church..., by preaching a code of belief, worship and behaviour, stimulated the teaching of children in prayer and confession, deportment in church, and Christian ethics. Law and custom, which required the
male aristocracy to govern and defend the realm, necessitated boys being taught to read, in order to understand administrative and legal documents, and to be trained in military techniques. Aristocratic wealth and possessions indicated the preparation of boys and girls for adult life of a certain style. Future knights and ladies needed to learn how to behave to one another and how to follow the occupations of civilised life: music, embroidery, dancing, and exercises such as archery and hunting.

Of the three areas of aristocratic education, the physical, artistic, and intellectual, it is the last which is most immediately relevant to a consideration of their literary interests. The basis of intellectual studies was the acquisition of language, which is generally accepted as meaning both English and French, even in the fifteenth century. Formal instruction in reading and writing was based on Latin, children beginning by learning the alphabet in Latin and graduating to the study of liturgical texts such as the psalter. Orme thought it likely that everyone reached this minimal level, concluding that, 'Literacy, and the elementary knowledge of Latin it involved, were probably universal among the later medieval English aristocracy of both sexes'. That the study of Latin was undertaken in earnest early in childhood, is shown by the often-quoted evidence of the books bought for the children of Henry Bolingbroke before he became Henry IV. Seven books of Latin grammar in one volume were bought for his heir Henry, aged 8, in 1395; two books 'de ABC', were bought for the instruction of Blanche and Philippa in 1397, when they were aged under 5 and 3 respectively; and in 1398, an elementary Latin grammar was bought for John aged 7. It seems likely that after this basic level was reached, the intellectual studies of boys and girls diverged, with the boys going on to study Latin grammar, though apart from those destined for clerical office and a few exceptional cases, it is probable that their use of Latin was limited to service books and to reading legal and other documents.

Education began in the household under the supervision of mothers and household women until the age of about 7, when boys began to receive
their education from men. In the royal household this meant separate
tutors for knightly studies and the study of letters, and it is possible
that the same division occurred in the wealthier aristocratic households,
probably with the assistance of household chaplains. (Apart from
having the capacity to provide the basics of education, the aristocratic
household also contained a number of literate and educated officials
involved in its daily running and in the administration of the estates:
the stewards, chamberlains, clerks and lawyers, as well as the retainers
who made up the baronial council.)

Subsequent education was usually undertaken elsewhere in the case
of boys at least. This could mean the King's household or other
aristocratic or ecclesiastical households. In the fifteenth century, for
a few, it might mean schools or universities, normally reserved for those
proposing to enter holy orders, but these were the exceptions rather than
the rule. In the second half of the fifteenth century in particular, the
Inns of Court, which could provide a general 'practical' education for
members of the nobility and gentry, were more popular.

Turning to the more cultivated expressions of literacy, we know
something about the kinds of books members of the nobility bought and
owned from references to books in wills and from extant manuscripts. A
general pattern which emerges from these sources is of the preponderance
of books in French throughout the fourteenth century, reflecting the
dominance of French as a literary language for the aristocracy at the
time. French books continue to appear in wills, and manuscripts in French
continue to find their way into aristocratic book collections in the
fifteenth century (with something of a revival of interest around the
middle of the fifteenth century), though English books appear with
increasing frequency. (The appearance of English books is the better
documented by extant manuscripts as the language of a book is frequently
omitted in wills.)
The wills of Margaret Countess of Devonshire and Eleanor Duchess

of Gloucester, both from the end of the fourteenth century, give some
idea of the currency of books in French among the aristocracy. In 1395,
Margaret bequeathed the following:

a ma fille Luttrell... mon livre appelle Tristram
a ma fille Dangayne... mes deux primers et un livre
appelle Artur de Britaigne.
Anneys Chambernon... un livre de medycynys et de
marchasye et un aultre livre appelle vyces et vertues
et un livre appelle merlyn.

Eleanor, in her will dated 1399, left a psalter, a fine family
heirloom, to her son Humphrey, as well as:

... un Cronike de Fraunce en Frauncois, ove deux
classpes d'argent, enamayles ove les armes de duc de
Burgoign. Item l livre de Giles 'de regimine principum'.
Item un livre de vices & vertues, et un autre rimeie del
'historie de chivaler a cigne' tous en Francois.

To her daughter Anne she bequeathed:

Un livre beal et bien enluminee de legenda aurea,
en Frauncois.

To her daughter Johanne:

un livre ove le psautier, primer, et autres
devocions, ove deux claspes d'or, enmailliez ove mes
armes, gele libre jay plus usee, ove ma benoison.

To her daughter Isabella:

... un bible en Frauncois en deux volumes, ove
deux claspes d'or enmailliez ove les armes de
Fraunce. Item un livre de decretals en Francois.
Item un livre de meister histoires. Item un
livre 'de vitis patrum', & les pastorelx Seint
Gregoire. Item psautier veil tange la nocturn de
'Exultate' glosez, auter livre novel du psautier
gloses de la primer, 'Domine exaudi' tange a 'omnis
spiritus laudet dominum', & souent les dites livres
de Francois.

Among a number of wills demonstrating the existence of both French
and English books is that of Anne Stafford Duchess of Buckingham which
mentions (in 1480) a Legenda Sanctorum in English among a number of books
in French. The inventory (1513) of John de Vere 13th Earl of Oxford,
lists a chest full of books 'of frenshe and englisshe' valued at £3-6s-8d.
Of course many wills do not mention any books, or mention only a valuable heirloom, such as the psalter bequeathed by Eleanor Duchess of Gloucester to her son Humphrey mentioned above, or list only service books, as in the will of Lady Fitzhugh (1427):

... and my son Rob't a sauter couered in Rede and my doghter Darcy a sauter cou'ed in blew & my doghter Malde Eure a prim' cou'ed in blew... Elyzabeth fitzHugh my goddoghter a book cou'ed in grene with praierers y' inne.

Service books form the largest single category of book bequests and a collection of such volumes for personal use and for family chapels can be assumed for every aristocratic household. It is also clear from wills that it was common practice to bequeath books to relatives and friends (and on occasions servants and retainers), as well as to lend books (there are a number of references to books already in the possession of the legatee). References to new books show that collections were being added to or books were being replaced, and bequests of books (or money to buy them) to religious foundations indicate a sense of the spiritual and educational importance of books.

Inventories which include books such as that of Thomas Duke of Gloucester (husband of Eleanor mentioned above) give some indication of the quality and estimated value of books owned and reveal a wider range of interests than is usually to be gleaned from wills. Among more than eighty books at Plessey in 1397, were theological and devotional works, romances, law books, chronicles, two English Gospels and one English Bible, as well as some 40 service books belonging to the Chapel. Allowing for wide variations in quantity and quality, these categories are probably representative of the range of reading material likely to be found in aristocratic collections.

Only a few individuals can be considered bibliophiles in the fifteenth century in England. John Duke of Bedford (the recipient of the Latin grammar in 1398), purchased the library of Charles V of France in 1425, though it does not seem to have remained intact for long in
English princely hands, and commissioned many finely illuminated manuscripts in London and Paris.\(^{36}\) His brother Humphrey Duke of Gloucester (d.1447), also owned a number of English, French and Italian manuscripts, and his interest in Italian humanism played an important and influential part in the introduction and development of humanism in England.\(^{37}\) He employed Italian scholars in his household\(^{38}\) and he was active in increasing his library, commissioning new translations of classical texts from Italy, and instructing scholars there to acquire books for his collection.\(^{39}\) His library, admired by his contemporaries, contained a range of classical, humanist and medieval learning and has been referred to as the most important in England at the time.\(^{40}\) That he was recognised as a collector by his contemporaries is revealed by the number of books given to him by his associates, including John Duke of Bedford, Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick, Lord Carew, Sir John Stanley and Sir Robert Roos.\(^{41}\) The Duke of Gloucester gave part of his collection to Oxford University during his lifetime\(^{42}\) and bequeathed all his Latin books to the University, though it is unlikely that they ever reached their destination.\(^{43}\)

Later in the fifteenth century, John Tiptoft Earl of Worcester (executed 1470) also obtained the major part of his book collection from Italy.\(^{44}\) During his journeys in Italy he visited Padua, Ferrara, Rome and Florence and was in touch with Italian humanists and English scholars studying there. He also spent some time in study himself and acted as a patron to humanist scholars.\(^{45}\) He obtained manuscripts while he was in Italy and continued to have manuscripts sent to him when he returned to England, including two printed bibles from Germany.\(^{46}\) He was accused by an Italian commentator of spoiling Italian libraries to build his collection,\(^{47}\) and his library, like that of the Duke of Gloucester before him, is thought to have been the most important of its time in England.\(^{48}\) His manuscripts included a number of classical and humanist texts, as well
as some works of medieval authors,\textsuperscript{49} and he bequeathed a number of books to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, but again it is likely that few, if any, reached these institutions.\textsuperscript{50}

In their book collections, literary patronage and patronage of scholars, John Tiptoft and Humphrey Duke of Gloucester bear comparison with the traditions of patronage and book-collecting established by members of the royal and ducal courts of France and Burgundy, traditions sadly lacking in English aristocratic culture of the same period. Of course, such a comparison can only be limited, but by the middle of the fifteenth century, and following continental influences, one or two members of the higher aristocracy seem to be concerned with establishing reputations as patrons for themselves, based on the model of their continental counterparts. Prior to this there was nothing in England which could realistically compare with the example set by the Continent. There is not the wealth of evidence in the form of library lists and inventories which exists for the French and Burgundian royal and ducal households,\textsuperscript{51} but neither is there evidence, until the individuals mentioned above, of the serious intention to form comprehensive libraries or to establish a name as a scholar or patron in the sense of the French and Burgundian patrons. Royal and aristocratic collections in England seem to have been collections dictated by personal taste and fashion rather than serious libraries, and in English royal circles there was nothing comparable to the traditions of book collecting and patronage of the Burgundian court (derived from the French court), where collections were inherited and added to. Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, and Richard III are all known to have owned books but the first significant royal collection of books was that of Edward IV. There was no royal library until the reign of Henry VII, who created the office of Stationer in December 1485 and employed the first royal librarian in 1492,\textsuperscript{52} and
we have to wait until 1535 for the first inventory of the royal collection. It is significant that the notable English royal and aristocratic collectors and patrons consciously emulated their continental peers: John Duke of Bedford acquired the library of Charles V of France; Edward IV purchased manuscripts along the lines of the collections of Louis de Gruthuyse; Henry VII followed Burgundian fashions; Tiptoft and Duke Humphrey were both influenced by Italian example.

More representative of aristocratic cultural contact with the Continent than either the Duke of Gloucester or Earl of Worcester, are the individuals who bought a few manuscripts abroad, or commissioned manuscripts at home which were illuminated by foreign artists, or which showed the influence of continental styles. The origins of such influences are not hard to find. The presence in English court circles of foreign-born Queens (Katherine of Valois, Margaret of Anjou, and earlier Anne of Bohemia), and of noble prisoners such as Jean d'Angoulême and Charles d' Orleans, must have strengthened interest in continental culture, especially in the case of Jean and Charles, who showed an active interest in acquiring books during their captivity in England. A number of manuscripts, mainly from Paris and Rouen, can also be linked with the presence of the English in France during the French wars and the period of the dual monarchy.

Later in the fifteenth century, such manuscripts were more likely to come from the Low Countries. There had been strong economic and, with some lapses, political ties between England and Burgundy from the early decades of the fifteenth century, and these ties were strengthened by the marriage of Charles the Bold to Margaret of York in 1468. Edward IV's exile in Burgundy in 1470 and 1471 brought him and his fellow exiles into direct contact with the libraries of his hosts Charles the Bold and Louis de Gruthuyse, and Edward and his associates are known to have acquired a number of Flemish manuscripts which influenced

Apart from owning and bequeathing books, a number of members of the aristocracy were actively involved in the production of literature through patronage and in a few cases, authorship. There is a considerable amount of evidence from the end of the fourteenth century onwards of members of the aristocracy acting as patrons of works in English, as well as of a number of hopeful dedications to potential aristocratic patrons. This interest in vernacular writing is usually noted as a feature of the fifteenth century, but it can also be interpreted as an extension of a tradition which had its origins in the fourteenth century. William of Palerne was written in the middle of the fourteenth century (c.1350) at the request of Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford, 'for hem pat knowe no frensche', and a number of translations were commissioned from John Trevisa (the Berkeley chaplain) later in the fourteenth century by Thomas Lord Berkeley, the difference being that the Trevisa translations were thought of as appropriate for an aristocratic audience.

Among some of the better known authors of fifteenth century English texts who were commissioned by or sought the patronage of members of the aristocracy were, Hoccleve, Lydgate, Bokenham, and the printer Caxton. Of Lydgate's longer works, the Pilgrimage of the Life of Man was commissioned by the Earl of Salisbury in 1426, the Fall of Princes by Humphrey Duke of Gloucester in 1431 (though he needed a few reminders to continue his support), and the Troy Book by Henry Prince of Wales (later Henry V), in 1412, finished in 1420. A number of shorter and occasional pieces can be linked with aristocratic patrons, including some religious writing for aristocratic ladies (the Virtues of the Mass for Alice Countess of Suffolk, the Invocation to St. Anne for Anne Countess of Stafford, and the Legend of St. Margaret for Anne Countess of March). 

Manuscripts of Lydgate's works are found with great frequency in aristocratic book collections. There are some twenty three manuscripts
of Troy listed in the Supplement to the Index of Middle English Verse,\textsuperscript{65} most of them 'quality' productions, a few containing presentation pictures.\textsuperscript{66} There are some 36 manuscripts or independent fragments of the Fall,\textsuperscript{67} again including a number of 'quality' productions.\textsuperscript{68} Though quality is by no means synonymous with aristocratic ownership and Lydgate's writings reached a wide audience, a number of these and other manuscripts of Lydgate's works can be found in aristocratic hands throughout the fifteenth century: B.L. MS Royal 18 D v (Fall of Princes), belonged to the Percies;\textsuperscript{69} B.L. MS Arundel 119 (Thebes), belonged to the Duke of Suffolk;\textsuperscript{70} B.L. MS Harley 3862 (Life of the Virgin), belonged to John de Vere, Earl of Oxford;\textsuperscript{71} B.L. MS Royal 18 D ii (Thebes & Troy Book), belonged to the Herbert and Percy families;\textsuperscript{72} and B.L. MS Harley 2278 (Edmund and Fremund), Henry VI's dedication copy, was later in the hands of the Audelay family.\textsuperscript{73} The possession of such manuscripts, and aristocratic patronage of Lydgate are clearly indicative of an interest in works in English, though the royal and courtly origins of some of the works may have been an influential factor on their popularity.

Osbern Bokenham's patrons were not exclusively aristocratic either, but they did include Elizabeth de Vere Countess of Oxford who commissioned the Life of St. Elizabeth and Isabel Bourchier Countess of Eu, who commissioned the Life of Mary Magdalen.\textsuperscript{74} Hoccleve was not so successful in his search for aristocratic patrons. He addressed his Regement of Princes to Henry V when he was Prince of Wales,\textsuperscript{75} and B.L. MS Arundel 38 is the putative presentation copy.\textsuperscript{76} However the status of his other aristocratic patrons is insecure. La Male Regle was addressed to Thomas Lord Furnival, with a plea to see that his arrears were paid; the Balade to my gracious Lord of York was addressed to Duke Edward who died in 1415; Humphrey Duke of Gloucester was claimed as his patron in the Dialogus cum amico, and Jereslaus's Wife was said to be a composition owed to the Duke; and a manuscript of his works (Durham, University Library MS Cosin...
V III 9) contains a dedicatory envoy, indicating that Hoccleve intended
to present it to Joan Countess of Westmoreland. Hoccleve clearly saw
the benefits, both financial and literary, to be gained from acquiring
the support of aristocratic patrons.

Caxton too in his prologues and epilogues claimed to have the support
of a number of aristocratic patrons including Earl Rivers, the Earl of
Arundel, Lady Margaret Beaufort and Queen Elizabeth Woodville. He also
dedicated works to members of the court and royal family, suggestively
worded to imply he was writing by royal appointment. While a number of
the claims of aristocratic patronage are dubious, they indicate the
continuing importance of acquiring and being seen to acquire a patron of
some status, and of appearing to have the support and sanction of influen-
tial members of the nobility, even when the works he printed were intended
for a much wider audience.

Of course, none of these men sought or received exclusively aristo-
cratic patronage, nor was their output directed solely towards an
aristocratic audience. A vast amount of literature in English came into
existence independently of any aristocratic assistance, and it is worth
remembering that, 'Court and aristocratic patronage... will not fully
account for... the great release into English of a vast store of encyclo-
paedic, didactic, and moralistic material hitherto more at home in Latin
and French'. However, to say that court and aristocratic patronage
'may even be of only subordinate importance', is perhaps to be too
dismissive, both of the active patronage of members of the aristocracy,
and of the benefits many authors clearly felt were to be gained from
evidence, however tenuous, of their support.

The number of aristocratic authors in the later middle ages can
hardly be described as legion. John Montagu Earl of Salisbury (d.1400),
was praised for his poetry (presumably in French) by Christine de Pisan,
though unfortunately his poems have not survived. Edward Duke of York
(d.1415) translated The Master of Game from Gaston Fibus's Livre de la Chasse; Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick is credited with a balade addressed to his second wife Isabella Despenser; Richard Duke of York is thought to be the author of the poem 'Excellent Soueraine'; and Sir Richard Roos translated Chartier's La Belle Dame Sans Merci, though attempts to prove his authorship of other fifteenth century poetry are unconvincing. Anthony Woodville Earl Rivers translated The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers and the Cordial into English, both of which were printed by Caxton, and is said to have written a poem while in captivity at Pontefract Castle, and John Tiptoft translated Cicero's De Amicitia and Buonaccorso de Montemagno's De Nobilitate, and he has some lost letters and orations to his name. Finally in this context, it is also appropriate to include the English poems of Charles d'Orleans which he wrote during his captivity in England.

Returning to the subject of this thesis, it is its purpose to document and to discuss the literary patronage and manuscripts of the Beauchamp and Neville families. Eleanor Hammond in English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey (p.13), acknowledging the later middle ages as a period with a love of book collecting, suggested an obvious and practical basis for such a study:

We have still to decipher and arrange the evidence afforded by the coats of arms painted in the books of their owners, which may reconstruct in part for us the collections of the Percies, the Stanleys, the Sinclairs, etc.

Manuscripts are not the only material available and the disparate and scattered nature of the sources for such a study presents an initial problem. For books, it is necessary to look for evidence of ownership both among extant manuscripts and among references in wills and inventories. Fortunately there are a great number of wills printed by record societies which are accessible (as well as a wealth of unpublished wills), and numerous catalogues of major and minor manuscript collections.
in the United Kingdom and abroad. The quantity and quality of the information to be gleaned from these sources cannot be predicted in advance, although obviously some sources are more likely to yield information than others, and it is often the case that the number of sources culled is vastly disproportionate to the amount of information gathered.

Valuable information about book ownership, patronage and authorship is often to be obtained from introductions to editions to texts or facsimiles of manuscripts, and from studies dealing with the provenance and ownership of particular groups of manuscripts. Studies devoted to individuals such as those already mentioned on Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, John Tiptoft and Richard Roos provide useful information not only about the interests of those men but also about their associates. More generally, works on literary history, genre, authors, medieval culture, baronial and other families, and manuscript illumination, can provide relevant information.

However, it is the reliability of the evidence which is the most pressing problem. In the case of literary patronage, distinctions need to be made about the nature of the patronage involved, whether it was initiated by the patron or the author, and whether dedications were accurate statements of the relationship between the author and patron or hopeful pleas from the author. With examples of writing by members of the two families, the authenticity of claims for authorship needs to be examined, and for works produced by household servants, officials and retainers, it is important to examine whether or not this was a by-product of aristocratic patronage and influence.

The reliability of evidence is particularly apparent with extant manuscripts. In a broad sense manuscripts are a 'fallacious test' of the survival of particular texts and of medieval libraries and can only be partial witnesses to the kinds and numbers of manuscripts that once existed. More specifically, with individual manuscripts it is important
to examine the evidence for ownership in order to have as secure a base as possible from which to make statements about the literary interests of members of the two families. In some cases the most tentative suggestions for ownership have, with time and tradition, hardened into positive identifications.

The evidence for identifying owners of manuscripts varies enormously. Verbal and visual statements of possession can include inscriptions of ownership, 'ex dono' inscriptions, signatures and mottoes in places where an owner might leave his mark, birth and obit notices, coats of arms (and badges, crests and seals), and presentation pictures. Less precise evidence can include randomly placed mottoes, initials and names, solitary Christian names and barely legible marginalia. It is important to look at each case for ownership on its merits and to remember that once ownership is established, it cannot necessarily be equated with an overwhelming interest in the contents (as opposed to the appearance) of a book.

The problem of reliability does not usually apply to the evidence provided by wills and inventories, but this type of evidence has its own limitations, some of which have already been touched upon. Inventories which contain lists of books are extremely helpful as they often give details of the physical appearance and estimated value of a book, giving a sense of the range and quality of books owned. However, many of the inventories which survive were compiled as the result of forfeitures and are often incomplete, giving only a partial impression of individual book collections.90

In a similar way the quality of information obtained from wills is variable too. On occasions it can be reasonably detailed, though more often about the appearance of a book rather than its contents. The description of the family psalter already mentioned given by Eleanor Duchess of Gloucester to her son (see note 32) gives a picture of a valued and valuable psalter, though the details mostly concern the binding:
Item un psauter bien et richement enlumines ove les claspes d'or enamailes, ove cignes blank & des arms de mon seignour & pierre enamailes sur les claspes, & autres barres d'or sur les tissues en maner des molets, quel psautier me fuist leses de remeindre a mes heirs & ainsi de heir en heir avauntdit.

Unfortunately, more typical is the barest mention of a book, with reference only to the title or less. The will of Sir Thomas Roos of Ingmanthorp (1399) is representative of the kind of will which contains interesting references to books, of which few details are given apart from the titles:

Item lego domino Willielmo de Helagh unum librum vocatum Maundevyl, et librum Stimuli Conscienciae. Item lego dominae Elizabethae Redeman meam Legendam Sanctorum. Item lego Willielmo Pynkestone... Primarium meum nigrum cum orationibus...

At the very least then, such evidence is confirmation that books were owned by testators. However, there are things to bear in mind when using wills as evidence of literary interests which are obvious but which are not always stated. Wills by themselves are inadequate material from which to judge literary tastes, ownership and quality of manuscripts, and attempts to use wills as a foundation for arguments about the frequency of possession of a particular kind of book, or about the booklessness of testators, which do not take into account the limitations of this kind of evidence, are misleading.

Some wills for example, do not mention books that we know from manuscript evidence to have belonged to the testator. Lady Anne Scrope owned a manuscript of the *Cleansing of Man's Soul* (B.L. MS Harley 4012), but this is not included in her bequests, nor does Richard Beauchamp's Trevisa manuscript (B.L. MS'Additional 24194) appear in his will. Equally, some bequests of books are plainly special gifts to a favourite institution or individual and do not necessarily represent the total of the testator's books, a fact confirmed by the frequent description of single books as my 'big', 'best' or 'second', implying both selection and the
existence of further volumes which do not appear in the will. Some volumes also contain more than one text and unfortunately, not all testators follow the example of John Newton, Treasurer of York Minster, in describing the contents of manuscripts with such care in his will (1414):

Item Boecium de consolatione Philosophiae, cum Expositione ejusdem secundum Nicholaum Trevette, Macrobiurn de Saturnalibus, Floriacens', Sextum Julium, et Vegecium de Re Militari, in uno volumine. (T.E. 1, No.265)

On the purely practical side, some wills were very obviously made in haste when the testator was close to death and had things other than the bequest of books on his mind. Others were made as a legal precaution preceding a journey overseas when the testator was concerned with naming executors rather than with the detailed distribution of his effects.

The will of Robert Playce, rector of Brompton offers an insight into the precarious nature of evidence in wills. It mentions a bible and a breviary as bequests then, at the end of the will after the usual formalities about executors, almost as an afterthought comes, 'Item lego Thomae Kilwardby librum meum de Statutis et omnes alios meos libros de Lege Terrae'. There would have been a very different view of his book collection had this been omitted and one wonders how many other books are missing from wills because they were not singled out for special mention as a particular gift, or because they were not remembered in time even to be an afterthought, or because they are buried in 'remainder of my goods' or 'all my books' clauses, as is the case with the tantalising will (1395) of Lady Alice West of Hampshire:

to her son Thomas: a peyre Matyns bookis
to her daughter-in-law Johane: a masse boke, and alle the bokes that I have of latyn, engligh, and frensch.

However, it should not be denied that the impression gained from reading many wills of members of the aristocracy and gentry of both the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, is that books, apart from precious heirlooms and special volumes, do not seem to have been regarded as gifts
of the highest status. They often follow more valued bequests of rings, jewelled buckles and belts, silver and gold cups and other plate, and bed hangings. Unlike their continental contemporaries, books do not seem to have been counted as significant signs of wealth, status and nobility, and this may have some bearing on allegations of booklessness: it may be that some bookless wills are such because no books were mentioned, rather than no books were owned.\textsuperscript{96}

Unfortunately, there is no well-established or fail-safe method for compiling the kind of evidence required for a study of this kind, and it is necessary to say something about the approach and organisation.

The two families which are the focus of this study were chosen because they were known to be owners of a few manuscripts and patrons of one or two works, there being little point in selecting two families at random from the ranks of the peerage. Two were originally chosen in case one provided inadequate material for a full length study, though when both provided more material than had been anticipated, it was decided to keep them together as a joint study, as the families frequently intermarried and the main-lines conveniently merged in the middle of the fifteenth century.

The initial search for evidence of book ownership and patronage covered the period from the beginning of the fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century, with flexibility at both ends to incorporate relevant material. However the paucity of surviving evidence for the earlier period meant that the focus of the study shifted to c.1390-c.1500, though relevant material from outside this period is noted. The preliminary search for evidence included everyone identified as belonging to the main-line of each family in each generation (as well as some members of cadet branches) under their family names, individual titles, and under the names and titles of marriage partners.
A study of this kind is a hybrid of material and disciplines and the material it incorporates does not fall readily into neat categories. The purpose in grouping together particular material is discussed during the course of the study, but it is useful to say something here about manuscripts and the justification for including some and excluding others.

It is difficult to establish hard and fast rules for giving or denying credence to a particular piece of evidence as owners inevitably differed over the forms in which they expressed their ownership, if they chose to express it at all. With 'ex dono' inscriptions, signatures and statements of ownership, particular attention has been paid to their place in a manuscript, whether they appear in a position generally accepted as implying ownership such as at the beginning or end of a manuscript, or on the first text page. Coats of arms and other armorial insignia have been checked in the standard works of reference on heraldry, and again attention has been paid to their position in the manuscript and to whether or not they form an integral part of the design of the manuscript or have been added later. Mottoes and initials can provide hints about ownership, again depending on their position, though supporting evidence is usually looked for. Caution has been exercised over dedications which appear in the text of manuscripts as they do not necessarily imply that a manuscript reached or even was intended for a named individual.

An organisational problem also arises in deciding who should be considered as a member of the Beauchamp and Neville families. As a general rule, women who marry into either of the two families are considered to be family members. Men who marry Beauchamp and Neville daughters are not considered to be members of the Beauchamp or Neville families unless any manuscripts they own have signs to connect them with the families of their spouses, though their own manuscripts and examples of patronage are of course noted. Exceptions to this are discussed as they occur.

Finally, there are limitations to a study of this kind, some of which
are obvious, some of which only emerge during the course of the study. The two families were not randomly selected, they were chosen because of known associations with literature and manuscripts, and both families were well-placed in the English peerage, especially in the fifteenth century when they were holders of important positions, so the question of how representative they were of the aristocracy as a whole cannot be answered fully until further studies add more detail to the picture of the area. Further, a family is an artificial unit for studying literary interests and ownership of manuscripts. It may provide what proves to be superficial or coincidental cohesion and structure for individuals may have literary interests independently of any family connection and by discussing them in the context of the family, revealing networks of associations might be missed. However some sort of structure has to exist in a study of this kind and the family is as convenient a structure as there is and has the advantage of allowing family traditions to be traced.

Although every attempt is made to be thorough and methodical in the search for evidence for this study, there are bound to be details that have been missed or overlooked, though it is to be hoped that these would not substantionally alter the conclusions. Related to this, although part of the study is based on manuscripts, these are discussed from the point of view of ownership by particular individuals, rather than from a codicological, palaeographical or art-historical viewpoint, though aspects of each inevitably occur from time to time and I have tried to be aware of expert and current opinion in these fields.
Chapter 1: References

3. Ibid., p.7.
4. Ibid., p.15.
8. 'The Author and his Public', Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1947, repr. 1970), p.114, where Bennett points out that the number of works dedicated to aristocratic patrons seems to increase.
9. 'Production', p.171.
11. Ibid., p.565.
12. Ibid., p.567.
13. Ibid.
15. Ibid., p.3.
16. For example J.M. Manly & E. Rickert The Text of the Canterbury Tales, 1 (Chicago & London, 1940); E. Langlois, Les Manuscrits Du Roman de la Rose (Paris, 1910). The editions of the works of Gower, Hoccleve and Lydgate printed by the Early English Text Society contain valuable information about manuscript ownership, and useful information is often to be found in the Society's editions of the works of less well-known authors.
17. See for example works by Scott, Doyle, Parkes, and Alexander in the bibliography.
22. Orme, 'Education', p.79.
23. Ibid. For the use of French for administrative purposes and in correspondence in the fifteenth century, see H. Suggett, 'The Use of French in England in the Later Middle Ages' TRHS, 28 (1946), 61-83. For the growth of standard written English during the same period, see J.H. Fisher, 'Chancery and the Emergence of Standard Written English', Speculum 52 (1977), 870-99.
25. Ibid.
25. McFarlane, Nobility, p.244.
27. Ibid., pp.69-71.
28. Orme, English Schools, p.36.
29. The details in this paragraph are taken from Orme, 'Education', pp.72-78.
30. Some of the manuscripts in French in English collections in the fifteenth century include: B.L., MS Royal 19 A.xix (Christine de Pisan's Livre de la cité des dames) owned by Richard Duke of York (or possibly his son Edward IV); B.L., MS Royal 20 C. v (Boccaccio's De claris mulieribus) owned by the Beaufort family; B.L., MS Royal 19 B. xii (Roman de la Rose) owned by the Earl of Stafford; B.L., MS Royal 19 A. xxii (Jean de Meun) probably owned by Richard Woodville Earl Rivers; Bodleian Library, MS 179 (medical compilation) owned by Sir John Fastolf. Manuscripts in French belonging to the fourteenth century or earlier with signs of fifteenth century ownership include: B.L., MS Royal 14 E. iii (Romance of Saint Graal) owned by Robert Roos and Elizabeth Woodville; B.L., MS Royal 20 B. xiv (religious and moral poems and prose treatise) owned by Walter Hungerford (possibly 1st Baron Hungerford, d.1449); B.L., MS Royal 19 B. xvii (Legenda Aurea) owned by William Fitzalan Earl of Arundel, and the Beaufort family.
31. McFarlane, op.cit., p.236. It is worth bearing in mind that because of the nature of wills, book bequests may represent the tastes of the 'older generation' rather than what was currently fashionable.
34. Will no 52 in Wills and Inventories, 1, ed. J. Raine, Surtees Society, 2 (1835).
40. Ibid., p.61.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., pp.62, 66-67.
43. Ibid., p.67.
Weiss, Humanism, pp.114-5. Tiptoft was one of the few lay members of the nobility to have spent time at Oxford University, ibid., pp.112-13.

Ibid., pp.116, 117 and Weiss, 'Library', p.158.


Weiss, Humanism, p.117.

Ibid., pp.117-8.

Ibid., p.118.

G. Paignon, Catalogue d'une partie des livres composant la bibliothèque des ducs de Bourgogne au XVe siècle, second edition (Dijon, 1841); G. Doutrepont, Inventaire de la Librairie de Phillipe le Bon (Brussels, 1906); L. Delisle, Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V, 2 vols. (Paris, 1907); J. Barrios, Bibliothèque prototypographique, ou les libraires des fils du roi Jean, Charles V, Jean de Berri, Philippe de Bourgogne et les siens (Paris, 1830); G. Dogaer & M. Debae, La Librairie de Philippe le Bon (Brussels, 1967).


On this, see E. Salter, 'The Troilus Frontispiece', Troilus and Criseyde: A Facsimile of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 61, introd. M.B. Parkes & E. Salter (Cambridge, 1978), p.22, footnote; N. Wilkins, 'Music and Poetry at Court: England and France in the Late Middle Ages', English Court Culture, pp.183-204. The foreign-born wives of John Duke of Bedford (Anne of Burgundy and Jacquetta of Luxembourg) should also be noted.

For example: B.L., MS Additional 18850 & Bib. Nat., MS latin 17294 (the Hours and Breviary of John Duke of Bedford); B.L., MS Royal 15 E. vi (romances given to Margaret of Anjou by the Earl of Shrewsbury); Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 12 R. 31 (Hours of Thomas Lord Hoo).

For Edward's Flemish manuscripts, see M. Kekewich, 'Edward IV, William Caxton, and Literary Patronage in Yorkist England', MLR, 66 (1971), 481-87. His chamberlain, William Lord Hastings, owned a number of Flemish manuscripts including: B.L., MS Additional 54782 (Hours); Madrid, Fundacion Lazaro-Galdiano, Inv. nr. 15503 (prayer book); B.L., MS Royal 18 E. i (Froissart's Chroniques). Richard Neville Earl of Warwick and former associate of Edward, obtained the only manuscript he is known to have owned in the Low Countries: Geneva, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS fr. 166 (L'enseignement de vraie noblesse). The cultural links between England and Burgundy during Edward's reign are discussed by C.A.J. Armstrong, 'L'échange culturel entre les cours d'Angleterre de Bourgogne à l'époque de Charles le Téméraire', Cinq-Centième Anniversaire de la Bataille de Nancy (Nancy, 1979), pp.35-49.


For Trevisa, see D.C. Fowler, 'New Light on John of Trevisa', Traditio, 18 (1962), 289-317.


Ibid., p.233. For the reminders, see E.P. Hammond, 'Poet and Patron in the Fall of Princes', Anglia, 38 (1920), 121-36.

D. Pearsall, op.cit., p.125.

Ibid., pp.162, 168.


68. Pearsall, op.cit., p.250.


70. Pearsall, op.cit., p.162.


72. A.I. Doyle, 'English Books In and Out of Court', English Court Culture, p.179.

73. Ibid., p.179, footnote; Pearsall, op.cit., p.27.

74. S. Moore, 'Patrons of Letters in Norfolk and Suffolk, c.1450', PMLA, 28 (1913), 79-105 (pp.86-91).


77. For the texts of the prologues and epilogues, see N.F. Blake, Caxton’s Own Prose (London, 1973). For the patrons, see Blake, Caxton and His World (London, 1969), especially pp.79-100; and 'Investigations into the Prologues and Epilogues by William Caxton', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 49 (1966-7), 17-46.

78. Pearsall, op.cit., p.71.

79. Ibid.

80. Green, op.cit., p.65; McFarlane, Nobility, pp.241-42.

81. McFarlane, ibid., p.242.

82. H.N. MacCracken, 'The Earl of Warwick’s Virelai', PMLA, 22 (1907), 597-607.


91. TE, 1, ed. J. Raine (younger), Surtees Society, 4 (1836), no 183.

92. M. Deanesly, 'Vernacular Books in England in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, MLR, 15 (1920), 349-58, stated that her study of books from wills in print suggested among other things, 'the extreme booklessness of the population as a whole' (p.349), without taking any account of the limitations of wills as evidence.


94. TE, 1, no 9.


The Beauchamp Family

1. Genealogy

McFarlane described the Beauchamps as "a family of great achievement, if not of consistent ability" (Nobility, p.188). Their most remarkable achievement was perhaps their hold on the Warwick earldom from 1268 until 1446, which spanned only six generations and which included the long minority of one heir and a period in exile of another. This unusual stability allowed the steady accumulation of estates and wealth. The Beauchamp estates were originally concentrated in the Midlands (particularly Warwickshire and Worcestershire), and by the death of Earl Richard in 1439, they had increased their holdings in that area and had extended their interests to the Welsh Marches and elsewhere. After the reign of Edward II the Beauchamp Earls maintained the family tradition of military and administrative service to the Crown until the direct male line ended in 1446.

The marriage of William Beauchamp of Elmley to Isabella, sister and heiress of William Mauduit Earl of Warwick (d.1268), brought the Warwick earldom to their son William. William first Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (d.1298), married Maud FitzGeoffrey and was succeeded by his son Guy (d.1315), who became one of the leading baronial opponents of Edward II and earned himself the nickname of the Black Dog of Arden.¹ He was one of the Ordainers and was instrumental in the execution of Piers Gaveston in 1312. Described by chroniclers as "vir sapiens et probus", "homo discretus et bene literatus, per quem totum regnum Anglie sapientia prefulgebat",² he bequeathed a large collection of books to Bordesley Abbey.³ He married first Isabel Clare, then Alice, widow of Thomas Leyburn and heir of the de Toni family, by whom he had his son and heir Thomas, who was only one and a half years old on Guy's death (Nobility, p.189), a dangerous state of affairs for the heir of a major
opponent of Edward II. Although Guy had secured an agreement from Edward II that his executors should farm his lands in the event of a minority, the wardship of both lands and heir was granted in 1317 to Hugh Despenser (the elder), only to be transferred in the following year to Roger Mortimer. This second transfer accounts for the marriage of Thomas to Mortimer's daughter Katherine.

Despite his uncertain start, Earl Thomas (d.1369) had a long and successful career, and according to Dugdale was 'scarce ever out of some notable and high imployment'.\(^4\) He saw active service in France under Edward III and the Black Prince, fighting both at Crecy and Poitiers, was engaged in diplomatic affairs on the continent, and served on the Scottish border. He also served on numerous commissions in Warwickshire and Worcestershire and made an expedition into central Europe, crusading with the Teutonic Knights, where it is said, probably apocryphally, that he captured the son of the King of Lithuania and brought him back to London.\(^5\)

Earl Thomas received a number of grants from Edward III, including one thousand marks per annum for life in 1347 and the lordship of Gower in 1356 (on the eve of the Poitiers expedition), and he held the position of Marshal of England from 1344-1369 \textit{(Nobility, p.194)}. Grants such as these increased the previously 'modest landed wealth' \textit{(ibid., p.199)} of the first Beauchamp Earls, which was further increased by Earl Thomas's policy of buying up land adjacent to or within manors he already owned in Warwickshire, Worcestershire and Buckinghamshire \textit{(ibid., p.195)}, and by the gains of his service in the French wars. After the battle of Poitiers he ransomed the Archbishop of Sens for eight thousand pounds and had a three-quarters share in the Bishop of Le Mans, whose captor Robert Clinton disposed of his own share for one thousand pounds \textit{(ibid., pp.30, 195)}. His career and association with Edward III and the royal family accounts for two items mentioned in the will of Earl Thomas: a
set of gold beads with buckles given to him by the Queen and an 'ouche' called the eagle, given to him by the Prince, presumably the Black Prince (Antiquities, 1, p.396).

Like most of the fourteenth-century Beauchamp Earls, Thomas had a special interest in Warwick and in the collegiate church of St. Mary where he wished to be buried. In his will he left instructions to his executors to rebuild the choir and bequeathed all the vestements of his own chapel to the church. He died of plague in Calais in 1369, a few months after the death of his wife Katherine.

Guy, the heir of Earl Thomas, predeceased his father in 1360, and Guy's two daughters were shortly afterwards found in a nunnery, enabling their father's brother Thomas to inherit the Warwick earldom (Nobility, pp.72-73). The second Earl Thomas continued his father's tradition of military service, though his career seems to have been relatively unexceptionable and modest, at least until the last few years of his life. He was knighted in July 1355 and in November of the same year was granted a pension of one hundred marks for good service. Before succeeding to the earldom he had served in the French wars with his elder brother Guy and took part in an expedition to Prussia in 1367 with two of his brothers. ('Chaucer's Knight', p.54.) His service in France in the 1370s included the unsuccessful campaign to relieve Rochelle in 1372, the campaign of 1373 under John of Gaunt, and the descent on Brittany in 1375. He was also employed by Edward III to treat with the Scots, was appointed Chief Commissioner to enforce the truce with Scotland in January and July 1375, was a Commissioner again in September 1380, and took part in Richard II's Scottish campaign of 1385. He carried the third sword at the coronation of Richard II in 1377 and in December of the same year was appointed Admiral of the Northern fleet. During the Peasants' Revolt of 1381, he was sent with Sir Thomas Percy to protect St. Albans and six years later, he was one
of the Appellant Lords. After what seems to have been a period in retirement, in 1396 Thomas was compelled by a lawsuit to hand over Gower and Swansea castle to the Earl of Nottingham in 1397. This was a prelude to his treatment by Richard II later in 1397 when he was impeached for treason. He was sentenced to death but this was commuted to exile for life on the Isle of Man and to the forfeiture of his goods and estates, his estates passing first into the custody of John Clynton, and then outright to Thomas Holland. This period constituted the greatest threat to the Beauchamp hold on the Warwick earldom but on Henry IV's accession, Earl Thomas had his goods and estates restored to him and became a member of the King's Council in December 1399. He died in 1401.

The second Earl Thomas was responsible for rebuilding part of Warwick Castle including Guy's Tower, which accounted for three hundred and ninety five pounds of the Earl's expenditure in 1393-1394 (Loyal Conspiracy, p.140), though it is possible that the tower was begun by his father (VCH, Warwickshire, VIII, p.456), and he completed the building work begun by his father at St. Mary's where he wished to be buried, (Nobility, p.196). His estimated annual income in 1397 was over two thousand nine hundred pounds of which six hundred and seventy six pounds is estimated to have come from his Warwickshire properties, five hundred and twenty nine pounds from his Worcestershire properties, and one thousand five hundred and eighty pounds from his holdings in other counties of England (Loyal Conspiracy, p.142).

In his will he left specific details concerning his burial service and the hospitality to be extended to the mourners, which included the provision of a supper and a dinner on the following day. He left to Henry IV an image of the Virgin and two silver-gilt cruets, doubtless in gratitude for the restoration of his estates, and like his father provided generously for St. Mary's, Warwick. His bequests to the collegiate church
included: a cross with a silver-gilt pedestal enamelled with a passion scene; a beryl bound in silver and enamelled to contain the Host; the best censer; a chalice; two silver-gilt cruets; a basin and an enamelled piece of silver (Antiquities, 1, p.403).

William, a younger brother of the second Earl Thomas, was destined for clerical office and had studied at Oxford, when the deaths of two of his brothers demanded his transfer to a secular career (Nobility, p.190). He had a successful military and administrative career, serving in France with the Duke of Lancaster, acting as chamberlain of the royal household from December 1378 to December 1380,9 and serving as Captain of Calais in September 1383 (Chaucer Life-Records, p.281; Nobility, p.192). In his capacity as chamberlain, he was one of the witnesses of Cecily Champain's release of action to Geoffrey Chaucer concerning the case of 'raptus' (Chaucer Life-Records, pp.343-47). John Hastings Earl of Pembroke (d.1375), had settled that in the event of his death without heirs of his body, Pembroke was to go to the King and the remainder of his inheritance to William Beauchamp (Chaucer Life-Records, p.280; Nobility, pp.74-76). In 1378 William Beauchamp was granted custody of part of the Pembroke estates during the minority of the heir, and on the latter's death in 1389, took the title of Lord Abergaveny (Chaucer Life-Records, p.281; Nobility, p.75).

William Beauchamp Lord Abergavenny died in 1411, and like his brother the Earl of Warwick left detailed instructions in his will concerning his burial service (Antiquities, II, pp.1030-31). He was to be buried in the church of the Friars Preachers at Hereford next to the tomb of John Hastings Earl of Pembroke, twenty-four men clothed in black, each holding a torch were to accompany the hearse, and ten thousand masses were to be said for his soul as soon as possible after his demise. There have been suspicions that William should be included in the list of so-called Lollard Knights, as he was closely associated both in the
royal household and in estates' matters with many of the men who are thought to belong to this group.  

Earl Thomas (d.1401) was succeeded by his son Richard, who had a long and distinguished career of service to the Crown, and was closely associated with Henry V and the upbringing of the young Henry VI. He saw military service during the Welsh rebellion in the early years of Henry IV's reign, and was with Prince Henry at the siege of Harlech Castle in 1407 (Glamorgan County History, III, p.188). He was retained for life by the Prince of Wales in 1411 for the sum of two hundred and fifty marks per annum (Nobility, p.200), was High Steward at the coronation of Henry V, under whom he served in France, and was appointed Captain of Calais in 1414, his commission being renewed in 1423 for a further two years, though he actually remained in office until 1427.12 In 1414 he represented the King at the Council of Constance, and between 1417 and 1422, he was one of the King's principal lieutenants in Normandy (Glamorgan County History, III, p.188). In 1419, he was granted the county of Aumale in Normandy (Nobility, p.194), and in 1421 was Steward of England at the coronation of Queen Katherine.  

Although he held the Calais Captainscy in the early years of the minority of Henry VI, he spent much of the time in England as a member and regular attender of the Minority Council (Henry VI, p.34). He was appointed Captain of Rouen in 1423 and in 1426 was lieutenant-general in Normandy, Anjou and Maine (Glamorgan County History, III, p.189). He was formally appointed guardian of Henry VI in 1428, a measure of his experience and of his acceptability among an already factious court. For this position he was to receive two hundred and fifty marks per annum and his duties involved teaching the King manners, letters, languages, nurture and courtesy.  

Beauchamp took care to ensure that his position allowed him to correct and chastise the King, safeguarding his position when the minority ended. He took further steps to safeguard his position in
1432 with guidelines covering the King's upbringing, and in 1436
resigned his guardianship, frustrated it is thought, by influences on
the King within the court and royal household, and the ambitions of the
Duke of Gloucester.

During his time as guardian, Richard Beauchamp attended the King
at the coronation at Westminster in 1429 and was with him during the
visit to France of 1430-1432, where Beauchamp was also engaged in mili-
tary duties. Beauchamp received his last public appointment in 1437
when he was made King's Lieutenant in France, a position he accepted
only after negotiations with the Council which allowed him to be assisted
by other named noblemen. He was charged with defending Lancastrian
territory in France and reviewing the state of the English territories,
in particular the Normandy garrisons. He died in Rouen in April 1439.

Commentaries on Beauchamp's life and career, influenced by the
fifteenth century pictorial record of his life known as the Beauchamp
Pageants,15 are often glossed with an image of him as a paragon of courtly
virtue. Whatever the validity of that image, there is no doubt that he
was an experienced and accomplished soldier and an able, distinguished
and loyal servant of the Crown. He was also one of the wealthiest men
in England, partly from his Warwick inheritance, and partly from two
financially beneficial marriages.

His first wife was Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Lord Berkeley
(d.1417), and heiress of her mother's de Lisle inheritance; his second
was Isabella Despenser, heiress of the Despenser estates. McFarlane
estimated that Beauchamp's inheritance from his father brought him an
income of between two and three thousand pounds per annum, after the
death of his mother.16 The de Lisle inheritance of Elizabeth Berkeley
brought some five or six hundred pounds per annum after the death of
her father, which was settled on Richard after Elizabeth's death. He
also obtained a portion of the Berkeley inheritance through Elizabeth,
and attempts by Beauchamp and Elizabeth to secure the whole inheritance were the source of a fierce and long-lasting dispute between Beauchamp (continued by his daughters) and the deceased Lord Berkeley's nephew and heir, James. The inheritance of Isabella Despenser has been estimated at around one thousand two hundred and fifty pounds, so that by 1430, Richard's landed income was likely to have been above four thousand pounds per annum. The death in 1435 of Joan Lady Abergavenny, widow of William Beauchamp previously noted, brought an additional income of four hundred marks per annum. For the income tax valuation of 1436, Warwick's English income was assessed at three thousand one hundred and sixteen pounds, though his actual income, including the Welsh revenues, must have far exceeded this. According to Dugdale, using accounts which have since disappeared, the Earl of Warwick's revenues in England and Wales in 1434-1435, before the addition of the Bergavenny estates, amounted to five thousand five hundred and thirty eight pounds. He was one of the three wealthiest landowners during the reign of Henry VI, preceded only by Richard Duke of York and Humphrey Duke of Buckingham, and at his death in 1439, his landed income was probably in the region of four thousand nine hundred pounds net. His most substantial holdings were in the Midlands and southern England, principally in Warwickshire and Worcestershire, but he also had manors in Staffordshire, Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire, East Anglia, Oxfordshire, Wiltshire, Berkshire, Hampshire and elsewhere. His other main territorial holdings were in the Welsh Marches and included the county and lordship of Glamorgan and the castle, town, manor and lordship of Abergavenny. Although Richard's service to the Crown necessitated his spending much time abroad, he had a well-administered and efficient system of estates-management and a stable affinity in Warwickshire, which enabled him to control much of the county at a local level. He continued the building traditions of his father and grandfather, constructing the south
tower of Warwick Castle and rebuilding the castles of Elmley, Hanslope and Henley (Nobility, p.196; VCH, Warwickshire, VIII, p.457). In his will he left instructions for the construction of an elaborate chapel in St. Mary's, Warwick to house his tomb, and for a chapel and dwelling houses to be built at the chantry of Guy's Cliff, just outside Warwick.22

By his first wife, Elizabeth, Richard Beauchamp had three daughters: Margaret, who married John Talbot later Earl of Shrewsbury; Eleanor, who married as her second husband, Edmund Beaufort Duke of Somerset; and Elizabeth, who married George Neville Lord Latimer. The de Lisle estates of his first wife descended to these three daughters on their father's death. By his second wife, Isabella, he had a daughter Anne, who married Richard Neville heir to the Earl of Salisbury, and a son and heir Henry, who married Cecily Neville, sister of Richard Neville.

Henry Beauchamp was aged fourteen when his father died in 1439.23 He is said to have been a friend and companion of Henry VI, a friendship originating in his father's guardianship of the young King (Henry VI, p.356), and it was presumably a sign of the King's friendship and favour, that the Beauchamp estates were not taken into royal wardship on Richard's death, but were committed to eight trustees who were to act on behalf of the dowager-Countess and the executors of the late Earl.24 In the same way, when Isabella Despenser died in December 1439, all her lands were allowed to remain in the custody of her feoffees until Henry came of age, on the payment of one thousand pounds to the King.

The King's favour was also seen in his treatment of Henry Beauchamp. On April 2nd 1444, Henry was made premier Earl of England, and almost exactly a year later, he was created Duke of Warwick, taking precedence before the Duke of Buckingham and after the Duke of Norfolk, though after a dispute involving Buckingham, Beauchamp was granted precedence only in alternate years. In July 1445, Henry was prominent among the lords in attendance when French envoys came to London to discuss a peace
treaty, and in November he was granted the reversion of the Channel Islands and hundred of Bristol, and the Forest of Dean. What seemed to be the beginning of a successful and profitable career was ended prematurely in June 1446 when Henry died at his birthplace, Hanley Castle.

Henry left a three-year old daughter Anne as his heir. A few days after her father's death, her marriage was granted to William de la Pole, later Duke of Suffolk, who intended the wealthy heiress for his son John, then aged four. A large part of Anne's possessions passed to Suffolk's control, with the exception of the dower due to Henry's widow and to Eleanor Duchess of Northumberland. The residue of Beauchamp's estates, excluding those still held by the feoffees of the late Earl Richard and his Countess, were farmed to Suffolk in 1447, for three hundred and thirty eight pounds per annum.

On the death of the child Anne in 1449, the Warwick inheritance passed to Henry's sister Anne, and her husband Richard Neville became Earl of Warwick in her right, though the late Earl Richard had envisaged all four daughters as heirs in the event of the failure of Henry's line. This Anne was co-heir of her mother's Despenser estates with the thirteen year old George Neville, Isabella Despenser's grandson from her first marriage. By some uncertain means, the whole of the Despenser inheritance was secured by Richard Neville for his wife, for although the wardship of George Neville was granted to John Tiptoft (later Earl of Worcester) in June 1449, this was surrendered by him to Neville in May of the following year. George Neville came of age in 1457, and although granted possession of his share of the Despenser inheritance, the whole inheritance remained with Neville.

After the death of Neville (Warwick the Kingmaker) in 1471, his widow Anne Beauchamp was deprived of her inheritance, her estates being divided between the husbands of her two daughters, Isabel, wife of the Duke of Clarence, and Anne, wife of the Duke of Gloucester, subsequently
Her inheritance was restored in 1487 after years of petitioning and was immediately re-conveyed to the Crown. Anne, the last member of the main line of the Beauchamp family died in 1492.

2. Manuscripts and Patronage

What follows is a general account of the manuscripts and patronage of the Beauchamp family, indicating the main areas to be explored more fully during the course of the study. The preceding account has highlighted the major title-holders of the main line of the family, some of whom re-appear as patrons and owners of manuscripts. Note has been made of times of political crisis and struggles concerning inheritance, and I believe some of these occasions can be directly linked with literary and artistic patronage, as I hope to illustrate in subsequent chapters.

The manuscripts and books known to have been owned or commissioned by the Beauchamp family satisfactorily chart the changing tastes and interests of members of the nobility in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The earlier predilection for French romances and for religious writings in French and Latin gives way at the end of the century and beyond to an interest in commissioning and owning English translations and contemporary writings in English, as well as in family history which at least purports to be in some measure historical, unlike the earlier romance family 'histories'. Interest too is shown in the purchase of manuscripts from abroad, especially from France, in keeping with contemporary fashions. The extant Beauchamp manuscripts also include a number of books of Hours, not literary manuscripts at all (although some contain extracts from lives of Saints and from religious poems), but still an important part of their manuscript culture, as many of them are noted for their fine illumination, often influenced by contemporary continental fashions.

The Beauchamp manuscripts also map the differences in the source
material available for such a study. So much of the fourteenth century information depends on wills for evidence of ownership and patronage, whereas there are many more extant manuscripts in the fifteenth century.

To begin with the best-known book-owner of the Beauchamp family, Earl Guy (d.1315) owned one of the most interesting book collections of the fourteenth century. Ten years before his death, Guy gave a collection of some forty books in French covering religious writing, romances and legends, didactic and historical literature, into the keeping of the Cistercian Abbey of Bordesley in Worcestershire. He also left all the chapel books to his wife. Guy's grandfather may have had an interest in romance literature too, if one book in his will is sufficient evidence, for he bequeathed a copy of Lancelot to his daughter Joan (Guy's aunt), which at the dating of the will (1286) had been in her possession for some time.

Guy's son and daughter are known to have owned books, again through testamentary evidence. His daughter, Mathilda de Say, who was in the service of Edward III, Queen Philippa and Princess Isabella, left her unnamed French and Latin books to John Harleston. Her brother Earl Thomas, did not leave any books in his will dated 1369, and is not to be confused with the Earl of Warwick to whom Deanesly referred, who "in 1359 bequeathed French gospels, psalter and apocalypse, two apocryphal gospels, and the Mirror of the Soul". This in fact refers to Earl Guy previously mentioned, as Deanesly's source prints the list of Guy's books and dates it 1359. Earl Thomas's wife Katherine Mortimer, who also died in 1369, left her enigmatic 'book of ch.' (chansons?) to her son Thomas, and was left a psalter by Robert Walkynton, a Lichfield canon, which she had previously given to him.

The second Earl Thomas (d.1401), is known to have owned a number of service books, but of greater interest is a Saint's Life written by his squire during their exile on the Isle of Man. An Inquisition of his
goods mentions a number of missals, \textsuperscript{33} one covered with blue 'baudekyn', another with white leather, one in a red cover, and one previously owned by the Earl of Stafford, probably Earl Hugh (d.1386) who had married Thomas's sister and who had named the Earl of Warwick as an executor.\textsuperscript{34} During his exile, his household squire who had accompanied him, one William Paris, wrote the \textit{Legend of St. Christina}, which is thought to show the influence of Chaucerian models.\textsuperscript{35}

In the same generation, William Beauchamp Lord Abergavenny, the university-educated brother of Earl Thomas, left 'the best messe boke' to his wife Joan in his will, which is among the earliest wills to be written in English (and may have been holograph).\textsuperscript{36} This book may be identical with a manuscript he owned, a missal now belonging to Trinity College, Oxford (MS 8), which contains the dates of birth of some of William's children. He has also been connected with a manuscript (Oxford, University College MS 97), which contains devotional writing, and was possibly compiled by William Contour, a cleric associated with Lord Abergavenny.\textsuperscript{37}

A third member of this generation, William's sister Alice (d.1384), married Sir Matthew Gurney, and it has been suggested that a two-volume \textit{Bible Historiale} in the British Library (MS Royal 19 D. iv, v) belonged to them, though the armorial evidence on the closed edges of the volumes is not sufficiently distinct to provide certain proof of their ownership.\textsuperscript{38}

In the following generation, Earl Richard (d.1439) married into a family with an established tradition of patronage of authors. Elizabeth Berkeley's father Thomas (d.1417) was Trevisa's patron, and Elizabeth followed her father's example by commissioning John Walton's translation of Boethius's \textit{De Consolatione Philosophae} in 1410.\textsuperscript{39} Walton, an Oseney canon worked for Lord Berkeley too. Disappointingly, Lord Thomas only bequeathed one book (his best pair of matins) to Elizabeth
in his will (1415).  

Richard himself owned a copy of some of Trevisa's translations (British Library, MS Additional 24194). He also owned Bib. Nat. MS f. fr. 831 (Froissart's Poésies), and gave a French version of Boccaccio's Decameron to Humphrey Duke of Gloucester (Bib. Nat. MS français 12421). Richard's commission to Lydgate to translate into English the Title and Pedigree of Henry VI (1426), is one example of a family tradition of patronage of Lydgate. It is also an example of one of the ways in which the family made use of literature for political purposes, in this case for national interests, though more often for family interests. Of a more personal nature, Richard is thought to be the author of a balade for his second wife Isabella Despenser, which appears in the Shirley manuscript B.L. MS Additional 16165.

John Shirley himself began his career in the household of Richard Beauchamp and acted as his secretary. The exact nature of the relationship between this and his later career as a compiler and lender of manuscripts is unclear, though it seems from the appearance of the balade in his manuscript and his one-time ownership of the well-known Troilus and Criseyde manuscript (Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 61), which has possible Beauchamp and Neville connections, that he maintained some aristocratic contacts.

Margaret Beauchamp, the eldest daughter of Richard and Elizabeth, was another of Lydgate's patrons and owned one (and possibly two) attractive books of Hours. She commissioned Lydgate's translation of Guy of Warwick, motivated as I suggest later by contemporary political concerns as much as by an interest in her mythical ancestor. She also owned the fine Hours of Margaret Beauchamp (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS 41-1950), made in France probably on the occasion of her marriage to John Talbot in 1424 or 1425. Talbot's own Hours, (Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 40-1950), has five stanzas (added on f.135a), of Lydgate's prayer to
St. Albon from his *Life of St Albon and St Amphabell*, an addition probably influenced by his wife, and her family's patronage of Lydgate. A third book of Hours (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Dep. 221/1, from Blair's College, Aberdeen) would also seem from available evidence, to have belonged to Margaret and Talbot. All three books of Hours are of similar tall, narrow format, and have frontispiece pictures of Talbot and Margaret before the Virgin, sponsored by their patron saints.

They seem to have been fond of self-'portraits'. Images of both appear in stained glass at Compton Wynyates, and a fine miniature of Talbot presenting the book appears in B.L. MS Royal 15 E. vi., the volume of romances he gave to Margaret of Anjou on her marriage to Henry VI. Talbot also commissioned a roll of arms depicting his family genealogy and the families into which the Talbots married (London, College of Arms, MS B. 29, fols. 8-17v+18).

Both Margaret and her sister Eleanor have been suggested as owners of manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*, respectively Oxford, Bodl. MS 686 and Laud 600, though there is insufficient evidence to accept this.

Richard Beauchamp's second wife Isabella Despenser commissioned Lydgate to write the *Fifteen Odes of Our Lady*. Both her son Henry, and daughter, Anne, who carried the Warwick title in turn, owned manuscripts or acted as patrons. Henry owned the fine Hours of Henry Beauchamp (New York, Pierpont Morgan Library MS 893) and may be the Beauchamp referred to as the owner of a copy of the *Nova Statuta* (Harvard Law Library MS 21). His wife Cecily owned a manuscript of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* (B.L. Royal 18 D. iv), and seems to have passed on Henry's Hours to her second husband, John Tiptoft Earl of Worcester.

Anne's patronage reflects an interest in committing the deeds of her family to paper and to posterity, inspired by the political circumstances which had deprived her of her inheritance. She commissioned one
of the best artists available in England to compile the Beauchamp Pageants, a collection of fifty-five ink drawings over pencil sketches with short texts, illustrating the life and exploits of her father Richard Beauchamp. It has been suggested that Anne commissioned the Pageants as part of her bid to draw attention to her situation and to regain her inheritance, and as I suggest later, in doing this she extended an existing family tradition of interest in Beauchamp ancestry.

Anne is also the most likely candidate for commissioning two genealogical rolls of the Lords of Warwick, one in Latin (College of Arms, MS Warwick Roll), the other in English (B.L. MS Additional 48976), from John Rous, chaplain of the Beauchamp sponsored chantry at Guy's Cliff near Warwick. The Rous rolls, made shortly before the Pageants between 1477 and 1485, seem to have been designed to promote Beauchamp family history and to draw attention to Anne's character and situation, and changes made in the Latin roll, indicate these were made to suit changing political circumstances.

Anne Beauchamp, a Neville by name after her marriage (though I would suggest always a Beauchamp), has been identified with the lady intended by the 'neuer Poryeteth' Anne neuill' on f. 101v of Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 61 (Troilus and Criseyde). The evidence for this identification is discussed in greater detail subsequently in Chapter 3.

Anne Beauchamp's husband Richard Neville (d.1471) is known to have owned a manuscript of L'enseignement de vraie noblesse (Geneva, Bibliotheque de la Ville MS fr. 166), and both their daughter Anne and her husband Richard Duke of Gloucester (later Richard III), owned manuscripts, which are discussed in the section on the Neville family.

Beauchamp patronage and their manuscripts will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent chapters. Two areas which will be examined closely are their interest in their ancestry (often linked with contemporary
politics) and the literary endeavours of members of what can be broadly termed their household.

The Neville Family

1. Genealogy

Throughout most of the period covered by this study, the Neville estates were concentrated in south and central Durham and in the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire, with a few holdings in Kent, Lincolnshire, Bedfordshire, Essex, Westmoreland, Cumberland and Northumberland. In London they had the Neville Inn and after 1399, a town house formerly belonging to Lord Scrope called 'Le Erber'. Their castles in the North, with their main estates centred round them were: Brancepeth, Raby, Middleham and Sheriff Hutton. Raby was the principal home of the first Earl of Westmoreland (Ralph d.1425), who built a collegiate chapel there, though Middleham was also favoured by him.

The Yorkshire estates became more prominent in the fifteenth century, especially after the death of the first Earl of Westmoreland, when the dispossessed children of his first marriage took action against the heirs of his second marriage in an attempt to regain the northern estates. By the mid-fifteenth century (1449), the vast Beauchamp estates in the Midlands were added to the Neville territories through Anne Beauchamp, wife of Richard Neville, heir of the Earl of Salisbury, as already mentioned. However the family continued to maintain close connections with the north of England.

Three inter-related areas emerge and recur throughout the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: (1) the close connection with the North, through territorial interests and service; (2) close associations with royalty; (3) arising from the last, their Lancastrian political affiliations, until Richard Neville Earl of Salisbury formed an alliance with Richard Duke of York in the middle years of the
The Neville family's acquisition of titles and land began with the marriage of Robert FitzMaldred Lord of Raby, to Isabella, daughter and heiress of Geoffrey de Neville (d.1194). Their son, Geoffrey FitzRobert (d.1249), assumed the name of Neville, becoming 1st Baron Neville of Raby, and secured his mother's inheritance which included Brancepeth and Sheriff Hutton. Geoffrey was succeeded by his son Robert (2nd Baron Neville, d.1282), who like succeeding generations of Neville lords, undertook various duties in the north of England. Robert was succeeded by his grandson Ralph (3rd Baron Neville, d.1331), his son and heir having predeceased him, though not before marrying Mary, heiress of the FitzRanulphs which brought Middleham into Neville possession. Ralph was succeeded by his second son, also Ralph, and it was with this 4th Baron Neville (d.1367), that the Neville family considerably increased their connections and inheritance.

Ralph, 4th Baron Neville, served both on the Borders and in the royal household. He was made joint Warden of the Marches with Lord Percy, became Governor of Bamburgh Castle, and was Warden of all the Forests north of the Trent. His service to the Crown in foreign affairs included treating with Philip VI of France in 1329 for marriages between the royal houses of France and England, and taking part in the peace negotiations with France in 1343. His advances to the King of wool from his northern estates are said, with his other services, to have secured him various privileges. He died in 1367 and became the first layman to be buried in the south aisle of Durham Cathedral.

He had five sons and four daughters, and their marriages and the positions they held reflect both the increasing status of the family and their northern affiliations. His son and heir, John 5th Baron Neville, married first Maud, daughter of Henry Lord Percy, and secondly Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of William Lord Latimer of Danby. Alexander,
another son, became Archbishop of York in 1374, a not entirely happy
appointment for the see or for the citizens of York. A supporter of
Richard II, he was found guilty of treason by the Appellants in 1388, a
year after he had fled to the Continent. He was outlawed and subsequently
translated to the see of St. Andrews which in effect deprived him of all
status, the authority of Urban VI not being acknowledged by the Scots.
He died as a parish priest in Louvain in 1392.

A younger son William, like his father, carried out royal service
in the north, within the royal household, and abroad. He was abroad in
the service of the King in 1369 and 1372, and in 1383 was commissioned
to treat for peace with France and Scotland. In 1372 he was also appointed
Admiral of the Northern fleet and was a chamber-knight by 1381, an office
he held until his death. The interest of literary scholars has been
aroused by Neville's inclusion in the group of so-called Lollard Knights,
and by his appearance as a witness to Cecily Champain's release to Chaucer
of the claim of 'raptus' previously mentioned. William died in 1391 near
Constantinople, shortly after his friend and fellow 'Lollard Knight',
Sir John Clanvow.

Among the daughters of Ralph 4th Baron Neville, Margaret married
William (later Lord) Roos of Helmsley and secondly Henry Percy, 1st Earl
of Northumberland, Katherine married Lord Dacre of Gilsland, Eleanor
married Geoffrey le Scrope, and Euphemia married in succession Reginald
de Lucy, Robert Clifford of Westmoreland, and Sir Walter de Heslarton.

John, the next and 5th Baron Neville, served in France both before
and after he succeeded his father, his endeavours in the early 1370s
coinciding with a series of reverses. He also took on the usual duties
associated with the northern border and was retained for life by John of
Gaunt in 1370, a connection which would prove to be invaluable to his
heirs. He was impeached in 1376 on charges of buying up the King's
debts, of allowing his troops to plunder at Southampton in 1372, and of
the loss of the Breton fortresses by failing to supply the full force of men. However, he embarked on a new series of duties in 1377 and was appointed Governor of Bamburgh Castle by Richard II. In 1378 he was appointed Lieutenant of the King in Aquitaine and engaged in various military expeditions there. He was back in England in 1381 and spent the remainder of his life engaged in duties in the north. He built much of Raby castle, began work on Sheriff Hutton, and provided money for the Neville screen behind the high altar in Durham Cathedral. He died in 1388. His association with John of Gaunt was an important factor in improving the fortunes of the family and led to the marriage between his son and heir Ralph and Joan Beaufort, Gaunt's daughter by Katherine Swynford.

Ralph, 6th Baron Neville of Raby (born c.1352), served in the French wars, including an expedition in 1380 under Thomas of Woodstock. His main service was on the Scottish border and he was Governor of Carlisle in 1385 and Warden of the West March in 1386. He received a number of commissions connected with border service and local Crown duties, and a number of grants and favours came to him through his connection with John of Gaunt. Immediately after his father's death he was granted the office of Warden of the King's Forest north of the Trent. In January 1392 he obtained custody of the land and heirs (and their marriages) of two Durham knights to the value of fifty pounds per annum, and in July 1394 he received the renewal of his grant from the late Queen Anne, of the Keepership of the Forest of Wensleydale. In May of the same year, he had been retained by Richard II at an annual fee of one hundred and thirty pounds, subsequently confirmed by Henry IV, V and VI.

His second marriage to Joan Beaufort in 1396 increased the favours he received, his power and influence in the north, and his material wealth. He was created 1st Earl of Westmoreland by Richard II in
September 1397, becoming one of the most influential men in the north of England, and between November 1396 and October 1397, Ralph and Joan received from the King lands and annuities in Westmoreland and Northumberland worth almost two hundred pounds of annual income. The favours continued during the reign of Joan's half-brother Henry IV. On September 20th 1399, Earl Ralph received the grant for life of the Honour of Richmond, only a month earlier having been raised to the dignity of Marshal of England. In April 1402 he was appointed Warden of Roxburghe Castle for a term of ten years, in 1410 he was appointed one of the members of the King's permanent Council (though he was soon replaced by the Earl of Warwick as he could not attend with sufficient regularity), and in February 1413 he was granted all the royal rights in the lordship of Bainbridge and in the Forest of Wensleydale, valued at one hundred and forty pounds per annum. During the reign of Henry V, Earl Ralph was still active in border duties and in April 1415 he was appointed a member of the council of the Duke of Bedford while Henry V was in France. In 1422, he was made a salaried member of the King's permanent Council, but age and distance prevented him from attending. He died in October 1425 at Raby.

The children of Ralph Neville's first marriage to Margaret Stafford did not benefit at all from the royal connections of their father's second wife, being effectively dispossessed of their inheritance in favour of the children of the second marriage. Many of the grants their father received from Henry IV were made either for life or in tail male to Ralph and Joan jointly, and between 1397 and 1422, the Earl of Westmoreland executed a series of conveyances which placed his Yorkshire estates in the hands of trustees who were licenced to re-enfeoff them to Ralph and Joan in tail male, or to reconvey them to Joan on Ralph's death, with the remainder to her sons. This deprived the 2nd Earl of Westmoreland of two thirds of the estates which the 1st Earl had inherited in 1388.
The royal connections also enabled Ralph and Joan to make a dazzling series of marriages for their children. Richard, Ralph's heir, married Alice, heiress of Thomas Montague Earl of Salisbury; George married Elizabeth Beauchamp, daughter of Richard Beauchamp and Elizabeth Berkeley; Edward married another Elizabeth Beauchamp, the Abergavenny heiress, daughter of Isabella Despenser and her first husband Richard Beauchamp Earl of Worcester; and William obtained the estates and marriage of Joan, heiress of Lord Fauconberg in 1408. William was summoned to Parliament as Lord Fauconberg in right of his wife in 1429, though his advantageous marriage had some drawbacks as Joan was a congenital idiot.

The daughters fared even better. Katherine married John Mowbray, later 2nd Duke of Norfolk, at the age of thirteen, her father having paid the King three thousand marks for Mowbray's wardship and marriage in 1411. Anne married Humphrey Stafford, later Duke of Buckingham. Eleanor married Richard Despenser at the age of about nine, was widowed within two years and subsequently married Henry Percy Earl of Northumberland, and Cecily, the youngest daughter, gained precedence over her sisters with her marriage to Richard Duke of York who was third in line of succession to the throne (excluding the Beauforts) in 1423. Ralph Neville obtained York's marriage from the Crown in 1423 for three thousand marks, to be paid in instalments, one third in December of that year, the remainder in half-yearly instalments of five hundred marks. An annual fee of two hundred marks was paid to Ralph for Richard's maintenance, which was increased after Ralph's death in response to petitions by his widow Joan. Richard of York spent much of his minority in the household of Joan Beaufort, often at Raby Castle, and although the date of the betrothal of Richard and Cecily is uncertain, they were certainly living as man and wife by 1429.

J.R. Lander saw the marriages as one of the key factors in national politics of the middle of the fifteenth century, calling them 'the most
amazing series of child marriages in English history. Two further quotations summarise the effects of these marriages in subsequent decades:

Between 1450 and 1455, no less than five Neville brothers and their nephew Warwick were sitting in the house of lords, as well as their nephew of the half-blood, Earl Ralph II of Westmoreland, five sons-in-law and several other grandsons of Earl Ralph I.

Of forty-one temporal peers summoned to Edward IV's first Parliament, approximately one third were descendants, or were married to descendants, of the first Earl of Westmoreland.

The royal connection continued to benefit Countess Joan after her husband died. For the purposes of the tax on income of 1436, Joan was assessed at the sum of six hundred and sixty seven pounds, way below her actual taxable income. She had an income of only a few pounds below this sum from her marriage portion, together with the grants she and Ralph had received jointly from Richard II and Henry IV, without taking into account her income from the Neville estates she occupied. It is likely that the under-assessment of her annual revenue was the result of her royal links, which also benefitted her son-in-law the Earl of Northumberland and her daughter the dowager Duchess of Norfolk, both of whom would seem to have been under-assessed in the 1436 taxation records.

Earl Ralph and Countess Joan's heir Richard, made an advantageous marriage to Alice Montagu and was summoned to Parliament as Earl of Salisbury in September 1429. Before his father died in 1425, Richard had been involved in local commissions, was Warden of the West March in 1420, and was appointed Master Forester of the Archbishopsric of York in 1423. His father had obtained for him a number of wardships and custodies, including in September 1420, the estates of Richard Lord Scrope of Bolton. In 1424 and 1426, he had the keeping of the lands of Elizabeth Holland, the dowager Countess of Kent, Lucy Visconti and Elizabeth Clifford. In March 1427, the government confirmed him as Warden of the King's Forest north of the Trent (with fees of one hundred marks per annum), a position
his father had leased to him.

From 1429 onwards, Richard Earl of Salisbury seems to have become more involved in national affairs. He was active on the Scottish border in 1429, and in 1430 was in France, entering Paris with the King in December of that year. At the same time, the dispossessed second Earl of Westmoreland was active in trying to regain his inheritance. Richard Neville brought the matter before the Council and both parties were bound over to keep the peace, though Richard's value to the Crown in border and foreign affairs, and his close relationship with Cardinal Beaufort, meant that the Earl of Westmoreland was unlikely to gain any advantage over the ten years or so of the dispute. 80

The dispute was particularly fierce in 1435 and 1436, when with Richard and his brother Lord Fauconberg in France, Westmoreland broke his peace, necessitating the intervention of the Council and the additional guarantee by the government that custody of the estates would go to Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick among others, if Joan died while her son was overseas. 81 The dispute was finally settled in 1443 when the luckless Westmoreland agreed to recognise Salisbury's claim to succeed to the first Earl of Westmoreland in Yorkshire, Cumberland, Essex and Westmoreland and in London and York (with one or two very minor exceptions such as the Neville Inn in London, twenty pounds of rent attached to Westmoreland's dignity as an Earl, and all the holdings of the first Earl in Ripon). 82 In return, Salisbury abandoned any claims to the lands in the Palatinate of Durham, and Westmoreland agreed to pay him a yearly rent of two hundred marks for various manors, plus another hundred for Bywell in Northumberland. 83

In the intervening years, Richard Neville had continued to increase his power, wealth and influence through a number of grants, wardships and positions. 84 In 1434, he paid four thousand seven hundred marks for the hand of Henry Beauchamp, son and heir of Richard Earl of Warwick,
for his daughter Cecily, the highest marriage fee McFarlane had come across, and married his son Richard to Warwick's daughter Anne. In 1436, another daughter, Joan was married to William Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel.

By the end of 1453, Salisbury was forming an alliance with Richard Duke of York, which led to his appointment as Chancellor during York's first period as Protector in 1454 when Henry VI was ill and incapable of governing. He was dismissed from the position on Henry's recovery at the end of 1454, and with his son Richard (now Earl of Warwick) and York, refused to attend the Leicester parliament of May 1455. Instead they gathered together an army and joined forces against the King at St. Albans on the 22nd of May. A second short Protectorship lasted from November 19th 1455 until February 25th of the following year, and a temporary reconciliation was effected. By the middle of 1459 hostilities were again in the open with York, Salisbury and Warwick failing to be summoned to a meeting of the great Council at Coventry on 24th June. The Yorkists gathered forces, but fled after an indecisive battle at Blore Heath, Salisbury retreating to Calais from where the Yorkist invasion of 1460 was launched. Richard Earl of Salisbury was executed shortly after the Yorkist defeat at Wakefield (30th December 1460), in which the Duke of York died.

On his father's death, Richard Neville Earl of Warwick, already the wealthiest Earl in England, added the Salisbury earldom and the Neville estates in Yorkshire to the vast Beauchamp estates he possessed through his wife in the Midlands, southern England and South Wales. McFarlane estimated that his annual net income from land as Earl of Warwick was about three thousand nine hundred pounds. It is with Richard that the Neville family reached its zenith and also in the way of such things its nadir, and to say anything at all about his life and career is to move out of the world of Neville family service and regional interests, into
the dynastic struggles of the royal Houses of Lancaster and York, a
shift which accurately measures the increased status and influence of
the main-line of the family, two generations after its first Earl had
been created.

Like his father, Warwick was allied with Richard Duke of York and
was appointed to the Council during York's first period as Protector.93
He was rewarded for his part in the first battle of St. Albans (22nd May
1455), with the Captaincy of Calais,94 which was to become an important
Yorkist base for launching invasions of England. He was Edward IV's
principal supporter in his struggles to claim the throne as Duke of York,
and was well rewarded by him when he gained the throne in 1461 and remained
a strong influence on the King during the early years of the reign. In
1461, Warwick was appointed Constable of Dover and Warden of the Cinque
Ports (with a fee of three hundred pounds per annum), Warden of the East
and West Marches (towards Scotland), and chief Steward of the Duchy of
Lancaster in the north and south parts, and of Duchy affairs in Lancashire
and Cheshire, Tutbury, and of Pontefract, Knaresborough and Pickering
in Yorkshire.95 He was Admiral of England by the end of the year and
was appointed to act as Steward of England at the 'trial' of Henry VI and
his associates.96 He also held the position of Chamberlain of England,
and grants continued to be made to him until 1469, when he was in open
rebellion against the King.97

Other members of the Neville family benefitted too. George, Warwick's
brother, was appointed Archbishop of York in 1465 and two years earlier
had been given a series of valuable wardships. William Lord Fauconberg,
Warwick's uncle, received the Earldom of Kent in 1461 and in the following
year was granted a substantial number of manors in the west country,
forfeited by the Earls of Devon and Wiltshire.98

To discuss Richard Neville Earl of Warwick fully, would be to write
a history of the reign of Edward IV until 1471, for he was intimately
involved in national and international politics. It must suffice here to say that he became increasingly estranged from the King and his influence waned from the late 1460s, caused partly by the ascendency of the Woodvilles, partly by Edward's Burgundian alliance as opposed to the French alliance favoured by Warwick, and partly by Warwick's ambitions (which threatened to be thwarted) of marrying his two daughters to Edward's brothers the Dukes of Clarence and Gloucester. He rebelled openly in 1469 and temporarily regained control of Edward IV. He finally resorted to an alliance with the Lancastrians, sealed by the betrothal of his daughter Anne to Henry VI's son Edward, Prince of Wales, which culminated in the brief restoration of Henry in 1470. Warwick was killed at the battle of Barnet in April 1471, during the Yorkist recovery of the throne.

In 1474, his widow Anne Beauchamp was disinherited and her estates were divided between her two sons-in-law the Duke of Clarence and Duke of Gloucester, married to Isabel (in 1469) and Anne (in 1472) respectively. Anne Duchess of Gloucester (d.1485) subsequently became Queen of England during the brief reign of her husband Richard III, and it was not until 1487, as previously noted that Anne Beauchamp's rightful inheritance was restored and reconveyed to the Crown.

It is probably no exaggeration to say that Warwick the Kingmaker is one of the best known names of the fifteenth century, and his deeds, personality and ambitions loom large in the popular mythology of the period. His marriage saw the merger of the Beauchamp and Neville families and for a time the Neville family, influential since the reign of Henry IV, became one of the dominant family groupings of English politics. By the beginning of Edward IV's reign, Richard Neville 'dominated the rest of the English baronage as no magnate had done since Earl Thomas of Lancaster in the middle years of Edward II's reign'. However, despite the numerous offspring of Ralph, first Earl of Westmoreland, the advantageous
marriages made by his children and grandchildren, and the power and influence wielded by Richard Neville as Earl of Warwick, there were only three male Neville lines left by 1500. 104

2. Manuscripts and Patronage

A general account of the manuscripts and patronage of the Neville family involves a much broader base than the account of the Beauchamp family. The Nevilles managed to produce a greater number of offspring in each generation and, unlike the Beauchamps, had flourishing cadet branches. In consequence, a survey of the Neville family involves more individuals, and because of this and the standing of the families into which they married, it is difficult to observe a sense of 'family' as demonstrated by the Beauchamps.

The majority of the evidence for Neville book-ownership and patronage belongs to the fifteenth century. In the fourteenth century, Thomas, a clerical brother of Ralph 4th Baron Neville (d.1367) maintained Richard Rolle at Oxford. 105 There are few references to books and patronage in the next generation. Elizabeth Latimer, second wife of Ralph 5th Baron Neville, received a primer from her father's will (1380), obviously a family heirloom: 'mon primer covere de velvet qui estoit a Dame Maude Longespee Contesse de Salisbris'. 106 Elizabeth's son, John Baron Latimer (d.1430), bequeathed two books in his will: his bible to the prior and convent of Gisburn, and his missal as a mortuary to St Mary's Abbey in York. 107

In the succeeding generations of the family there is much more evidence which, by contrast with the Beauchamps, is mainly in the form of extant manuscripts. Themes which emerge, some of which will be developed subsequently, are: the importance of their Lancastrian connections, which encouraged writers, particularly Hoccleve, to attempt to gain Neville patronage; the number of the families into which the Nevilles
marry who have their own traditions of book-owning or patronage; the way in which a number of relatives and offspring established royal connections in their own right.

Thomas Lord Furnival, a brother of the first Earl of Westmoreland, is the 'patron' addressed by Hoccleve at the end of La Male Regle and Hoccleve ended a manuscript of his works (Durham, University Library, MS Cosin V III.9) with a dedication to the Earl of Westmoreland's second wife, Joan Beaufort (d.1440). Joan received a copy of Tristram in the will (1426) of her brother Thomas Beaufort Duke of Exeter, and owned copies of the Chronicles of Jerusalem and the Voyage of Godfrey Bouillon which had been borrowed by her nephew Henry V. She was bequeathed a copy of Gower's Confessio Amantis by a Yorkshire gentleman who had been in her husband's service, and has been suggested as the owner of Bodl. MS e mus. 35 (Nicholas Love) which contains Neville and Beaufort arms. Chaucer had contact with both the Beaufort and Neville families, through his association with Joan's father John of Gaunt and the service in the royal household of John 5th Baron Neville and William Neville, Chaucer's witness in the Champain case.

A number of the descendants of the children of Ralph Neville and Joan Beaufort lead us into some of the most interesting areas of late medieval literary patronage. However, looking first at the children of Ralph and Joan, Alice Montagu, wife of their heir Richard, was left 'meum magnum Primarium optimum, et duos libros Gallicos vocatos Gyron le Curtasse' (a French prose Tristan) in the will (1446) of Mathilda Countess of Cambridge, together with a gold cross. Mathilda was the divorced wife of John Baron Latimer previously mentioned and the step-mother of Richard Duke of York who was married to Alice's sister-in-law, Cecily Neville.

Among Ralph and Joan's daughters, Katherine owned B.L. MS Cotton Vitellius E. ix (a psalter, almost completely destroyed in the Cotton
library fire of 1731), and Eleanor has been suggested as the owner of Bodley 939 (a collection of prayers), though there is not enough evidence to confirm this. Anne, who married Humphrey Stafford, is another candidate for the ownership of the Corpus Christi manuscript of Troilus and Criseyde, and definitely owned the fine Wingfield Psalter (New York, Public Library MS Spencer 3, Part II). A number of other manuscripts have been inconclusively linked with her. She has been suggested as the kneeling figure of an English painting now bound as f.3v in the Heures de Jeanne de Navarre (Bib. Nat. MS lat nouv. acqu. 3145), which has scrolls identical with those in the Wingfield Psalter, and has been associated with a psalter now divided into B.L. MS Royal 2 A. xviii and Rennes, Bibliotheque Municipale MS 22. She has been linked with the unique manuscript of Chaucer's \textit{Romaunt of the Rose} (Glasgow University Library, MS Hunter 409) through a reference on f.139 to the wife of Lord Mountjoy, (her second husband), and a poem, \textit{The Nightingale}, is dedicated to her in Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 203.

Among the manuscripts, only her ownership of the Wingfield Psalter is secure, but she is known to have owned other books from bequests in her will (1480) to her daughter-in-law Margaret Beaufort Countess of Richmond (mother of Henry VII): an English \textit{Legenda Sanctorum}, a French copy of Lucan, French Epistles and Gospels, and a primer with silver gilt clasps. Lady Margaret was a patron of authors, printers and scholars, and a book owner and author in her own right, and some of her interests seem to have been inherited by her son Henry VII.

A fourth daughter Cécily who married the Duke of York was evidently a lady of great piety and mentioned a number of books in her will. It is said that she used 'to rise at seven of the clock, and has ready her chaplain to say with her matins of the day, and matins of our lady; and when she is fully ready she has a low mass in her chamber, and after mass
she takes something to recreate nature; and she goes to the chapel
hearing the divine service, and two low masses; from thence to dinner
the time whereof she hath a lecture of holy matter, either Hilton of
contemplative and active life: Bonaventure de infancia, Salvatoris
legenda aurea, St Maud, St Katherine of Sienna, or the Revelations of
St Bridget'. The remainder of the day continues in like vein. A
benefactress of Queen's College Cambridge, she died in 1495 and was
buried in the choir of the collegiate church of Fotheringay, Northants.
When her coffin was opened in the sixteenth century, it was recorded
that Cecily 'had about her neck hanging in a silver ribband, a pardon
from Rome, which penned in a very fine Roman hand, was as fair and fresh
to be read as if it had been written but yesterday'. Her piety is
reflected too in the books she bequeathed in her will. To the Queen
she gave 'A sawter with claspes of silver and guilte enamelled, with
grene clothe'; to the King's mother 'a portuos with claspes of gold
covered with blacke cloth of gold' and to Fotheringay 'three masse bokes,
thre grayles, and vii processioners'; to the College of Stoke Clare
'iii antiphonars, iii grayles and sixe processioners'. Three of her
daughters received books from her will: Bridgett received a Legenda Aurea,
a life of St Katherine of Sienna, and a book of St Mathilda; Cecily
received 'a portuous with clasps of silver and gilt covered with purple
velvet and a grete portuous without note'; Anne, prioress of Sion
received 'a boke of Bonaventura and Hilton in the same in Englishe, and
a boke of the Revelations of Saint Burgitte'. Other bequests included
an antiphoner to St Anthony's College in London; a mass book and a
psalter for personal use and a primer to Sir William Grave; and 'a
gospell boke a pistill' to Sir John Blotte.

Cecily's husband was also known as a patron (see note 121) and two
of their children were important patrons and book collectors, influencing
later fifteenth century fashions, Margaret of Burgundy (who had access
to the Burgundian courtly tradition) and Edward IV. Another son Richard III, is also known to have owned manuscripts.

Before leaving this generation, it is worth mentioning the descendants of Joan and Ralph's son Edward Lord Abergavenny who married Elizabeth Beauchamp, daughter of the Earl of Worcester and Isabella Despenser. Their son George Lord Abergavenny owned a manuscript containing a Chronicle of England to Henry V and the De arte heraldica of Johannes de Bado Aureo, both in English (Bodleian MS Laud misc. 733), and was a later owner of the fine early fifteenth century Neville Hours (now at Berkeley Castle), from the Scheerre workshop. Either this George or his son of the same name, owned a manuscript of Hoccleve's Regement (Cambridge, St John's College MS 223). At the bottom of f.1 is the inscription, 'Thys boke hys myne George lord Bergavenny'.

In the next generation, a number of the children of Richard Earl of Salisbury and his wife Alice were book owners and again married into families with their own traditions of book collecting, though often only one or two manuscripts can be linked with named owners.

Warwick the Kingmaker's influence and position in political affairs was not echoed in cultural matters. As already noted in the survey of his wife's patronage (Anne Beauchamp), only one manuscript can be linked with him, a Flemish manuscript of chivalric interest, L'enseignement de vraie noblesse. However he is said to have assisted the historical researches of John Rous and promised to help the chronicler and historian Jean Wavrin.

Richard's brother Thomas (d.1461) who married Maud Willoughby was one of the few certain aristocratic owners of a manuscript of the Canterbury Tales (B.L. MS Sloane 1685) and is possibly the Neville for whom the Salisbury roll was made (Duke of Buccleuch's MS, Part VI at Boughton House).

A second brother, John Baron Montagu and Earl of Northumberland...
(d.1471), owned a de-luxe copy of the Statutes (Lincolns Inn MS Hale 194). His son George, created Duke of Bedford in 1470, degraded in 1477, has been suggested as the Duke of Bedford who gave a copy of Geoffrey of Monmouth to a Sir John Steward, but as I suggest later an earlier Duke of Bedford is a more plausible candidate. His daughter Elizabeth who married Thomas Lord Scrope of Masham bequeathed a primer and a psalter in her will (1518) to her sister Lucy, which had been given to Elizabeth by Lady Margaret Beaufort, previously mentioned.

A third brother George, who was Archbishop of York and Chancellor (d.1476) was a book-owner and patron of scholars and Greek scribes. He was interested in Latin learning and good Latin writing and his household had the reputation of being a gathering place of men of letters. Weiss believed that it was mainly through the efforts of Neville and his circle that the study of Greek was established in fifteenth century England. His patronage and book-collecting represents another aspect of aristocratic culture, that of the clerical aristocratic patron, with its roots in the world of universities and scholars, and drawing inspiration from the Italians, rather than in the courtly, civic and regional traditions of patronage, inspired by France and Burgundy.

The remaining members of this generation to be discussed are all daughters, but the source of interest in most cases, is their husbands. Joan married William Fitzalan Earl of Arundel, who owned B.L. MSS Royal 19 B. xvii (a French Legenda Aurea), 17 D. vi (Hoccleve), 20 D. v (Homilies of St Gregory), and who was claimed by Caxton as the patron of his translation and edition of the Golden Legend. Joan Neville's arms appear in B.L. MS 17 D. vi. Cecily's first husband Henry Duke of Warwick owned a fine book of Hours previously mentioned (Pierpont Morgan MS M. 893) which, it is thought, passed to Cecily on his death and from her to her second husband John Tiptoft, which probably accounts for some
Italian additions. Cecily's arms (incorporating those of Henry Beauchamp) appear with Tiptoft's in a manuscript of the *Fall of Princes* (B.L. MS Royal 18 D. iv) and she has been associated with the fine Hours of Elysabeth the Queene (B.L. MS Addit. 50001), from an erased inscription on f.147 noting her death, though it seems more likely that the manuscript belonged to someone related to or close to her. The manuscript takes its name from the wife of Henry VII whose signature appears at the bottom of f.22 and her cousin's name (Edward Duke of Buckingham) also appears in the manuscript. Her second husband John Tiptoft has been mentioned in Chapter 1 as a book-owner, patron and author and it has been said of him that only he and William Grey among Englishmen of the time understood what the Italians meant by patronage. Cecily died after only one year of marriage to Tiptoft but Tiptoft maintained connections with the Neville family. He was associated with fellow-scholars William Grey (son of Alice Neville) and Archbishop George Neville, and had known John Rous (the Beauchamp chaplain) at Oxford. His niece Isabella Ingoldesthorpe married John Neville Baron Montague.

Katherine Neville Lady Hastings, mentioned seven service books in her will (1503), the two most interesting being those to her daughter, Lady Mary Hungerford, 'a faire prym'ar, which I had by the yefture of Queen Elizabeth', and 'a printed mass-book, and a printed portvous' to the Lady Chapel in the parish church of Ashby-de-la-Zouche, where she was to be buried. The remaining bequests were, two mass books to her sons Richard and William, a mass book covered in red velvet to a poor church, and a Primer in the keeping of Lady Fitzhugh (her sister) to her daughter-in-law. Her husband, William Lord Hastings, executed by Richard II, was closely associated with Edward IV, and like him owned Flemish (and other) manuscripts, though he only mentioned one mass book in his will, a bequest to the Dean and Canons of St George's Chapel, Windsor, where he was to be buried. One further item of interest: a
London citizen, intending to present the finished work to Lord Hastings, commissioned Caxton to translate the *Mirror of the World* (this will be discussed in greater detail in a later chapter).\(^{138}\)

Margaret Neville (d.c.1489) married John de Vere, 13th Earl of Oxford, the proposed recipient of the poem 'The Prisoner to Vere' which appears on the flyleaves of the Ellesmere manuscript of the *Canterbury Tales*.\(^{139}\) Vere left a number of books in his will and a number are noted in his inventory,\(^ {140}\) and his arms appear in a manuscript of Lydgate's *Life of the Virgin* (B.L. MS Harley 3862). He also commissioned translations from Caxton, which will be discussed along with Fitzalan and Hastings in Chapter 6.

Anne Neville, the daughter of Warwick the Kingmaker and Anne Beauchamp, married Richard Duke of Gloucester, subsequently Richard III. An English translation of the *De re militari* of Vegetius contains both of their arms (B.L. MS Royal 18 A. xii) and a number of other manuscripts are attributed to Richard's ownership. One, B.L. MS Egerton 2006 (Visions of St Mathilda), contains the names Anne Warrrewyk and R. Gloucestre, but they are not thought to be autograph. Richard's Hours (Lambeth Palace Library MS 474) subsequently owned by Lady Margaret Beaufort, are stylistically closely related to the Hours of Henry Beauchamp, leading to suggestions that he acquired them via his wife, from her mother.\(^ {142}\)

Finally, a number of Neville manuscripts survive for which an owner cannot be securely identified, though their Neville provenance is not in doubt. These are noted in the chapter on Neville manuscripts and include: the Taymouth Hours (B.L. MS Yates Thompson 13); the Paris Neville Hours (Bib. Nat. MS lat. 1158); a *Roman de la Rose* (Gray's Inn MS 10).\(^ {143}\)
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73. Wright, op.cit., p.68. Other details in this paragraph are taken from here, pp.68, 70, 80, 82.
74. 'Marriage and Politics', p.96.
75. Ibid., p.97.
76. Wright, op.cit., pp.61-2.
78. Ibid., pp.8-9.
79. His career is outlined in Ross, 'Yorkshire Baronage', pp.48-58, from which details here are taken.
80. For the attempts of the second Earl of Westmoreland to regain the inheritance, ibid., pp.51-58.
81. Ibid., pp.55-56.
82. Ibid., pp.57-58.
83. Ibid., p.58.
84. Ibid., pp.53-54.
85. Nobility, p.87.
86. Griffiths, Henry VI, pp.726-27. For the first protectorate, ibid., pp.725-38.
87. See ibid., pp.741-46.
88. For the second protectorate, ibid., pp.746-57.
89. A full discussion of the activities of the Yorkists, including Salisbury, is given ibid., especially pp.817-75.
90. Ibid., p.870.
91. The northern territories continued to be a vital area of support for Neville, and in times of crisis it was to these less accessible estates that he retreated, rather than to the Warwickshire estates which were surrounded by royal and Lancastrian holdings, ibid., p.784.
92. Nobility, p.199.
94. Ibid., p.748.
96. Ibid., p.437.
97. Ibid., p.70.
98. Ibid., pp.71-72.
100. Griffiths, Henry VI, p.891. For a full discussion of Warwick's activities from the late 1460s to his death: Ross, Edward IV, pp.104-25 (Burgundian alliance and the weakening of Warwick's Influence); pp.126-45 (Warwick's rebellion); pp.145-77 (the deposition of Edward IV, the temporary restoration of Henry VI, the final restoration of Edward IV). Warwick's alliance with the Lancastrians is discussed in Griffiths, Henry VI, pp.889-92 and his career is surveyed in Glamorgan County History, III, pp.194-200.
101. GEC, XII, Part II, p.393.
102. Aided by 'biographies' such as P.M. Kendall's, Warwick the Kingmaker (London, 1957).
103. Pugh, 'Magnates, knights, and gentry', p.89.
104. McFarlane, Nobility, p.79.
105. See note 57 above.
106. TE, I, no.83.
107. TE, II, no.6.
108. TV, I, p.309; DNB, XIV, p.277.

111. Dr. A.I. Doyle informed me of this manuscript. Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford, 1, no 377.

112. Her second husband Henry Percy has been suggested as an owner of the Petworth manuscript of the Canterbury Tales, Manly and Rickert, The Text of the Canterbury Tales, I, pp.410 ff.


115. Pearsall, John Lydgate, p.268. Her first husband, Humphrey Stafford, had one of the extant manuscripts of The Epistle of Othea dedicated to him (see note 114 above) and gave a Polychronicon manuscript to his relative William Gray, R.A.B. Mynors, Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford (Oxford, 1963), no 236.

116. TV, I, p.357.

117. See W.E.A. Axon, 'The Lady Margaret as a Lover of Literature', Library, 2nd series, 8 (1907), 34-41. Her will is in Nichols, Royal Wills, pp.356-85. Her mother Margaret Beauchamp (of the cadet branch of Bletsoe descended from a younger son of William Beauchamp and Isabella Mauduit) has been convincingly suggested as the owner of B.L. MS Royal 2 A. xvii (Beaufort Hours), M. Rickert, 'The So-called Beaufort Hours and York Psalter', Burlington Magazine, 104 (1962), 238-46.


120. Plomer, 'Books mentioned in wills', pp.109-10. The similarity between the books in Cecily's will and the description of her daily reading matter makes one wonder if the latter account was based on knowledge of the will.

121. Her husband's family founded the East Anglian friary of Stoke Clare and the Duke of York maintained strong associations with the friary. The English translation of Claudian's De Consulatu Stilichonis (B.L. MS Addit. 11814) which mentions his name was probably made for him there and contains York badges in illuminated initials, E. Flugel, 'Eine Mittelenglische Claudian - Übersetzung 1445', Anglia, 28 (1905), 255-99. Stoke Clare was also the home of Osbern Bokenham who was commissioned by a circle of patrons in East Anglia, including Isabel Bourchier Countess of Eu, Duke Richard's sister, S. Moore, 'Patrons of Letters in Norfolk and Suffolk', PMLA, 38 (1913), 79-105 (p.89). The second version of Hardyn's Chronicle was addressed to Duke Richard, an explanatory dedication replacing the dedication to the King. The
final version was dedicated to Richard's son, Edward IV, Bennett, 'Production', p.178. B.L. MS Royal 19 A. xix (Christine de Pisan's Cité des Dames), contains York badges and may have belonged to Duke Richard or his son Edward.


128. TV, 2, pp.587-89.

129. Weiss, Humanism, p.148. Chapter IX: 'George Neville and his Circle' gives a comprehensive account of Neville, and notes a number of manuscripts he owned. George Ripley's Medulla and Thomas Norton's Ordinal of Alchemy are said to have been dedicated or presented to him, DNB, XIV, p.256.


131. See the discussion of this manuscript in the next chapter.


133. Mitchell, John Tiptoft, p.55. For manuscripts belonging to the Tiptoft family, ibid., pp.4-9.

134. Weiss, Humanism, pp.112-13; Mitchell, John Tiptoft, pp.94-97. Isabella presented some glass windows to the Church of Wiggenhall St. Mary Magdalen, Norfolk, probably in memory of her uncle, Mitchell, p.101.

135. TV, II, pp.450-56. The mention of the gift from Queen Elizabeth reminds one of B.L. MS Addit. 50001, previously mentioned.

136. B.L. MS Royal 18 E. i (Froissart's Chroniques); B.L. MS Addit. 54782 (Hours); Madrid, Lázaro Galdián, inv. 15503 (Hours), Harvard Law School Library MS 25 (Registrum breviwm), Scott, 'The Caxton Master', p.52.

137. TV, II, pp.368-75.

138. Blake, Caxton's Own Prose, p.115.

139. Seaton, Sir Richard Roos, p.421.


142. Tudor-Craig, Richard III, p.27. Other manuscripts which have been conclusively or otherwise linked with Richard are: Longleat MS 257
143. Details are given in Appendices 2 and 3 of miscellaneous references to Neville and Beauchamp books and patronage which are not included in the main text, and of the grounds for rejecting manuscripts from the Beauchamp and Neville group.
CHAPTER 3: THE BEAUCHAMP MANUSCRIPTS

This chapter and the one which follows examine the Beauchamp and Neville manuscripts in more detail, in order to give a fuller sense of the literary and artistic contexts of the manuscripts. Particular attention is given to the quality and contents of the manuscripts, the means by which the manuscripts were obtained, and in some cases, to a closer look at individual patrons and book-owners. Details of Beauchamp and Neville manuscripts outside the boundaries of this study, and of manuscripts of doubtful ownership, are given in appendices. An exception is made with Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 61, which is discussed in the present chapter.

The manuscripts which form the basis of the discussion for the Beauchamp family are listed below. A brief description of each manuscript is given, with references to sources where full descriptions can be found, and the evidence for ownership or commission is stated. The manuscripts are listed as far as possible, in order of owners, i.e. senior members of each generation first. Manuscripts which belonged to the Beauchamps but where precise identification of an owner cannot be made, follow the identified owners, and the list concludes with manuscripts given as gifts by members of the family. For ease of reference, footnotes are given directly beneath each manuscript in the list. Footnotes for the remainder of this chapter occur at the end. The second part of the chapter is taken up with a discussion of the manuscripts.
A. List of Manuscripts

Identified Owners

1. OXFORD, Trinity College MS 8

OWNER: Family of William Beauchamp Lord Abergavenny (d.1411)

Missal (Sarum), Latin. England, second half 14th cent., before 1388; 291 fols, double cols; 10¼" x 7¼"; historiated initials, decorated letters, partial decorative borders. ¹

The birth notices of three children of William Beauchamp Lord Abergavenny, appear in the Calendar: f. 3v, 3rd son 1403; f. 4v, Eleanor, 1st daughter 1388; f. 5v, Richard 1397. The nature of the birth notices which include details of the time of birth, suggest that the manuscript belonged to the family of Beauchamp of Abergavenny, possibly to Lord or Lady Abergavenny themselves. In this context, it is interesting to note that William left his 'best messe booke' to his wife in his will. ²

1. Described in H.O. Coxe, Catalogus Codicum MSS. Qui In Collegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus Hodie Adservantur, II (Oxford, 1852), p.4; and discussed in M. Rickert, The Reconstructed Carmelite Missal (London, 1952), p.79, where the date of before 1388 is given on the basis of the earliest entry in the Calendar.

2. TV, 1, pp.171-72.

2. LONDON, British Library MS Additional 24194 ¹

OWNER: Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (d.1439)

English translations by Trevisa. England, early 15th cent., before 1439; ² 263 fols, double cols of 47 lines; 16½" x 11¼";

71
2 historiated initials, 2 drawings, decorated initials and borders.

The arms of Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick appear on f.4 (partly obliterated) and on f.36, at the intersections of the borders.

2. And after 1387 when the translations were finished, Perry, op.cit., p.xx.

3. PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale MS f.fr.831 (anc. 7215)

OWNER: Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick

Poésies of Froissart. France, 1394; 202 fols (last 2 blank), double cols of 32 lines; 10¾" x 14¾"; frontispiece miniature of author addressing audience from pulpit, initials, vignettes.

An inscription on the front flyleaf identifies Richard Beauchamp as the owner, 'Se livre est a Richart le gentil fauls conte de Warrewyck'. Other scribblings at the front and back of the manuscript refer to Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and his wife Jacqueline de Bavière.

2. From the Explicit:

Explicit dittiers et traitiers amoureus et de moralité fais, dittés et ordonné par discret
et venerable homme sire Jean Froissart priestre
à che temp tresorier et chanonne de Cymai. Et
cloy che dis livre en l'an de grasce nostre
Signeur mil c c c iiiii.XX et xiiii. Le douzième
jour dou mois de may.

3. Dr. A.I. Doyle in a paper read to the Second York
Manuscripts Conference (July 1983), suggested that the
inscription might be in the hand of John Shirley,
one-time secretary to Richard Beauchamp.

4. Some of these references are listed in A. Paulin Paris,
loc. cit., and Scheler, op. cit., p.xvi, for example:
'c'est bien saison, Jacque de Bavière'; 'sans plus la
laide, Jacque a Gloucester'. Dr. Doyle does not
believe these to be by the same hand as the previous
inscription. A manuscript given by Richard Beauchamp
to the Duke of Gloucester is noted in a subsequent
section of this list.

4. CAMBRIDGE, Fitzwilliam Museum MS 40 - 1950
t (Talbot Hours)

OWNER: John Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury (d.1453), husband of
Margaret Beauchamp

Book of Hours (Sarum), Latin with hymns and prayers in French and
English; France, ?Rouen, 1424 (with later additions); 5 + 139 fols,
34 lines; 10½" x 4½"; 26 miniatures including picture of kneeling
man and woman, decorated borders.

The picture of the kneeling couple before the Virgin with patron
saints, appears on f.2v. Beneath them are: the banners of the
arms of Talbot and Beauchamp respectively; the Talbot and Beauchamp
badges (Talbot dog, bear and ragged staff); and a scroll containing
Talbot's motto 'Mon seul desir'. A crowned 'M', presumably for the
Virgin, occurs in the lower border.

1. Formerly in the possession of Henry Yates Thompson:
no 83 in A Descriptive Catalogue of the Second
Series of Fifty Manuscripts (Nos 51 - 100) in the
Collection of Henry Yates Thompson. The Notices
Contributed by Various Hands (Cambridge, 1902).
Also described in F. Wormald & P.M. Giles, 'A

2. Wormald & Giles, op.cit.
3. Ibid., and Yates Thompson Catalogue.

5. CAMBRIDGE, Fitzwilliam Museum MS 41-1950\(^1\) (Hours of Margaret Beauchamp)

OWNER: Margaret Beauchamp (d.1467), wife of John Talbot

Book of Hours (Sarum), Latin with prayers in English; France, c.1424;\(^2\) 102 fols, 31 lines; 8\(\frac{1}{4}\)" x 4\(\frac{3}{4}\)"; 31 miniatures including picture of kneeling man and woman, decorated borders.

The picture of the kneeling couple before the Virgin with patron Saints on f.2v is similar to that in the preceding manuscript, with some changes in details.\(^3\) Beneath the picture are banners of arms with their bearings removed. The garter badges contain marguerites and the crowned 'M' appears in the lower border. The similarity of format, picture and marguerites, indicate that the manuscript formed a pair with the preceding book of Hours, and belonged to Margaret, wife of John Talbot.

1. Formerly in the possession of Henry Yates Thompson: no 84 in A Descriptive Catalogue. Also described in Wormald & Giles, op.cit., no 177, and by the same authors in Illuminated Manuscripts in the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge, 1966), no 72.
2. Wormald & Giles, Illuminated Manuscripts, where it is suggested that the manuscript was made for the Talbot-Beauchamp marriage. A.J. Pollard, 'The Family of Talbot, Lords Talbot and Earls of Shrewsbury in the Fifteenth Century' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Bristol, 1968) 2 vols, p.37, gives the date of that marriage as before April 1425, possibly on 6th September 1424.
3. The Virgin is not elevated, the Christ-child is in a different position, and the kneeling lady wears different robes.
6. **EDINBURGH, National Library of Scotland MS Dep. 221/1** (from Blairs College, Aberdeen)

**OWNER:** ? John Talbot and Margaret Beauchamp

Book of Hours (Sarum), Latin with prayers in French and English; France, mid-15th cent.; ii + 121 + ii fols, 68 long lines; 9" x 3¼";

23 miniatures including picture of a kneeling man and woman, decorated borders, initials.

N.R. Ker suggested that the manuscript was an adaptation of a Talbot book of Hours, made in France for an unidentified member of the family of Bethune of Balfour, from shields on f. 4v beneath the kneeling couple. The man in the picture has Talbot arms on his tabard. However, Elspeth Yeo has written in reply to an enquiry about the manuscript, 'Although Dr. Ker thought the MS was made for a Bethune of Balfour, I am rather doubtful. The Bethune arms below the figures have been painted over two other shields. It is not possible to make out the original designs, but some of the devices show up on the back of the leaf. The badge inside the Garter on the left looks like a bear and ragged staff (for Warwick); the one on the right is too rubbed to make out. The roundel at the foot of the page contains the letters IB on a blue ground, but this is another overpainting: looking at the back of the leaf again, I think the roundel originally contained a crowned M. This suggests that the MS was made for a member of the Talbot family - possibly Margaret Beauchamp - and was later owned by a Bethune who inserted his own arms and initials'. The picture of the kneeling couple is similar to that in the Talbot Hours, and what is visible of the original decoration beneath the overpainting as described above, strongly suggests that the manuscript should be considered along
with the two preceding manuscripts, as belonging to John Talbot
and Margaret Beauchamp. The Scottish manuscript also contains a
scroll, the writing on which is only partly visible, but it looks
as though it might have been the beginning of 'Mon seul desir'.
The similarities between this manuscript and the Talbot Hours
suggest that it may have also been made for John Talbot. All three
books of Hours contain a middle English lyric based on the Litany.4

1. Described in N.R. Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in
no 689 + Plate XLIV.
3. Assistant Keeper in the Department of Manuscripts,
National Library of Scotland. I am grateful to
Ms Yeo for her letter of 20th January 1982.
4. D. Gray, 'A Middle English Illustrated Poem',
Medieval Studies for J.A.W. Bennet, ed.

7. LONDON, College of Arms MS B. 29, fols. 8-17v + 181 (Talbot Banners)
OWNER: John Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury

Armorial of the Talbots and families associated with them. England,
c.1442; 10 paper leaves, 7½" x 10"; 15 full-page paintings of
quarterly banners + 22 smaller banners.

The manuscript belonged to a Talbot, and as the first quarterly
banner is of Warwick and Talbot, it is probable that the manuscript
was made for John Talbot who married Margaret Beauchamp. It is
thought to have been made at the time Talbot received the earldom,
1442.2

1. Described in A.R. Wagner, A Catalogue of English
Mediaeval Rolls of Arms, pp.91-92.
2. Ibid. A manuscript given by Talbot to Margaret of Anjou is noted in a subsequent section of this list.

8. NEW YORK, Pierpont Morgan Library MS M. 893¹ (Hours of Henry Beauchamp)

OWNER: Henry Beauchamp Duke of Warwick (d.1446), son and heir of Richard Beauchamp (d.1439)

Book of Hours + Psalter (Sarum), Latin. England, 1430-40,² with Italian additions c.1482;³ 261 fols, 23 lines; 10⁴/₄" x 7⁵/₄"; 22 half-page miniatures, full-page borders + 5 later half-page miniatures (N. Italian).⁴

The signature 'Warrewyk' and the motto 'Deservyng causyth' are written at the foot of f.12. The motto was Henry Beauchamp's,⁵ implying that the manuscript was owned by him.


2. This is the date given in the Major Acquisitions catalogue. The manuscript is dated more generally as the first half of the fifteenth century in the Dyson Perrins catalogue, and as c.1430 in G. Schmidt, 'Two Unknown English Horae from the Fifteenth Century', Burlington Magazine, 103 (1961), 47-54 (p.53 note).

3. The date of the Italian additions is given in Major Acquisitions, on the basis of the added table of golden numbers for the years 1482-1509.

4. Ibid.

9. **LONDON, British Library MS Additional 48976¹ (English Rous roll)**

**COMMISSIONED BY:** Anne Beauchamp (d.1492), daughter of Richard Beauchamp and Isabella Despenser, and widow of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick (d.1471)

Illustrated armorial roll-chronicle of lords and benefactors of Warwick from earliest times, with English text by John Rous.²

England, 1483-5;³ 8 membranes; 23' x 1'; 64 pen and ink drawings of figures, partly coloured, under painted arms on recto, 94 painted coats of arms on verso.

(For evidence of commission see next manuscript.)

---


2. At the end of the roll (verso) is the inscription, 'This rol was labur'd & finishid by Master John Rows of Warrewyk'.

3. In the Catalogue of Additions it is said that the roll was probably completed before 9th April 1481, the date of the death of Richard III's son Edward, whose death is not recorded in the roll.

---

10. **LONDON, College of Arms MS Warwick Roll¹ (Latin Rous roll)**

**COMMISSIONED BY:** Anne Beauchamp Countess of Warwick

Illustrated armorial roll-chronicle as preceding manuscript, text in Latin by John Rous. England, 1483-5 with alterations 1485-91;² 24'6" x 11"; 66 drawings of figures under shields or banners on recto, 43 banners of arms and portrait of Rous on verso.
Kathleen Scott suggested that Anne Beauchamp was the patron of the two rolls which were compiled by John Rous, chaplain of Guy's Cliff, a chantry founded and sponsored by the Beauchamp family. Both rolls were compiled at the same time, though the Latin version has been altered to make its text more appropriate to the reign of Henry VII. The rolls draw favourable attention to the Beauchamp Earls of Warwick and emphasise Anne Beauchamp's nobility of character and her lawful inheritance of the Warwick lands and estates. Dr. Scott suggests a specific context for the production of the rolls: both were compiled at a time when Anne had been deprived of her inheritance in favour of her daughters and was actively seeking its restitution. The two rolls are linked both by their contents and author to someone interested in the Beauchamp family. Anne was the only surviving member of the main line of the Beauchamps at this time, and it is most probable that they were compiled at her instigation, as described by Dr. Scott, as part of her attempt to regain her inheritance.

2. That is, between the beginning of Henry VII's reign and Rous's death.
3. The original number of membranes is obscured by various joining-pieces and insertions.
4. 'The Caxton Master and his Patrons', p.62.
5. For the division of the inheritance, see Chapter 2, and GEC, XII, Part II, p.393.

11. LONDON, British Library MS Cotton Julius E. IV, Article 6

(Beauchamp Pageants)

COMMISSIONED BY: Anne Beauchamp Countess of Warwick
Pictorial 'life' of Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (d.1439), with English text. England, 1483-7; 28 fols; 11" x 7¼"; 53 pen and ink drawings over pencil sketches + 2 genealogical trees (unfinished) of Richard, his wives and offspring.

There are no signs of ownership in the manuscript, but like the Rous rolls, it was obviously closely connected with a member of the Beauchamp family. The most likely candidate for commissioning the manuscript is again Anne Beauchamp, dowager Countess of Warwick, and at the time of the pageants, the sole surviving child of Richard Beauchamp and Isabella Despenser. Kathleen Scott suggested that the pageants and the two rolls discussed previously, were composed for the same purpose: to draw attention to Anne's situation through the memory of her family, in this case the memory of an influential and respected figure. The following arguments are given by Dr. Scott in support of Anne Beauchamp as patron: (1) the contents of the manuscript suggest that the book was commissioned by someone with a strong interest in preserving the name of the Beauchamp family, through a famous member of that family, and that the compiler probably had access to family records; (2) Anne had already shown an interest in preserving the name and memory of her father; (3) the circumstances of Anne's life after the death of her husband suggest a plausible context for commissioning the book.

1. The manuscript is described and discussed in detail in Scott, 'The Caxton Master and his Patrons', pp.55-66. It is also described in A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library in the British Museum (London, 1802). The manuscript is reproduced in full in William Earl of Carysfort, The Pageants of Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (Roxburgh Club, 80
2. Scott, pp.64-65.
3. Suggested by Scott, pp.61-64. Anne was first suggested as the patron of the pageants by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, 'The Pageants of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, Commonly Called the Warwick MS', Burlington Magazine, 1 (1903), 151-64 (p.160).
4. In the construction of the fine tomb for Richard in the church of St. Mary's, Warwick. On this, see my Chapter 5.
5. See note 5 to the preceding manuscript.

Unidentified Owners

12. CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Harvard Law School Library MS 211

Nova Statuta (1 Edward III - 23 Henry VI) in French, with contemporary index and De modo tenendi parliamentum (later addition). England, c.1450: 2 233 fols; 11" x 7½"; illuminated initials and decorated borders. 3

In the lower border of f.1 is a scroll containing the name 'Beauchamp'. De Ricci suggested that this probably meant that the manuscript belonged to Henry Beauchamp Duke of Warwick (d.1446). The manuscript was later owned by William Fletewoode, Recorder of London. Henry Beauchamp is a possible candidate for the earlier and original owner of the manuscript, especially if the date of c.1450 allows for some flexibility (the 23rd regnal year of Henry VI was 1st September 1444-31st August 1445). However, without more compelling evidence, it is safer to say only that the manuscript was owned by or intended for a member of the Beauchamp family in the fifteenth century.

2. Edith G. Henderson of the Law School Library gave this date in a letter replying to queries about the manuscript. De Ricci gives the date as early fifteenth century.

3. Due to the condition of the manuscript, it was impossible to obtain photographs or microfilm, and I am grateful to Ms Henderson for providing me with details about the manuscript and a photostat of f.1.

Manuscripts Given As Gifts

13. PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale MS français 12421

DONOR: Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (d.1439) to Humphrey Duke of Gloucester (d.1447)

Boccaccio's Decameron in French translation of Laurent de Premierfait. France, second quarter 15th cent., before 1447; 2 i + 452 fols. double cols of 38 lines; 11½" x 8½"; miniatures, decorated initials.

After the Explicit on f.452, an inscription records the gift of the manuscript to Humphrey Duke of Gloucester from the Earl of Warwick, 'Cest livre est a moy Homfrey duc de gloucestre du don mon treschier cousin le conte de Warrewic'. 3 The formula is one frequently used by the Duke of Gloucester and the Earl of Warwick must have been Richard Beauchamp (d.1439), who was associated with Gloucester during the minority of Henry VI.

1. Described in H. Omont & C. Couderc, Catalogue Général des Manuscrits Français, II (Paris, 1896); C. Bozzolo, 'Manuscrits des traductions françaises d'oeuvres de Boccace dans les
14. **LONDON, British Library MS Royal 15 E. vi**

**DONOR:** John Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury (d.1453) to Margaret of Anjou Queen of Henry VI

Romances in French, and works of reference and advice suitable for nobles. France, c.1445; 440 fols, double cols; 18¼" x 13"; 140 miniatures, one full page picture, donor picture, genealogical diagram of royal Houses of England and France, decorated initials, borders.

On f.2v there is a picture of John Talbot presenting the book to Margaret of Anjou. There is a Talbot dog in the foreground of the picture, and at the bottom of the page there is a dedicatory inscription to the King and Queen containing Talbot's motto 'Mon seul desir'. The arms of Shrewsbury and Worcester with the Beauchamp and Warwick arms in the centre appear next to the dedication, and liberal scatterings of daisies, the badge of Margaret of Anjou, appear in the borders. The manuscript was probably made for the marriage of Margaret and Henry in 1445, when Talbot acted as one of Margaret's escorts on the journey to England.
1. Described in Warner & Gilson, Catalogue of Western Manuscripts, 2.
2. When Margaret came to England, and before 1447 when the Duke of Gloucester, shown as one of the supporters of the royal family tree on f.3, died, Warner & Gilson, Ibid.

This concludes the list of manuscripts which forms the basis of the discussion of the books of the Beauchamp family. Arranged by contents, they give: five books of Hours or service books (the Abergavenny missal, the three Talbot books of Hours, and the Hours of Henry Beauchamp); five manuscripts of reference, historical and genealogical interest (the Talbot Banners, the two Rous rolls, the Beauchamp pageants, and the Statutes); and four manuscripts of poetry and works of advice and instruction (Trevisa, Froissart, Boccaccio, romances). However, before going on to a discussion of the owners and the contexts of the Beauchamp manuscripts, some attention needs to be given to Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 61.

Corpus Christi MS 61: A Beauchamp or Neville Manuscript?

Corpus Christi MS 61 is included here as it has suggested and suggestive connections with both the Beauchamp and Neville families, connections which are often noted but which need to be fully aired to appreciate some of the problems of assigning this manuscript to either family. On the basis of the evidence, ownership of this manuscript cannot be securely claimed for either of the two families, but the importance of the manuscript in discussions of fifteenth century book production and patronage, and the clues which point towards the Beauchamp and Neville families mean that
it cannot be ignored.

CAMBRIDGE, Corpus Christi College MS 61

Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde. England, probably 1st quarter 15th cent. (after 1385 and before 1456); 151 fols + 2 endleaves, 5 seven-line stanzas on average to page; 12½" x 8¼"; frontispiece and 90 spaces for pictures.

This well-known manuscript contains the famous frontispiece on f.1v of an open-air scene with Chaucer in a pulpit before a courtly audience, with a separate scene in the background of an outdoor meeting of two courtly groups outside the walls of a city, probably a reference to an incident in the story. The frontispiece has excited scholars and attempts have been made to claim it as an illustration of an actual event - Chaucer reading his poem to the court of Richard II - in some cases with attempted identification of individual figures. This in turn, has influenced views about Chaucer's contemporary audience and Chaucer's position with regard to that audience, the frontispiece according to this interpretation, seeming to imply Chaucer's position as a court poet. More recently however, the historical veracity of the frontispiece as a representation of an event has been questioned, and it has been more convincingly regarded as an imaginative representation of the fictional life of the poem: 'it represents as reality the myth of delivery that Chaucer cultivates so assiduously in the poem, with his references to "al this compaigny" of lovers "in this place".'

The frontispiece aside, the book is also exceptional in England in the intended scope of its final form. It is written in littera quadrata, an expensive 'display' script usually reserved for de-luxe
manuscripts, liturgical books and headings.  The layout of the manuscript is 'generous' with five seven-line stanzas per page, a one-line space between each stanza, and some ninety spaces left for illustration. There are headings and colophons in red at the beginning and end of each prologue and book, with a large space left between the colophon of one book and the heading of the next, and a smaller space between the end of each prologue and the beginning of each book.

The decoration of the manuscript was never completed and it is not known whether the book was commissioned by a particular patron or whether it was the 'speculative venture' of some entrepreneur. Whatever the case, it was an expensive and ambitious venture, without parallel in English book production at this time. The reason for the unfinished state of the manuscript is not known either and there is a tendency to see in this incompleteness an indictment of the taste and conviction of the English luxury book-buying public of the period.

The search for fifteenth century owners of the manuscript has been concentrated by the inscription on f.101v, "neuer Foryeteth Anne neuill'", in a late fifteenth century hand in plummet. Two ladies of that name who have been considered as prime candidates for the reference and for ownership are Anne Neville Duchess of Buckingham, wife of Humphrey Stafford, and Anne Beauchamp, a Neville after her marriage to Richard Neville who became Earl of Warwick.

In support of Anne Duchess of Buckingham is another inscription in the manuscript. In the margin of f.108r the name 'Knyvett' appears written upside down in plummet. Anne's daughter Joanna married Sir William Knyvett of Norfolk in 1477. More circumstantial evidence for this Anne Neville comes from another family connection.
Anne was the daughter of Joan Beaufort, the legitimised daughter of John of Gaunt and Katherine Swynford, herself sister-in-law of Geoffrey Chaucer. Brusendorff suggested that Joan Beaufort had the Corpus manuscript transcribed from a family copy of Troilus, originally belonging to John of Gaunt, and executed at the time of the poem's composition in the 1380s, which included a frontispiece of the author reciting the poem at court. Brusendorff here seems to have been seduced by the frontispiece in Corpus Christi MS 61, interpreting it as an historical record.

Anne Beauchamp, daughter of Richard Earl of Warwick, is the candidate favoured by Malcolm Parkes. The earliest identifiable person to have the manuscript in his possession was John Shirley, secretary to Anne's father, and compiler of manuscript anthologies. He is also known to have retained contact with the Beauchamps after he was actively engaged in their service. On f.1r there is a couplet in Shirley's hand, the refrain of Lydgate's prayer for the King, Queen and people, which also appears in two other manuscripts in Shirley's hand and in a Shirley-derived manuscript. Parkes speculated that the manuscript could have been Anne's before it passed into Shirley's hand. Parkes also notes that the wording of the Anne Neville inscription is 'attractively relevant' to what is known of Anne Beauchamp's situation in the latter half of the fifteenth century. It may also be noted in this context that the inscription is placed in the margin against a stanza of Troilus's lament over the proposed exchange of Criseyde for Antenor, more specifically when he wonders how he will fare when 'hope is lasse and lasse alway' (lines 575-81).

I think it is important to state here that while the Anne Neville inscription provides clues about the early ownership of the
manuscript, it cannot necessarily provide proof of ownership. It could have been written by someone of that name or by someone close to or related to one of the Anne Nevilles. However, as A.I. Doyle has pointed out, there were a number of ladies with this name,\textsuperscript{15} and a few might be mentioned to indicate the difficulties of precise identification:

- Anne Neville (d.1485), daughter of Anne Beauchamp Countess of Warwick and Richard Neville. She married Richard III and at her death, there were rumours that he had poisoned her,\textsuperscript{16} an attractive context for a reminder to never forget her.

- Anne Neville, daughter of Earl Ralph (d.1425) and his first wife Margaret Stafford. She married Sir Gilbert Umfreville of Kyme.\textsuperscript{17}

- Anne Neville, granddaughter of Joan Beaufort and Ralph Neville. Her father was Edward Lord Abergavenny (d.1476).\textsuperscript{18}

On the available evidence, I would incline towards the inscription referring to either Anne Beauchamp or her daughter Anne, wife of Richard III, on the basis of the known Shirley association and their own circumstances.

B. The Manuscripts and their Owners

The Beauchamp manuscripts form an undeniably small but manageable group, and none of the individuals discussed here can on this evidence be called collectors or bibliophiles. The majority of the manuscripts were concentrated in the hands of a few closely related individuals, and although from such a small corpus it is difficult to identify any family traditions, a number of the manuscripts show an interest in family history. This group of manuscripts also provides evidence of a number of ways in which manuscripts were obtained, and of some of
the purposes a book might serve. As the manuscripts are distributed among such a small number of people, I will look at these individuals first and then at the manuscripts in general.

Richard Beauchamp

Of the three manuscripts associated with Richard Beauchamp, the most interesting is perhaps Bib. Nat. MS f.fr. 831 containing poetry by Froissart. It is one of only two known manuscripts of Froissart's poetry and contains a number of virelays, balades and roundels, as well as longer works including: *Le Dittie de la flour de la Margherite*, *La Plaidoirie de la Roze et de la Violette*, *Le Trettie de L'Espinette amoureuse*, *Le Trettie du Joli Buisson de Jonece*, *Le Paradis amoureus*, *Le Temple d'onneur* and *Le Prison amoureuse*. All in all, it is a collection of French courtly literature, fashionable at the end of the fourteenth century, and attractive in English aristocratic circles too, if the episode of Froissart presenting a copy of his works to Richard II is a reliable witness. The contents of the manuscript may be relevant to a balade said to be by Richard Beauchamp, which appears in a manuscript compiled by John Shirley, B.L. MS Additional 16165.

This manuscript and a closely related one, Bib. Nat. MS f.fr. 830, which between them contain all of Froissart's known poetry, were compiled, probably from a common source and possibly under Froissart's supervision, within a year of each other, with MS f.fr. 830 first, in 1393. They were both probably intended as presentation copies from the author, and the script and decoration in both is uniform, though MS f.fr. 831 has a frontispiece miniature of Froissart addressing his audience. There are also some differences
in the number and order of the contents between the two manuscripts. 25

The manuscript was French in origin, but it is not clear how or when it came into Richard Beauchamp's possession. Scheler noted both the difference in the contents of the two manuscripts and the English provenance of MS f.fr. 831 early in its history, and wondered if the two might be connected, suggesting that the Débat du cheval et du levrier, Dit du florin and six pastourelles, all missing from the manuscript, were by reason of context or politics, inappropriate to an English audience. 26 With these considerations in mind, Scheler offered some attractive speculations as to the fate of the manuscript presented by Froissart to Richard II, and without committing himself ('nous n'affirmons rien'), 27 he noted that the description in Froissart's Chroniques of the appearance of the volume ('enlumé, escript et historié'), its contents ('tous les traitiés amoureux et de moralité'), and the date of presentation (1395), 28 are not in the least incompatible with that manuscript and MS f.fr. 831 being one and the same. 29 Lettenhove's interpretation, earlier than Scheler's, was slightly different, as he suggested that MS f.fr. 831 might be a copy of the manuscript for Richard II, presented at the same time to the Earl of Warwick. 30 Both of these suggestions are attractive possibilities, but unfortunately, there is no evidence to confirm them.

The other French manuscript known to have been in Richard Beauchamp's hands is Bib. Nat. MS fr. 12421, Laurent de Premierfait's translation of Boccaccio's Decameron, which Beauchamp presented to Humphrey Duke of Gloucester. The manuscript belongs to the second quarter of the fifteenth century and contains ninety five miniatures attributed to the Fastolf Master. 31 It is not known whether or not the manuscript originally belonged to Richard Beauchamp, or whether
it was obtained with the sole intention of giving it to Gloucester. There were certainly plenty of opportunities for contact between Beauchamp and Gloucester, especially during the early years of Henry VI's reign when Beauchamp was a member of the minority Council, and subsequently the King's tutor, though there is nothing to suggest that Beauchamp was personally close to the politically ambitious Gloucester. There were also numerous opportunities for Beauchamp to obtain the manuscript during his tours of duty in France, and it was during one stay in France that he commissioned Lydgate to translate the Title and Pedigree of Henry VI into English.

This gift to a known patron and bibliophile, while it is also a gift to a superior, might suggest a knowledge on the part of Beauchamp of the tastes of the Duke of Gloucester, perhaps even an awareness of a specific interest, though in the absence of evidence, it has to be classed along with the other gifts of books Gloucester received from his associates.

Richard Beauchamp's interest in a manuscript containing translations by Trevisa (B.L. MS Additional 24194), must have arisen from his knowledge of the origin of the translations. The manuscript contains Trevisa's translations of the Dialogus inter militem et clericum (from Occam's De Potestate Ecclesiastica et Saeculari), Bishop Fitzralph's sermon Defensio Curatorum, and Higden's Polychronicon. The whole manuscript comprises an informative and instructive collection of reading material with a debate on the nature of spiritual and temporal power, a staunch defence of the established Church by way of an attack on the Friars, and a popular and comprehensive 'history'.

The Trevisa manuscript is a large volume written in a neat hand and contains a few modest decorated initials and borders. It
has the same contents and was written by the same scribe as Cambridge, St. John's College MS R. 1 (1204), a London scribe engaged in commercial book production, whose hand has also been identified in B.L. MS Royal 18 C. xxii (Confessio Amantis), Oxford, Brasenose College MS 9 (Love's Mirror of the Life of Christ), and Bib. Nat., MS anglais 25 (Guy de Chauliac's Cyrurgie). It is described as a 'metropolitan commercial product', and though not of the finest quality, is reasonably representative of the kind of book found in aristocratic and other hands throughout the fifteenth century.

Richard Beauchamp's interest in this particular manuscript must have had its origins in family connections. His first wife Elizabeth Berkeley was the daughter of Thomas Lord Berkeley (d.1417), and Trevisa (d. c.1402), was vicar of Berkeley in Gloucestershire, and chaplain to Lord Berkeley, for whom he had translated the Polychronicon in 1387. Elizabeth Berkeley continued the tradition established by her family and commissioned John Walton's translation (1410) of Boethius. Rather disappointingly in view of his patronage and interest in vernacular translations, Lord Berkeley's only book-bequest to Elizabeth in his will was his best pair of matins previously mentioned.

The three manuscripts connected with Richard Beauchamp can hardly be used to suggest a vast range of as yet undiscovered interests, but taken together with his alleged authorship of a balade and his patronage of Lydgate, they give a broader indication of some of his interests and provide a few examples of the ways in which manuscripts might be obtained.
Margaret Beauchamp and John Talbot

The books of Hours owned by Margaret Beauchamp and her husband (three if the Blair's College manuscript in Edinburgh is accepted as one of them), are attractive examples of the most popular of devotional books, 'the late medieval best-seller'. The size, format and contents of these Hours give a greater sense of intimacy, and reveal more about the piety of their owners, and possibly about their involvement in the creation of the manuscripts, than some larger more lavish books.

The long, narrow (holster) format of the books indicates that they were convenient for carrying and reading and were intended for private, regular use. It is probably the size of the books which has encouraged the conjecture that Talbot had his Hours with him when he was killed at Castillon in 1453, a speculation not discouraged by the knowledge that the manuscript was certainly in France from the seventeenth century, and possibly earlier. The pictures of Margaret and John before the Virgin with their patron saints (St. Margaret and St. George), are conventionally expressed images of their piety. A more personal statement of their piety is given by the inclusion in their Hours and in the Blair's College manuscript, of an illustrated middle English lyric poem based on the Litany. Each stanza concentrates on a particular scene, or a spiritual figure or group, and has a related picture, though not always on the same page. The pictures act as a devotional focus for the text, as well as being devotional images in their own right, having a further practical use as an index, indicating the place reached in the Litany.

The choice of saints and their iconography is orthodox, though there are some unusual French spellings of saint's names.
lyric provides a concentrated devotional image:

Saint Trinite, all blessid and eterne,
Euer regnant in parfait vnite,
Whos pouer, Lord, no tonge may discerne
Ne joies nombre of Thy deite;
Thi grace euer in oure necessite
Be in oure help oure fauti~
An with Thin hand, Lord, every day [vs] blesse
(Stanza 5)

As Douglas Gray has pointed out, it is one of the few English
lyrics which can be called a Litany and it is unusual to find
illustrated vernacular devotional material of this kind in a book of
this quality. 48

Another inclusion which gives the Talbot Hours some individu-
ality is the appearance of the first five stanzas of the prayer to
St. Alban from Lydgate's Life of St. Albon and St. Amphibial on
f.135, an addition probably influenced by a tradition of patronage
of Lydgate among Talbot's in-laws. 50 The prayer may indicate a
particular devotion to the Saint, and to Talbot's own situation,
heavily involved as he was with military affairs in France:

O blessid Albon, O Martir most benygne,
Callid of Brytaynes Steward most notable,
Prince of knyghthode previd be many a signe,
In all thy werkes Iust, prudent, and tretable,
And in thy domes Rightfull and merciable,
Be yn our pavayce sheld and proteccyoun,
O Prothomartyr of Brutys Albioun.

Let all thy seruauntis grace and mercy fynde,
Which that call to the in myschef and distresse,
And haue thi passioun and martyrdom in mynde;
Ageyne foreyn enemyes and all froward duresse,
Of thi benygne mercifull goodnesse,
Them to defende be thou her champioun,
O Prothomartir of Brutis Albioun. 4466/1-14

The inclusion of part of this prayer and the Litany poem allow
a glimpse of the private piety of Talbot and Margaret Beauchamp,
often masked behind the more public expressions of religious devotion
such as Talbot's pilgrimage to Rome, or his support of preachers and scholars. 

The Talbot Hours and Hours of Margaret Beauchamp were both obtained in France c.1424, close to the time of their marriage. By this date, Talbot had already seen service in France under Henry V, including time at Rouen (the suggested origin of the Talbot Hours) and service with Richard Beauchamp, Margaret's father. The place of origin of the books of Hours is not surprising considering Talbot's military duties, and it is possible that he was influenced by the Duke of Bedford, himself a collector of manuscripts, with whom Talbot had close military, administrative and private associations. The miniatures in the Hours of Margaret Beauchamp are attributed to a follower of the Bedford Master.

The volume of French romances with other works given by Talbot to Margaret of Anjou, is a large volume, copiously decorated with fine borders, some full-page pictures, and numerous well-executed miniatures by a number of French artists working in Rouen, mostly followers of the Bedford Master. The main artist, the Talbot Master, was responsible for one hundred and twenty two of the one hundred and forty three miniatures, and his identified collaborators include the Fastolf Master and the Hoo Master, both of whose work has been noticed in a number of manuscripts.

The manuscript contains an anthology of courtly instruction and narrative. It includes the romances of Alexander, Charlemagne, Oger of Demark, Four sons of Aymon, Pontus and Sidoine, Guy of Warwick, and the Swan Knight. Other works include the *Arbre des Batailles*, three books of Colonna's *De Regimine Principum* (translated by Henri de Gauchi), Chronicles of Normandy, Chartier's *Le breviaire*
des nobles, Christine de Pisan's Faits d'armes (with the passage concerning English treachery tactfully abbreviated), and the Statutes of the Order of the Garter. 60

While the contents of the volume were of interest in themselves, the size of the book and the quality of the art-work suggest that its value was as a decorative volume as much as an anthology of entertaining and instructive literature, and as a symbol of the status of its owner and by association, the donor of the volume. Its size and weight confirm that it was never intended for informal or spontaneous reading, and as a gift it indicates what was felt to be appropriate for a French Queen. There may be something to be said here about the limitations of English aristocratic taste, as nothing comparable seems to have survived for any member of the Beauchamp or Neville families. If the ambitious Corpus Christi College manuscript of Troilus and Criseyde had been finished, it might have been a comparable secular book; as it is, its unfinished state is a chastening reminder of the differences between de-luxe book production in England and France, and of the relative expectations of their book-buying publics.

The Royal manuscript provides a number of reminders of the social and political function of books. Folio 2v contains a picture of Talbot, (escorted by an obedient Talbot hound), presenting a book to the Queen. Talbot's arms (with his wife's in the centre), and a verse pledging loyalty to the King and Queen, incorporating his motto 'Mon seul desir', appear on the same page. On the facing page is a diagram of the genealogies of the royal Houses of France and England, taken from the pictorial genealogy which had circulated with Lydgate's Title and Pedigree, commissioned some twenty years
earlier by Talbot's father-in-law, Richard Beauchamp, as part of the propaganda campaign associated with the dual monarchy. The royal Houses are supported in the manuscript by Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and Richard Duke of York, and together these pages serve as constant reminders both of the significance of the marriage and the origin of the volume.

Illustration of a very different kind and quality is found in the Talbot Banners (College of Arms MS B. 29), which are now bound up in a volume given to the College in 1669. The manuscript is thought to have been made for Talbot at the time he was created Earl of Shrewsbury (1442), and the banners of the arms of Talbot and related families provide a visual catalogue of reference, a reminder both of family and personal history.

Although the Talbot Banners cannot be compared in quality or content with the other manuscripts associated with Talbot and Margaret Beauchamp, they share with them a common interest in displaying visual reminders of Talbot, his wife, and the Talbot family, an interest shared by many other members of the English nobility including Anne Beauchamp to be discussed below. Perhaps these 'reminders' were given a more practical immediacy in Talbot's case by his and his wife's vigorous pursuit of the Berkeley inheritance, a campaign grounded in and governed by awareness and justification of family alliances and possessions.

Anne Beauchamp

Anne Beauchamp's patronage, John Rous, and the contents of the Rous rolls and Beauchamp pageants are discussed in Chapter 5. The discussion here will concentrate on the manuscripts.
The rolls and pageants are three more manuscripts which demonstrate an interest in family history, ancestry and heraldry, with the additional motive of using family history for propaganda purposes. Both rolls are dated c.1483–85. The English roll (B.L. MS Addit. 48976) has Yorkist affiliations, and the Latin roll (College of Arms MS Warwick Roll) was altered between 1485 and 1491, to give it a Lancastrian bias. Both rolls have pen and ink drawings of members of the Beauchamp family, their historical and legendary predecessors as lords of Warwick, and other important personages in the history of Warwick. Each figure has a painted coat of arms above it, many have badges, and all have a concise biography of the individual concerned beneath the figure. Particular emphasis is placed in the text on nobility of character and on individuals who undertook building work or other improvements in and around Warwick.

The recto of the English roll was written by three hands. Hand A was responsible for membranes 1–7, Hand B for membrane 8, and Hand C for the corrections, additions and genealogies. Hand C also wrote the first inscription of names against the arms on the verso, and it is the only hand in the Latin version. As this hand was responsible for the corrections, it has been suggested that it may have been Rous himself. If so, perhaps the 'finishid' of the inscription identifying Rous on the verso of the roll refers to these activities.

The two rolls contain good examples of late fifteenth century pen and ink drawing and demonstrate the popularity of heraldic and genealogical manuscripts. More important for the purposes of this study, they illustrate how a family regarded itself and wished to be seen in relation to its past history during a time of crisis.
and also demonstrate the means by which a member of the family went about creating and reaffirming that past.

The Beauchamp pageants consist of fifty three ink drawings over pencil sketches of events in the life of Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (d.1439), with a few significant royal events. The pageants conclude with two unfinished genealogies of Richard, his wives and their children. Each pageant has a short text explaining the events depicted in the illustrations which range from Richard's birth to his death and include Richard on pilgrimage, Richard jousting, Richard on royal business, and Richard being received by foreign dignitaries. They conclude with the return journey of Richard's body to England.

The pageants have been called a 'momentous creation', unique in depicting in such a way, the life of a relatively recently deceased member of the English nobility:

To that point in the history of English art, nothing comparable had been made: there had been illustrated lives of Christ, the Virgin, the saints, of remote historical figures such as Alexander and Marco Polo, but never before had there been a pictorial life of a nearly contemporary historical personage.

The full-page illustrations are among the best of their kind produced in England at this time, and the battle, tournament and ceremonial scenes such as the knighting of Richard (pageant 3), are particularly noteworthy in their composition.

The artist, named the Caxton Master from his work in a manuscript of Caxton's Ovid moralised, is thought to have been trained in the Low Countries, possibly in Utrecht. He was at work in England from the end of the 1470s and during this time he was in contact with the new style of the Ghent-Bruges school, either through a return visit to the Low Countries, or acquaintance with the Flemish
books brought back from Bruges by Edward IV. His work has been
detected in a number of manuscripts, and it is thought that he began
his career in England attached to a shop, and had moved to 'more
courtly circles' by the time the pageants were produced. Dr. Scott
wondered if the Rous rolls, of comparable format and showing similarities of technique with the Caxton Master, may have been produced
in the same atelier as the pageants.

The choice of drawings rather than of painted pictures is an
interesting one. Pen-work illustration had been popular in England
throughout the fifteenth century and certain manuscripts, usually
instructive works in English, traditionally contained illustration
of this kind. Among manuscripts illustrated with pen drawings
were guild documents, botanical, astrological and heraldic manuscripts,
Mandeville's Travels and Deguilleville's Pilgrimages. Dr. Scott
notes a flowering of interest in this kind of illustration during the
second half of the fifteenth century, 'even among prominent patrons'.

The quality of the drawings, the use of a foreign artist in
touch with recent stylistic developments, and the original format
of the pageants, indicate the importance of the pageants to their
patron. The preservation of the family name merited the best and
resulted in a unique manuscript. Together with the Rous rolls, the
pageants offer an insight into family propaganda at a time when
direct political action was impossible.

Henry Beauchamp

The Hours of Henry Beauchamp (Pierpont Morgan MS M. 893) is
an example of a good quality English book of Hours from the second
quarter of the fifteenth century. The illumination belongs to the
stylistic tradition of Scheerre,⁷⁷ and although the original miniatures were attributed to William Abell,⁷⁸ two distinct artists have since been identified.⁷⁹ The manuscript was written by the same scribe as another book of Hours of English provenance now in Altenburg Abbey in Austria (MS AB. 6. D. 4),⁸⁰ which contains artwork attributed to Scheerre.⁸¹

The manuscript is known to have been in Italy later in the fifteenth century (c.1482), from the added table of golden numbers for the years 1482-1509. The North Italian miniatures which were probably added at the same time have been tentatively linked with the illuminator Tommaso da Modena.⁸² It is probable that the manuscript passed to Beauchamp's widow Cecily Neville on Henry's death in 1446, and from her to her second husband John Tiptoft Earl of Worcester,⁸³ whom she married in 1449, a year before her death. Tiptoft's known fondness for Italian manuscripts and scholarship and his visits to Italy probably account for the manuscript's appearance in Italy.

From the evidence of this one book of Hours, it is possible to speculate that had he lived Henry might have been the owner of some fine manuscripts.

William Beauchamp and the Beauchamp of Abergavenny family

The Abergavenny missal (Trinity College MS 8), some fifty years earlier than the Hours of Henry Beauchamp, is decorated in 'pure English style',⁸⁴ and reveals equally important stylistic affiliations with the best contemporary illumination taking place in England.

According to Margaret Rickert in her study of the Carmelite Missal, the miniatures in the Trinity manuscript show close affinities
with the Liber Regalis, and probably represent a transitional phase between the styles of the Liber and the Carmelite Missal, perhaps indicating the influence of Bohemian artists on English style. The missal contains historiated initials and in Rickert's words 'beautiful decorative letters and partial borders on a very small scale but of very fine quality'. She suggested that the decorative work might be by the same hand as the Canon and Prefaces in the Carmelite Missal, and that some of the historiated initials (which show a variation in style throughout the manuscript), were close to the work of Hand B of the Carmelite Missal.

The missal was regarded as a suitable volume in which to record the births of the Abergavenny children, and it may well be the best mass book which William left to his wife Joan.

C. Quality, Contents and Provenance

Quality

It is difficult to make generalisations about a group of manuscripts separated in some cases by almost a century, which in all probability represent only a portion of the books owned by the people discussed here. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that the overall sense of the group is generally of good quality, though not de-luxe manuscripts, ranging from modest border and initial decoration, to more elaborate illumination in touch with recent stylistic developments. The Trinity missal and the Hours of Henry Beauchamp contain some of the better native art-work being carried out in England at their respective dates; the books of Hours belonging to Margaret Beauchamp and John Talbot contain good French work of a kind fashionable among the occupying forces on the Continent. The two Rous
rolls have good pen-work figures, and the Beauchamp pageants are some of the best pen illustrations of the time. Richard Beauchamp's Trevisa manuscript contains unexceptional, though competently executed decoration of a commercial kind. The Harvard Law School Library manuscript of the Statutes, tentatively associated with Henry Beauchamp, was probably commercially produced and has a nicely decorated opening page, the rest of the manuscript being sparsely decorated.

It is also difficult to judge how much the appearance of a manuscript was influenced by its owner. There are grounds for suspecting that the format of the Rous rolls and Beauchamp pageants were a deliberate choice by Anne Beauchamp. Of the remaining manuscripts, the Talbot Hours and the Hours of Margaret Beauchamp show individuality in their format and some personal choice in contents, though it is likely that the style of their art work was dictated by what was current among the upper echelons of English soldiers and administrators in France.

Provenance

The provenance of the manuscripts is a more straightforward matter: the Beauchamps obtained their manuscripts from France and England. The Boccaccio manuscript given by Richard Beauchamp to the Duke of Gloucester, the books of Hours belonging to Talbot and Margaret Beauchamp, and the large book given to Margaret of Anjou, all came from France, and all were obtained at a time when their owners or donors were involved with matters in France. The Froissart manuscript is the exception among the French manuscripts, as it may have been in England at the end of the fourteenth century.
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The manuscripts from England are distributed more evenly from the late fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century. The Trinity missal belongs to the second half of the fourteenth century, the Trevisa manuscript to the early fifteenth century, the Hours of Henry Beauchamp to the second quarter of the fifteenth century, the Talbot Banners and Statutes to the mid-fifteenth century, and the Rous rolls and Beauchamp pageants to the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Further, the Trevisa manuscript, the Rous rolls and the pageants can all be linked with metropolitan commercial book production, in the early and later decades of the fifteenth century respectively. The scribe of the Trevisa manuscript worked on a number of other books and the artist of the Beauchamp pageants was responsible for illustrations in a number of manuscripts for both mercantile and courtly clients.

Contents

In this group of manuscripts, the largest single category is of service books and book of Hours, three of the Hours containing an English lyric poem. There are also three manuscripts dealing with family genealogy and heraldry, one with the text in English, another in Latin, and a manuscript devoted to the life and deeds of a member of the Beauchamp family, with the explanatory text in English. The remaining manuscripts include a book of Statutes in French, an anthology of translations by Trevisa, and a rather isolated book of courtly poetry. Separating the contents of the manuscripts, the areas they cover are: devotional works and works of instruction, lyric poetry, and works of history, heraldry, genealogy and reference. As far as general statements can be made from such a small group, there
seems to be an interest throughout the period covered by these manuscripts in works in English, particularly seen here in works for private devotion or concerned with family history.

General Themes

It is possible to note two general areas of interest from these manuscripts which occur throughout this study. First, there is the use of books as gifts to social superiors, a common practice throughout the middle ages. Secondly, it is interesting to note the political contexts which often governed or influenced the acquisition of manuscripts: the 'social' gifts previously mentioned, the purchase of books in France during military and administrative service there, the political and personal circumstances which necessitated the production of the Rous rolls and Beauchamp pageants.

It is also possible to identify a trend, if not exactly a tradition, of displaying in words and pictures, the family, individuals, and family connections, and although this interest was by no means confined to the Beauchamp family, I believe it to have been an important one for them, when considering their literary and artistic patronage. It is also worth noting that a number of the books arising from family associations are those books already mentioned as having identifiable links with commercial book-production. The origins of Trevisa's translations have already been mentioned. Of the others, the Rous rolls were compiled by a chaplain closely associated with the Beauchamp family, and the text of the pageants must have been compiled by someone with access to the family. All of this suggests a mingling of 'household' with civic and cosmopolitan expertise both at the beginning and end of the fifteenth century.
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19. Poems from this manuscript and from MS f. fr. 830 were first printed in J.A. Buchon, *Poésies de J. Froissart Extraites de Deux Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi* (Paris, 1829).


21. This is discussed more fully in Chapter 5.

22. Scheler, op.cit., p. x. MS f. fr. 830 is described ibid., pp.x-xiv; and in A. Paulin Paris, op.cit., pp.374-83 (no 839).

23. Scheler, pp.x-xv.

24. Ibid., p.x.

25. A list of the contents of both manuscripts is given in A. Paulin Paris nos 839, 840.
Relations with Gloucester would have been strained by the assistance he gave to Beauchamp's opponent James Berkeley in the Beauchamp-Berkeley dispute, see Cooke, 'The Great Berkeley Law-Suit', passim.

Weiss, Humanism, p.61.

Printed in Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum, ed. Perry.


Doyle, 'English Books In and Out of Court', English Court Culture, p.1

Dialogus, ed. Perry, p.lxxxvi.


In Chapter 2.


In his will, Talbot left instructions that a chapel dedicated to the Virgin and St. George should be built at his expense in the church where he was to be buried, G.H. Vane, 'Will of John Talbot, First Earl of Shrewsbury, 1452', Transactions Shropshire Archaeological Society, IV (1904), 371-78 (p.373). Pollard, 'The Family of Talbot', p.404, says that these wishes were not carried out. The portraits in glass at Compton Wynyates have already been referred to in Chapter 2.

The lyric is printed in full in D. Gray, 'A Middle English Illustrated Poem'. The Talbot Hours contains only stanzas 1-5 and 16 of the lyric ibid., p.194.

Ibid., p.188.

Ibid., pp.190-91, 195.

Ibid., pp.187, 192.

The Life of Saint Alban and Saint Amphibal, ed. J.E. Van Der Westhuizen (Leiden, 1974), p.10. The extract in the Talbot Hours corresponds to 11. 4466/1-35 of this edition, and must have been added to the manuscript after 1439 when the Life was written, ibid., p.25.

Beauchamp patronage of Lydgate is discussed in Chapter 6.

Pollard, 'The Family of Talbot', p.404, gives details of Talbot's patronage and the pilgrimage to Rome. A Latin hymn to St. George, Talbot's patron saint, appears on f. 135v, and on f. 107v is a short prayer for victory and safe return to England, suggesting that he carried his Hours with him.
(I)esu whom ye serue dayly  
Vpon your enemies gyff you victory  
Off the holy Crosse the vertu  
Your gode ffortune alwey Renew  
Oure lady and saynt gabryell  
Geve you long lyffe and gode hele  
And saynt george the gode knyght  
Ouer your ffomen geue you myzt  
And holy saynt Kateryne  
To zoure begynnynge send gode fyne  
Saynt christofre botefull on see and lond  
Joyfully make you see England.

(Yates Thompson Catalogue, pp.226, 224-5.

52. Pollard, 'The Family of Talbot', pp.139-41. After the marriage Talbot became closely involved with Beauchamp affairs.

53. Ibid., p.144. Bedford was godfather to Talbot's eldest son by Margaret.

54. Yates Thompson Catalogue, p.236. These are thought to be superior to the miniatures in Talbot's Hours.


56. Williams, op.cit., p.191. For other work of the Talbot Master ibid., + note.


58. Williams, op.cit., p.191.

59. For other work of the Hoo Master, ibid., p.206. For other work of the Fastolf Master, Alexander, 'A Lost Leaf', pp.249-51.

60. A list of contents is given in Warner & Gilson, 2.

61. This is discussed in Chapter 6. It is interesting to note the inclusion of the romance of Guy of Warwick. The Guy story was extremely popular and the Beauchamps claimed descent from him (see Chapter 5).


63. For Talbot and the Berkeley dispute, Pollard, 'The Family of Talbot', pp.36-51. Talbot and Lady Margaret also disputed the Beauchamp inheritance which went to Richard Neville via his wife Anne Beauchamp. Talbot makes a passing reference to this in his will where he names his second choice of burial place as 'the Newe Chapelle there the whiche Richarde late Earl of War'k my fader in lawe late let make & ordyn In case that any tyme hereafter y may attayne to the name & lordeship of Warewik as right wolle.', Vane, op.cit., p.373. Some other items which carried Talbot and Beauchamp arms and badges were bequeathed to Margaret, 'all suche Vessell of Sylver as byn make with my Armes & hers togedre or with the dogge or with the ragged staff', ibid., p.375.

64. The text of the English roll and the alterations in the Latin roll are given in John Rous, The Rous Roll.


66. Wright, 'The Rous Roll', p.79.


68. Ibid.

69. Ibid., pp.3-24.

70. Ibid., pp.42, 60.
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71. Ibid., pp.59, 67-68.
72. Ibid., p.67.
73. Ibid., p.62.
74. Ibid., p.68.
75. Ibid., pp.68-69.
76. Ibid., p.69.
79. Pierpont Morgan Library, Major Acquisitions, no 34.
81. Ibid., pp.48-52.
83. Mitchell, John Tiptoft, p.150.
84. Rickert, The Reconstructed Carmelite Missal, p.79. The remaining details in this paragraph are from here.
86. This is discussed further in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4: THE NEVILLE MANUSCRIPTS

This chapter is concerned with the Neville manuscripts and follows the same format as the preceding chapter. Manuscripts which do not appear in the list, such as those belonging to husbands or those with conjectured associations with the Nevilles, are incorporated in the discussion which follows the list, as appropriate.

A. List of Manuscripts

Identified Owners

1. LONDON, British Library MS Cotton Vitellius E. ix

OWNER: Katherine Neville Duchess of Norfolk (still living 1483),
dughter of Ralph Neville and Joan Beaufort

The manuscript was almost completely destroyed in the 1731 Cotton library fire. A few fragments of the third article remain. The contents of the manuscript are described in the 1696 Cotton Catalogue as: 1. Calendarium vetus; 2. Orationes cum picturis historias varias N. Testamenti repraesentantibus; 3. Psalter, Latinum cum versione Gallicana ad singulos versus apposita; mutilum ab initio ... ."

The catalogue also identifies the owner of the manuscript;

Erat olim liber Katharinae, Ducissae Norfolciensis, filiae Radulphi, Comitis Westmorlandiae, et Janae uxoris filiae Joannis de Gandavo, Ducis Lancastriae, quam dono dedit Ceciliae Dudleiae nepti suae; ut illa propria manu testatur.
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1. GEC, IX, pp.605-7.
2. T. Smith, Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Cottonianae (Oxford, 1696), p.121. I am grateful to Dr. A.I. Doyle for informing me of this manuscript.

2. NEW YORK, Public Library MS Spencer 3, Part II¹ (Wingfield Psalter)  

OWNER: Anne Neville Duchess of Buckingham, wife of Humphrey Stafford (d.1460), daughter of Ralph Neville and Joan Beaufort.

Psalter. England, mid-fifteenth cent.; 133 fols, 24 long lines; 11½" x 7½"; 6 miniatures, decorated borders, decorated initials.

Stafford badges appear on all but one of the illuminated pages: f. 19, Stafford Knot; f. 38, Antelope and Wheel-nave; f. 47v, Antelope, Swan and border of alternate knots and Wheel-naves; f. 68v, Knot, Wheel-nave and motto 'Mercy and grace'; f. 79v, Stafford Knots intertwined, Swans, Wheel-naves and Antelope.² The prayers identify the original owner as a lady named Anne. This in conjunction with the Stafford badges suggests Anne Neville,³ daughter of Ralph Neville and Joan Beaufort, whose first husband was Humphrey Stafford Duke of Buckingham.

1. Formerly in the possession of H. Yates Thompson. The manuscript is described in M.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of Fifty Manuscripts from the Collection of Henry Yates Thompson (Cambridge, 1898), no 28. Illustrations appear in Henry Yates Thompson, Illustrations from One Hundred Manuscripts, IV (London, 1914), plates LXXV-LXXXII.
The manuscript was sold in 1920, Sotheby & Co., Henry Yates Thompson, Catalogue of Twenty-Six Illuminated Manuscripts and Eight Fifteenth Century Books Printed on Vellum, (March 23, 1920), Lot XLIV.

2. James, Descriptive Catalogue, p.131.
3. Originally identified ibid., p.132.

3. GLOUCESTERSHIRE, Berkeley Castle MS 11¹ (Neville Hours)

OWNER: George Neville Lord Abergavenny (d.1492), grandson of Ralph Neville and Joan Beaufort.

Hours (Sarum). England, c.1410-15; 2 108 fols.; 6⅜" x 5½";
miniature of original owner f. 7v, added picture of later date f. 7, 3 28 half-page miniatures, 10 historiated initials,
full-page borders.

The original owner of the manuscript is not known. An unidentified coat of arms appears on f. 7v: checky of nine, or and azure, 4 golden lions on the azure. 4 The earliest identified owner is George Neville Lord Abergavenny: 5 the Calendar contains entries of the births of eight of his children by his first wife Margaret Fenne. 6 The manuscript passed to Neville's daughter Elizabeth and her husband Thomas Berkeley, probably on their marriage. Their arms appear on f. 7 beneath an added miniature c.1500, now almost obliterated. An inscription on the flyleaf reads 'le tout vre Amy/George Nevylle'.

Hours and the School of Herman Scheerre', JWCI, 37 (1974), 104-30.
4. Ibid., pp.110-11 and 'Unidentified Coat-of-Arms', p.3.
5. Sotheby's Catalogue, p.44.

4. OXFORD, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc. 733
OWNER: George Neville Lord Abergavenny (d.1492)

English translation (15th cent.) of Johannes de Bado Aureo, De arte heraldica & Chronicle of England to Henry V, in English. England, c.1440-1450; 2 170 fols; 8¼" x 11¼"; margins of De arte heraldica contain illustrative shields, heraldic birds and beasts, ornamental full page Explicit f. 17v, 4 miniatures, decorated initials and borders.

Signature on front flyleaf (f.i), 'George Lord Bergavenny' in position implying ownership. The unidentified shield which appears in the Neville Hours also appears in this manuscript on f. 1.

2. Pächt & Alexander. Spriggs, Ibid., gives c.1475 as a possible date.
3. Pächt & Alexander; Spriggs, Ibid., p.8, where it is suggested that the same name in a different hand which appears at the back of the manuscript is that of his son, also George.
5. **CAMBRIDGE, St John's College MS 223 (I. 22)**

**OWNER:** George Neville Lord Abergavenny or his son George who succeeded him (d.1535)

Hoccleve, *Regement of Princes* and Lydgate, *Fall of Princes* (extract). England, late 15th cent.; 8 + 98 fols, paper, 4 stanzas of 7 lines to a page; 8¾" x 5½"; some coloured and pen flourished initials.

At the bottom of f. 1 in a position implying ownership is written 'Thys boke hys myne George lord Bergavenny'. The signature is similar, though not I think identical to that in Laud Misc. 733 above, and it has been suggested that the book belonged to George Neville's son and heir, George.

2. The extract is identified in an interleaved note by J.B. Trapp in the St John's College copy of the James Catalogue.
3. James, Catalogue. The son George also owned a Chronicle of England in French, containing the inscription 'Thys boke is myn G. Bergavenny', F. Madan, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, IV (Oxford, 1897), no 21694 (MS Douce 120). This manuscript came to my attention too late to be incorporated into this study and I have not yet been able to compare the signatures.

6. **GENEVA, Bibliothèque de la Ville MS fr. 166**

**OWNER:** Richard Neville Earl of Warwick ('Warwick the Kingmaker', d.1471)
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L'enseignement de vraie noblesse (anon.), other contents added later. Flanders, third quarter 15th cent., c.1464; 2 81 fols; 12¾" x 8½"; miniatures including frontispiece, decorated borders.

The arms of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick appear on f. 3, the beginning of the text, as an integral part of the decoration. The Warwick badge of bear and ragged staff also appears in the decoration of the manuscript.3

2. The concluding lines of the manuscript imply that it was copied in 1464, Aubert, op.cit., pp.300-1.
3. Ibid.

7. LONDON, British Library MS Sloane 16851

OWNER: Thomas Neville (d.1461), brother of Richard Earl of Warwick

Canterbury Tales. England, 1420-1450; 223 fols, single cols of 36 lines; 12" x 8½"; illuminated capitals ornamented with sprays and penwork.

At the end of the manuscript on f. 223 is a 15th century signature 'T. Neuill', with the names 'Maud Wyllwghby' and 'Alyanor Stanlay' above it. The Thomas Neville must refer to Thomas who married Maud, widow of Robert Lord Willoughby (d.1452). Neville's sister Eleanor married Thomas Stanley later Earl of Derby.2 The combination of names and the position of the signature points towards Neville's ownership.
1. The manuscript is described in Manly & Rickert, The Text of the Canterbury Tales, 1, pp.504-9; S. Ayscough, A Catalogue of the Manuscripts preserved in the British Museum (London, 1782); E.J.L. Scott, Index to the Sloane Manuscripts in the British Museum (London, 1904).

2. Identified in Manly & Rickert.

8. LONDON, Lincoln's Inn MS Hale 194 (Misc. 43)¹

OWNER: John Neville Marquis Montagu (d.1471), brother of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick

Nova Statuta 1 Edward III - 29 Henry VI, in French, with Index. England, second half of 15th cent., 225 fols, 44 lines to a page; 13" x 9"; 5 historiated initials, decorated borders and initials.

The arms of John Neville occur in the initial on f. 2 and in the borders of four other folios, as an integral part of the design,² indicating that he was the original owner.

1. Described in Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries, 1, p.140.
2. Ibid.

9. LONDON, British Library MS Royal 17 D. vi¹

OWNER: Joan Neville (d.1462) sister of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick, and her husband William Fitzalan Earl of Arundel (d.1487)

Hoccleve's Regement, Jereslaus's Wife, Lerne to Dye, Joys of Heaven, Jonathas and Fellicula. England, first half 15th cent.; 150 fols; 10½" x 7"; miniature of Hoccleve offering Regement to Henry V, marginal portrait of Chaucer, decorated
initials and borders.

Added arms of Joan Neville and William Fitzalan f. 4, arms of Fitzalan in bottom border of f. 40. Fitzalan's name appears on f. 1 'Euer ffeytheffull/Arundell'. Most of the other names appearing on f. 1 and elsewhere in the manuscript have known connections with Fitzalan, and probably refer to readers of the book.²

1. Described in Warner & Gilson, Catalogue of Western Manuscripts, 2; Seymour, 'The Manuscripts of Hoccleves Regiment', no 9.
2. Among these are 'Duddeley', 'E. Berkeley', 'jane Fytzlowys'. Dudley was probably John Sutton Baron Dudley who was sent on an embassy to France with Fitzalan in 1477-1478; his wife was Elizabeth Berkeley. Jane Fitzlewis was probably a relative by marriage, Boffey, 'The Manuscript Context of English Courtly Love Lyrics', pp.334-36.

10. LONDON, British Library MS Royal 18 D. iv¹

OWNER: Cecily Neville (d.1450) sister of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick, and her second husband John Tiptoft Earl of Worcester

Lydgate's Fall of Princes. England, c.1446-70; 168 fols, double cols of 42 lines; 16½" x 11½"; decorated borders and initials.

In the border of f. 1 is a shield bearing the arms of Cecily Neville and her second husband John Tiptoft.² The manuscript was probably made at the time of Cecily's second marriage.³

1. Described in Warner & Gilson, Catalogue of Western Manuscripts, 2.
2. The shield was deciphered by R.J. Mitchell who noted that the description of it in the Warner & Gilson Catalogue was incorrect, 'A Renaissance Library', p.69 note.
3. Ibid., pp.68-69.

11. LONDON, British Library MS Royal 18 A. xii

OWNER: Anne Neville (d.1485), daughter of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick and Anne Beauchamp, and her husband Richard Duke of Gloucester (Richard III)

Vegetius, De re militari, in English. England, last quarter 15th cent., before 1485; 123 fols; 9½" x 6"; decorated initials and full page borders.


1. Described in Warner & Gilson, Catalogue of Western Manuscripts, 2.
2. Other manuscripts thought to have been owned by Richard III are noted at the end of Chapter 2.

Unidentified Owners

12. LONDON, British Library MS Yates Thompson 13 (Taymouth Hours)

OWNER: A Neville lady in the fourteenth century

Hours (Sarum), with prayers in French. England, first half 14th cent.; 195 fols, 14 lines to a page; 6½" x 4½"; full page and half page miniatures, numerous smaller miniatures, medallions, decorated borders.
The first owner of the manuscript was a lady 'of royal connexion'. On f. 7 there is a picture of a crowned lady at mass; on f. 18 crowned, she kneels with a man; on f. 118b she is crowned and kneels with a crowned man; on f. 139 crowned, she is presented by the Virgin to Christ. The Neville arms appear on f. 3a and on f. 151. On f. 3a the arms appear before the gemini in the Calendar medallion; on f. 151, a lion passant holds the shield. This shield appears over a shield arg. a cross gules (for St. George).

The Hours came into Neville possession sometime in the fourteenth century. James in the Yates Thompson Catalogue, noted the prayer to St. Katherine (f. 166) and mentioned Katherine Neville, daughter of Ralph 4th Baron Neville. One of Ralph's daughters might have been the Neville lady who owned the manuscript: Ralph was in courtly circles and was involved with Royal marriage negotiations in 1329. James also mentions Joan Beaufort, a Neville lady with royal connections, but I think there is little evidence for the manuscript having belonged to her or being passed on to her. John Harthan suggests Joan, daughter of Edward II as a 'strong candidate' for the royal lady, and notes that a Neville lady was buried at her side in the Church of Grey Friars, London.

1. No 57 in A Descriptive Catalogue of the Second Series of Fifty Manuscripts (Nos 51-100) In the Collection of Henry Yates Thompson. It is also described in D. de Ricci, Les Manuscrits de la Collection Henry Yates Thompson (Paris, 1926). Illustrations appear in Illustrations From One Hundred Manuscripts in the Library of Henry
Yates Thompson, IV, 51; and in J. Harthan, Books of Hours and Their Owners (London, 1977), pp.46-49.


3. Ibid., pp.54-55.

4. Ibid., p.55 note.

5. Ibid., p.55


13. OXFORD, Bodleian Library MS e Mus. 35

OWNER: Someone with Neville and Beaufort connections in the fifteenth century, possibly Joan Beaufort, wife of Ralph Earl of Westmoreland


In the bottom border of p.xvi are the shields of Beaufort and Neville (erased). At the intersections of the same border are the initials 'M' and 'N'. Joan Beaufort (d.1440) has been suggested as the owner of the manuscript as she had married (before 20 February 1397) Ralph Neville Earl of Westmoreland (d.1425). However, another marriage between members of these two families should be noted: Margaret, daughter of Sir Thomas Neville of Hornby married Joan's brother, Thomas Beaufort Duke of Exeter. He died in 1427 and she predeceased him. As far as can be seen, the Neville shield is not differenced as one would expect, if it was intended for Margaret, though that in itself is not sufficient to exclude her. Thomas Beaufort left bequests to
Mount Grace, where Nicholas Love had been Prior, in his will. The initials 'M' and 'N' do not seem to refer to the owners. Doyle wondered if they were translator's initials and Scott noted a religious scribe 'M.N.', who occasionally signed his work.

Joan Beaufort is certainly a strong candidate for ownership, though the other Neville-Beaufort marriage should not be forgotten. It is not clear why the Neville shield was erased.

2. Pächt & Alexander.
3. The Summary Catalogue has Beauchamp instead of Beaufort.
4. Pächt & Alexander. For a manuscript intended as a gift to Joan Beaufort, see below no 17.
5. The Nevilles exhibited differences on the saltire for different branches, the Earls of Westmoreland always bearing the saltire plain, D. Rowland, A Historical and Genealogical Account of the Noble Family of Nevill (London, 1830), p.61. It is said in the standard genealogical reference works that Margaret predeceased her husband. However, there is a will in IV, 1, p.293, proved in 1458, which is identified as hers. I have not yet explored the source of this confusion.
14. **PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale MS lat. 1158**

**OWNER:** A member of the family of Joan Beaufort and Ralph Neville

Hours (Paris use). France, first half 15th cent.; 187 fols; 7 4/8" x 5"; 18 miniatures including 2 added pictures of members of the Neville family, borders with scenes, decorated initials.

The two added pictures of members of the Neville family occur on f. 27v and f. 34v respectively. The first depicts Ralph Neville Earl of Westmoreland with some of his children. The second depicts Joan Beaufort with her daughters, and two daughters of Ralph's first marriage. Both have family shields beneath the portraits. Leroquais suggested that the manuscript came into Neville possession shortly after it was made, and that the portrait pictures were added after 1427, as Robert Neville depicted in Bishop's robes, only became a Bishop in that year. The costumes have been dated at c.1430.

It is not known who was responsible for the additions to the manuscript, or for acquiring it, though two sons of Joan and Ralph had strong connections with France at that time which may be relevant. Their eldest son, Richard Earl of Salisbury, was in France in 1431, entering Paris with the King in December of that year, returning to England in 1432. In 1436 he accompanied his brother-in-law Richard Duke of York (himself a book owner), successor to the Duke of Bedford, to France. Salisbury's brother, William Lord Fauconberg, was
said to have been at the siege of Orleans in 1428. He accompanied York and Salisbury to France in 1436, held posts in Normandy in 1439, assisted in the capture of Harfleur in 1440 and served in France under the Duke of York 1441-1442.

The additions must have been made at the request of one of the offspring of Joan and Ralph (the masculine forms in the prayers\(^5\) suggest a male owner). The pictures seem intended to illustrate the status and the unity of the extended Neville family.

4. Details of their respective careers are from DNB, XIV, pp.279-383, 304-6.
5. Leroquais, p.73.

15. LONDON, Gray's Inn MS 10

Roman de la Rose and Testament de Jean de Meun, in French. France, end 14th cent.; 162 fols, double cols of 42 lines; 12\(\frac{1}{4}\)" x 8\(\frac{1}{2}\)"; 34 miniatures and one half page picture.

On f. 162 is the inscription 'Je atans grace/Jhon Neuill', in a late fifteenth century hand.\(^2\) A similar two-line inscription occurs on f. 161 after the end of the text, though it is now very smudged, perhaps the original of that

\(123\)
on f. 162. Both inscriptions are in a place where an
owner might choose to write his name.

I have been unable to find any information about the
(?)motto 'Je atans grace' and hence any clues as to the
identity of John Neville. There were various Nevilles
of this name at the end of the fifteenth century: John
Marquis Montagu (d.1471), the owner of the copy of the
Statutes (no 8 above); John Neville of Althorpe (d.1482);
John, 3rd Baron Latimer (born c.1490). Earlier John
Nevilles included: John (d.1423), eldest son of Ralph Earl
of Westmoreland by Margaret Stafford; and John Baron
Latimer (d.1430), son of John 5th Baron Neville (d.1388)
by Elizabeth Latimer.

1. Described in N.R. Ker, Medieval Manu-
scripts in British Libraries, 1, p.59;
A Catalogue of the Ancient Manuscripts
belonging to the Honourable Society of
Gray's Inn, preface by A.J. Horwood
(London, 1869).
2. Ker, ibid.

16. KETTERING, Boughton House, Duke of Buccleuch's MS Part VI

(Salisbury roll)

Armorial roll of the Earls of Salisbury. England, c.1460,
not later than 1471; 2 now pp.176-225 of Writte's Garter Book; 3
10½" x 13½"; 50 painted figures with some genealogical details.

The descent of the Earls of Salisbury is traced from William
Longspeek to Montagu, ending with Richard Neville Earl of
Warwick, his wife Anne Beauchamp, Sir Thomas Neville who owned
no 7 above, and his wife Maud. The manuscript was made for a member of the Neville family, possibly Sir Thomas Neville, who appears at the end of the roll.

2. The year in which the Earl of Warwick who appears in the manuscript, died.
3. For which see Wagner, pp.122-24 and Scott, 'The Caxton Master and his Patrons', pp.47-54.

Manuscripts Given as Gifts

17. DURHAM, University Library MS Cosin V III. 9

DONOR: Hoccleve, intended for Joan Beaufort Countess of Westmoreland

Hoccleve's Complaint, Dialogue with a Friend, Jereslaus's Wife, Jonathas and Fellicula, Lerne to Dye, The Joys of Heaven. England, not before 1419; 95 fols; 9" x 6½"; 11 decorated initials, coloured initials in text. 2

On f. 95 is a dedicatory envoy to Lady Westmoreland (Joan Beaufort), written by Hoccleve. It is clear that the book was intended for Joan Beaufort and was probably an attempt to gain patronage.

2. I am grateful to Dr. A.I. Doyle for his comments on this manuscript. The manuscript and Hoccleve's patrons are discussed in Chapter 6.

18. **OXFORD, Balliol College MS 236**

**DONOR:** Humphrey Stafford Duke of Buckingham (d.1460) husband of Anne Neville, to William Gray, son of Alice Neville and Sir Thomas Gray.

**Polychronicon.** England, mid 15th cent.; i + 311 fols, double cols of 66 lines; 18½" x 12¾"; 4 decorated capitals (originally 5), flourished capitals, coloured initials, three-sided border f. 1.

An inscription on f. 1v records that the book belonged to William Gray, Master of Balliol College (and Humanist scholar), who gave his books to the College. A further inscription on the same page indicates that the book had been a gift to Gray: (expanded) 'Policronicon ex dono ducis Bokyngamie/avunculi subscripti episcopi'.

The relationship between the Duke of Buckingham and Gray sounds more complicated than it was. Buckingham married Anne (daughter of Ralph Earl of Westmoreland's second marriage), half-sister of Alice Neville (from Ralph's first marriage), who was William Gray's mother. Buckingham was related on his own side to Gray, as his father Edmund Stafford and Alice Neville's mother, Margaret Stafford, were brother and sister.

2. For Gray, his manuscripts, and his part in early English humanism: Weiss, Humanism, Chapter 6, especially pp.84-94; Mynors, p.xxiv-xlv.

This concludes the list of manuscripts which forms the basis of the discussion of the books of the Neville family. As with the Beauchamp manuscripts, the list includes a number of books of Hours, but by contrast it also includes a number of works of a more literary nature (the Canterbury Tales, works by Hoccleve, Lydgate and Nicholas Love, a Roman de la Rose, and L'enseignement de vraie noblesse). A number of works of reference or historical interest are also included (De arte heraldica and a Chronicle, Statutes, De re militari, an armorial roll, and a Polychronicon).

B. The Manuscripts and their Owners

Unlike the Beauchamp manuscripts which were concentrated in the hands of a few individuals, the Neville manuscripts were distributed among a greater number of people, and for some of these individuals only one manuscript has been found. It is also more difficult to identify family traditions, partly because of the numbers involved, but also I suspect because the Nevilles were in the process of founding and establishing their own traditions, according to the titles they inherited or married into. Unlike the Beauchamps, the Nevilles did not inherit a united family tradition, though there is, a certain sense of 'dynasty', for political reasons, among the children of Ralph Neville and Joan Beaufort. As a result, the discussion which follows is concerned with providing fuller details about individuals, the circumstances in
which they obtained books, and the books themselves. Some general comments about the manuscripts as a group follow at the end of this chapter.

Joan Beaufort

We know something about the kinds of books owned by the Countess of Westmoreland and the ways in which she acquired them from sources other than extant manuscripts. In 1426 she was left a copy of Tristram by her brother Thomas Duke of Exeter. Earlier, her nephew Henry V had borrowed a book from her containing 'les Cronikels de Jerusalem, & le Viage de Godfray Boylion', and she had to petition the Council of Henry VI for its return. She was also left 'unum librum de Anglico, vocatum Gower', presumably a copy of the Confessio Amantis, by John Morton 'armiger' of York, in his will dated 1431.

Morton, Sheriff of York in 1394 and 1408, was in the service of the Earl of Westmoreland. He seems to have been closely associated with the Earl and was involved in the property transfers which dispossessed the Earl's heir from his first marriage. He acted as one of the Earl's executors and was still involved with his estates in 1428, three years after the Earl's death. The bequest of the Confessio to Joan would have a particular appropriateness, as she was the half-sister of Henry IV to whom Gower had transferred the dedication of the work. It is interesting to note the family and household connections surrounding the three books noted above; similar connections can be seen in some of the extant manuscripts which have been linked with Joan.

It may have been a knowledge of her interest in books which prompted Hoccleve to dedicate the Durham manuscript of his work.
to her, though it is more likely that he hoped to benefit from Joan's support. Although we cannot be certain that the book ever reached Joan, it shows what Hoccleve considered to be an appropriate gift to a potential patron. It is a slim volume with ninety-five pages of text, and has eleven decorated initials (usually marking the beginning of new items), as well as other gold and blue initials in the text. Though there is now much scribbling in the margins, it is obvious that in its original state it was neatly written, uncluttered, and tastefully-decorated in an unostentatious way.

The contents of the manuscript were obviously thought to be suitable for the Countess of Westmoreland. The book comprises 'autobiographical' works, two stories with moralizations, and a work of spiritual instruction. Part of the contents were originally written for the Duke of Gloucester, as the Dialogue with a Friend which prefaces Jereslaus's Wife indicates. The friend remembers what Hoccleve had said in September, 'Thow seidist of a book thow wer in dette/Vn-to my lord pat now is lieutenant,/My lord of Gloucestre', and asks if this book is intended for him. Hoccleve replies, 'Yee siker, freend, ful treewe is your deemynge;/ffor him it is pat I this book shal make' (Minor Poems, ll. 532-34, 540-41).

The reference to Duke Humphrey in the dedication copy for Joan must have been intended to help rather than hinder Hoccleve's approach to the Countess of Westmoreland, as Gloucester was her nephew. Another relative, Joan's brother-in-law Thomas Neville Lord Furnival, is the 'patron' addressed in Hoccleve's La Male Regle (1406). Although it is not certain that Joan owned Bodl. MS e Mus. 35
containing the *Myrroure of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christ* by Nicholas Love, and the *Speculum Vitae*, her ownership of such a manuscript would be appropriate for a number of reasons.

The manuscript, though now mutilated in places, has good decorated borders and initials, and the coats of arms indicate that it was intended for someone of noble birth who was interested in devotional works. Here it may be relevant to note Joan's consultation with Margery Kempe as evidence of a possible interest in the contents of a manuscript such as Bodl. MS e Mus. 35. 9

More specifically, manuscripts of Love's *Myrroure* had a wide appeal among various classes of reader throughout the fifteenth century, 10 with continued aristocratic interest: Edmund Lord Grey of Ruthyn (married Katherine Percy after 1450), owned National Library of Scotland Adv. 18.1.7; 11 Joan Countess of Kent, wife of the founder of Mount Grace where Love was Prior, owned Takamiya 8 (formerly Suamarez MS); 12 Robert Lord Willoughby of Eresby (d.1452) owned Glasgow University Gen. 1130; 13 George Neville Archbishop of York, Joan's grandson, was bequeathed a book 'called boneaventure de vita christi'; 14 and Cecily Duchess of York, Joan's daughter, bequeathed what was probably a copy of Love's *Myrroure* to her daughter or niece Anne. 15

Further, there were strong Yorkshire affiliations among the early owners of copies of the *Myrroure*. 16 Joan Countess of Kent bequeathed her copy of Love's *Myrroure* to Alice Belacyse, a member of a Yorkshire family; 17 Takamiya 4 (formerly Phillipps 8820) had Yorkshire connections among its early owners; 18 and a number of early bequests of the work can be linked with Yorkshire. 19 Joan's ownership would again be in harmony with this context, as her husband's primary residences and territorial interests were
in this part of the country and Joan continued to spend time there during her widowhood.

Finally, there are a few more connections which should be mentioned. Mount Grace was founded in 1397 by Thomas Holland and benefitted during its first few years from 'semi-royal patronage'. Joan's own royal connections as a daughter of John of Gaunt and half-sister of Henry IV would make her ownership of a work composed by the Prior of a house which received royal favour, and which was located in the area of her husband's regional interests, doubly appropriate. Finally, Joan's brother the Duke of Exeter left bequests in his will to Mount Grace as previously mentioned, and Joan's nephew, John Beaufort Duke of Somerset, married Margaret Holland, granddaughter of the founder of Mount Grace, giving Joan a series of connections with Mount Grace which might account for a personal interest in Love's Myrrour.

Of course none of this proves Joan's ownership, and it is included only to indicate how her ownership of Bodl. MS e Mus. 35, would fit neatly into both traditions of patronage of Mount Grace and patterns of ownership of Love's Myrrour. Indeed some of the points made in the foregoing discussion are equally relevant for Margaret Neville, daughter of Thomas Neville of Hornby, and her husband Thomas Beaufort Duke of Exeter, the partners of another alliance between the Beauforts and the Nevilles.

Before making some general remarks about Joan Beaufort's books, the unassigned book of Hours (Bib. Nat. MS lat. 1158) which contains the pictures of Joan and her family, deserves some comment. The manuscript was made in France in the first half of the fifteenth century and contains, apart from the added folios, some attractive miniatures and decorated borders containing scenes.
The person who commissioned the portraits of the Neville family and had them added to the manuscript, was clearly interested in portraying family alliances, and was particularly interested in the children of the second marriage. It is safe to assume that this person belonged to the second family, and Richard Earl of Salisbury would seem to be a strong candidate. Taking into consideration his part in reaffirming the hold on the estates of the dispossessed second Earl of Westmoreland, the pictures displaying the massed ranks of the children of the second marriage have an attractive relevance to him, which is not at all weakened by the inclusion of a few of the daughters of the second marriage, modestly positioned at the rear of the pictures, and his time in France coincides with the dates suggested for the added pictures.\footnote{24}

Combining the evidence from different sources, a picture begins to emerge of the Countess of Westmoreland and her literary interests. She was someone from whom a relative borrowed a book, and she took pains to secure its return. Another relative and an associate both considered books to be appropriate bequests for the Countess, and the Tristram and Confessio Amantis intended for her are an interesting change from the usual bequests of service books. Hoccleve regarded her as a potential patron and thought a manuscript of moral fables and spiritual instruction in English would appeal to her, and she may have owned a devotional manuscript containing Love's Myrrour and the Speculum Vitae. Her Chronicles of Jerusalem and Voyage of Godfrey Bouillon, and the Tristram she received from her brother, suggest an interest in chivalric romances. At least two of her children shared her interest in books, and another of her children was probably responsible for adding the pictures of Joan and Ralph Neville and their family,
to an attractive book of Hours.

Anne Neville Duchess of Buckingham

The first of these children to be discussed is her daughter Anne (d.1480), who married sometime before 1424, Humphrey Stafford Earl of Stafford, created Duke of Buckingham in 1444. Like her mother Joan Beaufort, we know more about Anne's books from wills and other sources than from extant manuscripts. There is conclusive evidence that she owned Part II of MS Spencer 3 in the New York Public Library (the Wingfield Psalter), an attractive book made in England around the middle of the fifteenth century, with six miniatures, borders containing badges, grotesques and flowers, and numerous gold decorated initials. The two manuscripts which make up MS Spencer 3 (Part I is a book of Hours) were originally separate manuscripts, though both were executed at about the same time. The manuscripts were bound together c.1520, a name on the binding identifying the owner at that time as Sir Richard Wingfield K.G. (d.1525). A direct line of descent can be traced from Anne Neville to Wingfield. It is likely that the psalter passed to Anne's grandson Henry, second Duke of Buckingham (executed 1483), then to his wife Katherine Woodville, and from her to her third husband Sir Richard Wingfield.

Artistically, MS Spencer 3 is related to the 'owl' group of manuscripts from an English illuminating shop in the mid-fifteenth century, and it shows the direct influence of the style of the so-called Caesar Master.

The inscription 'Mercy and grace' which appears on f. 68v of the Wingfield Psalter also appears in the fourteenth century Heures
de Jeanne de Navarre (Bib. Nat. MS lat. nouv. acqu. 3145) on f. 3v, which contains a full-page fifteenth century English painting added to the Hours, showing a lady kneeling before the Trinity and the Virgin and Child. In the Hours, the inscription appears on a scroll from the mouth of the kneeling lady who is not identified by heraldic devices, and there have been suggestions that Anne Neville, or a member of the Stafford or Neville families might be the kneeling figure represented in the added leaves.

Among other books which have been tentatively but inconclusively linked with Anne Neville are, Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 61, discussed in Chapter 3, Glasgow University Library MS Hunter 409 (Hunterian V.3.7), the unique manuscript of Chaucer's Romaunt of the Rose from the early fifteenth century, and a manuscript which is now divided, but which originally formed one psalter, B.L. MS Royal 2 A. xviii and Rennes, Bibliotheque Municipale MS 22.

The Glasgow University manuscript has on f. 139 the inscription 'my lorde monjoy my lady yo ...', which Doyle completes as 'your wyffe'. Anne married Walter Blount first Baron Mountjoy as her second husband, and it is possible that she was the person referred to in the inscription which occurs in the right hand margin against the account of the activities of False-Semblant, more precisely coinciding with the section dealing with the advances to be made from laying claim to good deeds and from the recommendation of wealthy men, obtained through flattery.

The original psalter represented by the preliminary pictures in B.L. MS Royal 2 A. xviii and the Rennes psalter, is dated as early fifteenth century, before 1415, and it is thought that
the division occurred sometime between 1415 and 1437 or 1443. Though the provenance and original owner of the undivided manuscript are unknown, there are some clues concerning later ownership in the Rennes psalter. In the bottom margins of six of the Calendar pages are entries of the births (between 1439 and 1449) of five children of Richard Duke of York and Cecily Neville, and the birth in 1461 of Anne, daughter of Richard and Cecily's eldest child Anne. Rickert suggested that these additions were made after 1461, for or by Anne of York, daughter of Richard and Cecily who married Henry Holland Duke of Exeter and Earl of Huntingdon.

The only clue to earlier ownership is the letter 'A', together with feminine forms in two of the prayers (f. 12 & f. 25), which were written in a hand probably only slightly later than that of the original hand. Leroquais conjectured that Anne Mortimer, wife of Richard Earl of Cambridge (executed 1415) might be a candidate, and could have passed the book to Cecily Neville, who gave it to her daughter Anne of York, while Rickert inclined more towards earlier Neville provenance.

There is more concrete evidence of Anne's ownership of books from a number of bequests in her will, proved in October 1480, and it is interesting to note a mixture of French and English books. She left to her daughter-in-law Lady Margaret Beaufort (mother of Henry VII), an English book called Legenda Sanctorum, a French book called Lucum, a French book of the Epistles and Gospels, and a primer with silver and gilt clasps, covered with purple velvet. 'Lucum' probably refers to Lucan, the classical historian whose work was popular throughout the middle ages and who was an important influence on and source for medieval historians.
and chroniclers. He was studied as a master of style and there were a number of French works based on Lucan in the thirteenth century. Jehan de Tuim compiled *Li hystoire de Julius Cesar*, allegedly translated from Lucan's *Pharsalia*, subsequently versified by Jacques de Forest, and in the fourteenth century, the author of *Commentairies de Cesar* compiled his work from Sallust, Suetonius and Lucan. Such compilations from and adaptations of classical authors were popular in the middle ages and Anne's bequest might refer to such a work.

Anne and her first husband Humphrey Stafford both had literary works dedicated to them. A poem on the Nightingale, a direct imitation of the *Philomena* of John Peckham, appears in Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 203, with a dedication to 'The Duches of Bokyngham', and Stephen Scrope's translation of Christine de Pisan's *Epître d'Othéa* is in one manuscript (Cambridge, St. John's College MS H. 5, possibly the presentation copy), dedicated to Humphrey Duke of Buckingham. Both of these dedications are discussed further in Chapter 6, where the absence of evidence for commission is noted. Humphrey Stafford also gave a *Polychronicon* to William Gray (Oxford, Balliol College MS 236), which is said to be one of the largest and most handsome copies of the work.

A second daughter of Joan Beaufort who shared her interest in books was Cecily who married Richard Duke of York. The books in her will and her daily reading works were discussed in Chapter 2, and further details of her and her husband will be discussed below in the section on Anne Neville and Richard III.

**George Neville Lord Abergavenny**

George Neville owned two nicely illuminated manuscripts.
The first, the fine Nevill Hours, was from the workshop of Herman Scheerre in the early fifteenth century (1410-1415). The original owner is unknown, though it is possible that the full-page miniature on f. 7v of someone kneeling before the Virgin and Child, may have been intended as a representation of the owner. This picture was inserted in the Hours, but is in keeping with the rest of the decoration. On the recto is a miniature, c.1500, now almost obliterated, with the arms of a Neville woman and a Berkeley man (Elizabeth Neville, daughter of Lord Abergavenny, and her husband Thomas Berkeley). Other decoration includes twenty eight half-page miniatures and ten historiated initials with full-page borders.

The Hours were evidently regarded as a family book and an heirloom. On the flyleaf is the inscription 'ie tout vre Amy/George Nevylle', probably recording the presentation of the book to George's daughter, and in the Calendar, the births of eight children by his wife Margaret Fenne are recorded: George (1470); Elizabeth (1471); a son (1473- Edward); William (1474); Anne (1475, died); Mary (1477); Thomas (1479, died); Thomas (1482). It is not known how the manuscript came into George Neville's possession or who owned the manuscript before him, though it is possible that its origins may have been within the Neville family. His grandmother Joan Beaufort and his aunts, Anne Duchess of Buckingham and Cecily Duchess of York, were all owners of manuscripts. There is also a possibility that the Neville Hours came via his wife Margaret Fenne (d.1485). Her father (d.1476) left a book of saint's lives to his wife, to be passed on to Margaret, and then to her daughter Elizabeth, and a mass book to his almshouse at Herringby, Norfolk, so there were traditions.
of book-owning on both sides of the family.

On f. 7v, there is an unidentified coat of arms, nine pieces or and azure, on the azure a lion rampant or, which also appears in a second manuscript owned by Lord Abergavenny, Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 733.

The Bodleian manuscript is an English translation of Johannes de Bado Aureo, De arte heraldica, and a Chronicle of England, also in English. The copiously illustrated treatise on heraldry begins with an explanation of the colours of heraldry, heraldic birds and beasts including a 'lionpard', and illustrates and describes blazons. It describes the ranking order of colours, discusses signs and tokens and what they represent, and gives the individual history of signs and changes in signs. It is a fully illustrated introduction to heraldry, with constant reference to authorities such as Aristotle, and to the 'philosophy', rules and traditions of heraldry. For example, the status of a colour depends upon the mixing of other colours needed to create it, the worthiest being those nearest to white (green being made from blue and gold is of low status):

Blak colour is the privation and the utmost undoynge of white colour/As bitternesse is the clene putting away of swetnesse Wherefore it is said that whitnesse is the first begynnyng of coloure as swetnesse is the begynnynge of savoure... (f.3)

The author of De arte heraldica is said to be John (Ieuan) Trevor, Bishop of St. Asaph (d.1410), who moved in courtly circles and had a known interest in heraldry, serving on a commission with the Earl of Salisbury in 1389 to examine a case in the court of chivalry, though the evidence for his authorship is far from conclusive. Whoever the author was, the work seems to have been written for Anne of Bohemia, Richard II's Queen:
Therefore atte the instaunce and prayer of some my souveraignes and desirers and specially of dame Anne sumtyme queen of Englo'nd I have compyled and drawen this present tretees... (f.l)

With the Chronicle of England, the manuscript is a reference work of historical interest. The manuscript is well laid out and illuminated and is written in a neat and regular hand. Aids to finding place and contents are provided by coloured headings and initials, and in the heraldic treatise by the illustrations in the margins of shields and heraldic devices. At the beginning of the Chronicle (f.18) there is an attractive miniature, divided into two levels of activity, depicting two related incidents in the narrative. The upper scene depicts Diocletian, his daughters and their suitors, the lower scene shows the daughters landing in Albyon, a giant lurking ominously. A second miniature on f. 22v depicts Brutus disposing of Gogmagog with drawings of important historical figures in the margin (Arthur and Saints Edward and Ursula). A third miniature on f. 70v depicts William the Conqueror at the Battle of Hastings.

On f. 1 is a miniature by a foreign artist, of a nobleman addressing a King of Arms and questioning him about heraldry. The King of Arms counsels the nobleman to 'attende to pis tretis'. Between them is the unidentified shield and looking down on them is an angel holding the same shield which also appears in the Nevill Hours: nine pieces or and azure, on the azure a lion rampant or. There is something of a mystery about this shield. Spriggs explored the arms of the Neville and Fitzalan ancestors of George Neville and although the shield has not been identified, it bears traces of Neville's ancestry. He was descended on his mother's side from the Fitzalans (via the Beauchamps and Despensers) and his great-great-grandfather Richard Earl of Arundel bore
Gules, a lion rampant or. Checky or and azure of the Warenne family from whom the Fitzalans were descended, seemed to come into use as a coat of arms in the family around the time of George's great-grandmother Joan Fitzalan. There is an irony (presumably unintentional?) in the appearance of such an enigmatic shield, epitomising the problem of heraldic genealogy, at the beginning of a reference work on heraldry.

The manuscript of Hoccleve (Cambridge, St. John's MS 223) which probably belonged to George Neville's son George is in striking contrast to the two preceding manuscripts. It is a very plain manuscript, written on paper, and with no illustrations, suggesting that the value of the book to its owner was its contents, rather than its appearance.

Richard Neville Earl of Warwick, Thomas Neville, John Neville Marquis Montagu

Richard Earl of Warwick and two of his brothers owned manuscripts, but so far only one manuscript has been identified for each of them. Thomas Neville's manuscript is of interest as the only manuscript of the Canterbury Tales which is of secure Beauchamp or Neville ownership. The other two manuscripts are of interest in the circumstances of their production.

Richard Neville's manuscript of L'enseignement de vraie noblesse is the only witness of his literary interests. The anonymous work is said to be an account of an encounter between the author, of Flemish birth, and Dame Imagination in May 1440, which the author relates for common profit, at Imagination's request:
Pour m'acquitier d'une promesse que j'ay faicte
à Dame de trésgrant renommée, passer temps et
eschever oyseuse, mère de vices, moyennant la
grace de Dieu, que devotement appelle à mon aide,
veul exposer une merveilleuse adventure qui
nagaires m'est advenu...62

The manuscript was written and illuminated in Flanders in
1461 according to the Explicit and was probably acquired during
one of Warwick's sojourns on the Continent, perhaps in 1465,
1467 or 1469 when he visited the Duke of Burgundy. The manuscript
concludes with a conventional apostrophe to Christ, and it is
difficult to dismiss a strong sense of irony arising from Warwick's
possession of such a manuscript:

Priant nostre Seigneur Jhesuchrist, nostre bon
creator, que ce que j'en ay fait soit à sa
loenge, doctrine et exaucement des princes et
leur chevalerie, et prouffit à la chose publique,
qui par sa doulce grace nous doinst paix en se
siecle et paradis en fin. Amen.63 (ff.80-81)

The other items in the manuscript were added at a later date.

Thomas Neville's Canterbury Tales manuscript is unexceptional
in appearance. It has illuminated capitals and rubrics, penwork
initials, and some sprays touched with gold. It may be argued
from the appearance of the manuscript that it was valued for its
contents rather than appearance, and as with the Hoccleve manu-
script belonging to George Lord Abergavenny, indicative perhaps
of a genuine interest in the work. However, it is worth pausing
to ask why there seem to be comparatively so few manuscripts of
the Canterbury Tales in aristocratic hands in the fifteenth
century, and why there are so few well-decorated and illustrated
copies, compared with copies of the works of Lydgate and Hoccleve.
Chaucer had authoritative literary status in the fifteenth century,
as witnessed by his followers who included Lydgate and Hoccleve.
However, it may be that the attraction of manuscripts of Hoccleve's *Regement* or Lydgate's *Fall* and *Troy*, were the known royal associations of these pieces, which were early incorporated in the manuscript traditions of these works by means of presentation pictures and the like. No such early and well-established traditions seem to have existed for manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*, and perhaps this may have something to do with the paucity of attractive Chaucer manuscripts in aristocratic collections.

By contrast, John Neville's de-luxe copy of the Statutes contains numerous decorated initials and five historiated initials at the beginning of each reign of an enthroned King delivering a statute to his lay and clerical counsellors. There are differences in the details of each picture, in the appearance of the King, the colour scheme, and the positioning and arrangement of the counsellors, though the format of each is similar. The manuscript was commercially produced in London, and has a standard format of full borders and large decorated initials at the beginning of each regnal year, with smaller illuminated capitals to mark divisions within each reign. Most of these commercially produced manuscripts have spaces for or contain arms in the middle of the lower borders.

The historiated initials in John Neville's manuscript (Lincoln's Inn MS Bale 194) were executed by two artists. The manuscript was related to a group of commercially produced *Nova Statuta* manuscripts, the work of one artist who was also the border artist of MS Bodley 283, *The Mirroure of the Worlde* made for a London draper Thomas Kippyng, in the 1470s and illustrated by the Caxton Master, the artist of the Beauchamp Pageants.
William Fitzalan owned a number of manuscripts, and was the claimed patron of Caxton's *Golden Legend* (discussed in Chapter 6), but only one manuscript contains his wife's arms along with his own, B.L. MS Royal 17 D. vi. This manuscript contains Hoccleve's *Regement, Jereslaus's Wife, Lerne to Dye, The Joys of Heaven*, and *Jonathas and Fellicula*, and has a portrait of Chaucer in the margin of f. 93v. The manuscript belongs to the first half of the fifteenth century and has a half-page picture of Hoccleve presenting the the *Regement* to Henry V. Other decoration includes illuminated borders and flourished initials of gold, red and blue. Joan and her husband are the first identified owners of the manuscript, their arms being added on f. 4, and Fitzalan's appearing on f. 40. The inscription on f. 1 'Euer ffeytheffull/Arundell', appears with other names, most of which can be shown to have family connections with Fitzalan, and perhaps indicate relatives and associates who read or borrowed the manuscript and added their names.  

Fitzalan is known to have owned two other manuscripts, B.L. MS Royal 20 D. v and B.L. MS Royal 19 B. xvii. The first is a copy of forty Homilies on the Gospel by St. Gregory in French, and was compiled c.1400. The decoration on f. 3 is French in style and is stylistically more conservative than the rest of the manuscript, which is more English in style. The later miniatures are said to resemble and often copy the figures and compositions of Hand A of the Carmelite Missal and Hand A of the Missal worked on the Fitzalan manuscript. The manuscript is said to illustrate the beginnings of the spread of the New Style in English illumination at the end of the fourteenth century.
At the end of the table of contents on f. 2v is the inscription 'My trust ys. Arundell. Thys boke ys myn'. Later inscriptions on f. 175v indicate that the book was passed on to his son and grandson.

The second manuscript is a copy of the Golden Legend in French, and was written in 1382 according to an inscription after the colophon. It was written and illuminated in France and there are eighty miniatures, as well as initials and partial borders. According to Meiss, the first three folios contain the earliest precisely dated work by Pseudo-Jacquemart, the remaining miniatures being painted by followers of Jean Bondol and his associates. On f. 5 is the inscription 'My tryst ys. Arundell' and on f. 1v (flyleaf) are the arms, badge and motto (also used by the later Staffords) of the Beaufort family, indicating earlier ownership. Both of these manuscripts are in French and were old manuscripts by the time they were in Fitzalan's hands. Both are well illuminated and attractive volumes which at the time of Fitzalan's ownership were old-fashioned in their styles of decoration, and it is tempting to see Fitzalan as a collector, with something of an antiquarian interest.

Cecily Neville was only married to her second husband John Tiptoft for a year, and it is more than probable that there would be many more manuscripts to discuss had she lived longer. The Hours of Henry Beauchamp which probably passed via Cecily to Tiptoft and then on to Italy, have already been mentioned. The only manuscript which bears the arms of Cecily and Tiptoft is B.L. MS Royal 18 D. iv, a copy of Lydgate's **Fall of Princes**, perhaps acquired about the time of their marriage. It is a large volume and has decorated capitals and borders with foliage and
flowers.

A second manuscript which has been linked with Cecily is B.L. MS Additional 50001, a fine book of Hours written and illuminated in England c.1420. It takes its name of the Hours of Elizabeth the Queen from one of its known owners whose signature 'Elysabeth ye quene' appears on f. 22, Elizabeth, wife of Henry VII. On f. 152 is the erased inscription 'Edwardus Dux Bukyngham', referring to Edward the third Duke who was beheaded in 1521. Edward and Elizabeth were cousins and the manuscript probably passed between the two of them. An erased inscription on f. 147 recorded the date of Cecily Neville '[Iesu]s which lykedest to dy for redempcion of all mankynd have mercy vpon the soul of Cesill Dwchess of warwyk which dyed the yere of grace ye moneth of Aug't'. (She died on 28 July 1450.) Cecily Neville was the niece of Cecily Duchess of York, Queen Elizabeth's grandmother. As there is no other evidence for Cecily's ownership of the manuscript, it seems likely that the memorandum was written by and the manuscript belonged to, someone related to her or close to her.

Anne Neville and Richard III, Cecily Neville and Richard Duke of York

The arms of Anne Neville and her husband Richard Duke of Gloucester appear in B.L. MS Royal 18 A. xii, an English version of the De re militari of Vegetius, Richard's on f. 1, and Anne's on f. 49 at the beginning of the third book. The manuscript itself is small and has heavy, rather unattractive borders densely packed with foliage and flowers, and decorated initials at the beginning of each chapter, with more elaborate initials at the beginning of each book.
The De re militari was probably the most popular and influential military manual in the middle ages. Some one hundred and fifty eight fifteenth century manuscripts of the work are extant, seventeen of which are in English versions. Of these English versions, thirteen manuscripts, including the one belonging to Anne Neville and Richard of Gloucester, contain the translation made for Thomas Lord Berkeley. Vegetius was also translated into French (forty six extant manuscripts), Italian (ten extant manuscripts), Spanish (three extant manuscripts), and German (two extant manuscripts).

The popularity of the work was widespread, and arose from the model of chivalric behaviour through warfare which it provided, as well as from its possible military application. Humphrey Duke of Gloucester owned a copy in French (Cambridge University Library MS Ee II, 17); John Paston had a copy (B.L. MS Lansdowne 285); Mary Hastings owned Bodleian Library MS Digby 233; Sir John Astley owned Pierpont Morgan MS 775; and Bodleian Library MS Douce 291 belonged to the Chalons family of Devon. The fourth book, dealing with siege warfare was the most immediately relevant to medieval readers, and Vegetius provided a standard, authoritative handbook on the business of war, 'the most popular, and...most influential discussion of the art of war available between A.D.600 and 1600'.

Richard III is known to have owned a number of other manuscripts, though not all the manuscripts usually claimed for him have conclusive signs of his ownership. His book of Hours (Lambeth Palace Library MS 474) is related stylistically to the Hours of Henry Beauchamp, and it is possible that the manuscript came into Richard's
hands via his Beauchamp relatives (Anne Beauchamp was his mother-in-law). 80

Both Richard and Anne Neville inherited well-established traditions of patronage and book ownership from their respective families. Anne's mother Anne Beauchamp commissioned the Beauchamp pageants and Rous rolls, and Richard's parents, Cecily Neville and Richard Duke of York, were patrons and owners of manuscripts. A number of service books and devotional works belonging to Cecily were mentioned in the survey of the Neville family in Chapter 2. A patron of Queen's College Oxford and with her husband, benefactor of a number of religious institutions, Cecily's interest in literature was shared by her husband. A translation of Claudian's De Consulatu Stilichonis 'Translat & wrete at Clar'. 81 1445' (Stoke Clare), contains the badges of the Duke of York (locked fetterlock, f. 5v; falcon, ff. 9v+10; white rose, ff. 13v+14) and some royal badges, and refers to Richard by name and as the 'high prince' (line 3), ending with a prayer: 82

Souereyn god & verry good reward off perfyght meende
Make pryncys to love & othyr folk wurshyp for he alone
Non nobis domine graunt them to seye & bat they lyst be seende.
Thy godly omage syth grace hyrself descendyth fro thy trone
Leende pees off vertu bytuyx hem alle preserue hem fro her ffone
My lord off yorke most tendurly graunt good ihesu thys
Preeude in hys herte: how euyr honor merces est virtutis.
Amen.
(Prayer, ll. 43-49)

A manuscript of Christine de Pisan's Cité des Dames (B.L. MS Royal 19 A. xix) also contains badges of the House of York (f. 4, white rose and fetterlock), indicating Duke Richard's ownership, or perhaps that of his son Edward, and he is said to be the author of a lyric 'Excellent soueraine, semely to see' in Bodleian MS Douce 95, 'per ducem Eboracensis nuper factus'. 83
Richard and Cecily also seem to have been diligent about their children's education. A letter from their two eldest sons in 1454 records this interest:

...and where ye commaunde us by your said lettres to attende specially to our lernyng in our yong age that shulde cause us to growe to honor & worship in our olde age/Plaese hit your hieghnesse to witte that we have attended our lernyng syth we come heder....

Richard Duke of Gloucester was not their only child to share their interest in books; Edward IV and Margaret who became Duchess of Burgundy were both significant patrons and owners of important collections of manuscripts.

Quality

Again, the general sense is of manuscripts of good, though not outstanding quality. The psalters and books of Hours contain the best decorative work, the Wingfield Psalter and the Neville Hours being among the best available in England at the respective dates of their production. The Taymouth Hours is an attractive manuscript from the first half of the fourteenth century and the Hours obtained in France had two individually ordered pictures of members of the Neville family added. John Neville's copy of the Statutes is a de-luxe manuscript of that work, and the Polychronicon given by Humphrey Stafford to his nephew is one of the best of the Polychronicon manuscripts. A number of the manuscripts are decorated but not in any outstanding way, many containing conventional decoration, representative of the middle and upper 'range' of the manuscript market. Hoccleve's manuscript for Joan Beaufort is an interesting example of a modestly illuminated manuscript, but one which was thought suitable to attract the attention of a
potential patron. Two manuscripts stand out in a different way. The Hoccleve manuscript probably belonging to George, third Lord Abergavenny, and the Canterbury Tales manuscript owned by Thomas Neville, contain minimal decoration and are very plain copies of works which were readily available in better quality manuscripts.

There is little sense of individual taste in the decoration or appearance of this group of manuscripts, apart from the added pictures in the Hours from France (Bib. Nat. MS lat. 1158), though the two older manuscripts owned by William Fitzalan might indicate a task for earlier styles of illumination.

Provenance

The majority of the manuscripts were produced in England, the three exceptions being the Hours obtained in France during the period of the English occupation, the French Roman de la Rose manuscript of unknown ownership, and the Flemish manuscript of Richard Neville. Among the commercially produced English manuscripts, George Neville's Hoccleve manuscript and John Neville's Statutes represent the opposite poles of professional production. The manuscript Hoccleve prepared for presentation to Joan Beaufort has more personal origins, the Taymouth Hours probably came into Neville hands via royalty, and the Neville Hours may have been in the Neville family earlier than its first recorded owner, George, second Lord Abergavenny.

Contents

Again, there are a number of books of Hours, psalters,
historical and reference works, together with works of advice and instruction and one manuscript containing devotional writing. The range of devotional writing is extended if the books Cecily Duchess of York bequeathed are added (Lives of St. Katherine and St. Mathilda, Bonaventure, Hilton, St. Bridget, and Legenda Aurea), and a further category is added to the range of reading material by the Tristram and Godfrey Bouillon Joan Beaufort is known to have owned. The majority of the manuscripts contain works written in English or translated into English (Lydgate, Hoccleve, Chronicles, treatise on Heraldry, Nicholas Love, Vegetius), leaving only two in French (excluding the statutes which were traditionally in that language), the Roman de la Rose and Richard Neville's L'enseignement de vraie noblesse. Taken as a whole, the group is probably representative of the kinds of works to be found in most aristocratic collections in the fifteenth century. There is nothing to compare with the interest in family history and genealogy of the Beauchamp family, but then the Nevilles at this time had little reason to look to the past, and indeed had nothing to gain from contemplating their past history, by comparison with the present. More personal touches are revealed in the signatures which appear in the Hoccleve manuscript owned by Joan Neville and William Fitzalan, and in the added pictures in the Paris book of Hours.
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This chapter and the one which follows are both concerned with patronage. The next chapter will be concerned with some examples of 'public' patronage, public that is in the sense that individuals commissioned works from authors (and printers), who were known for these activities outside the immediate circle of the patron, and also in the sense that individuals were approached as potential patrons, largely because of their public position and status. In this chapter, some examples of what can be broadly called 'household' patronage are discussed. Though the examples included are varied in nature, they all have links of some sort with the aristocratic household, either through patronage, or because an author was in household employment, though not necessarily at the time of his literary activities.

The focus of the chapter will be upon three men and some writing associated with them: William Paris, a Beauchamp esquire, who wrote an English version of the Life of St. Christina; John Rous, antiquarian and also chaplain of the chantry of Guy's Cliff, founded and sponsored by the Beauchamp family; and John Shirley, former secretary to Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick, who later in his career compiled manuscript anthologies. Paris and Shirley were therefore both at some time in the employ of the Beauchamp family and Rous probably took up his chaplaincy (which was to continue during Neville possession of the Warwick earldom and beyond to the reign of Henry VII), at a time when the Beauchamps still held their hereditary lordship, though the exact date is unknown. Certainly, his loyalties seem to have lain with the Beauchamp family, as will be suggested below, though he did have some assistance in his historical researches, from Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, as was mentioned in Chapter 2.

Both Paris and Rous undertook their writing while engaged in other activities. Paris wrote his Saint's Life in the company of
and as a direct response to the changed fortunes of his lord, Thomas Beauchamp Earl of Warwick, who he accompanied into exile, and John Rous combined his position as chantry chaplain with his own interest in antiquarian studies, and among other works produced two genealogical rolls, probably commissioned by a former (Beauchamp) Countess of Warwick. The literary activities of John Shirley belong to a time when his service as a Beauchamp official had ended, though there are a number of direct and indirect links between his earlier and later careers.

It will be the purpose here with Paris and Rous to examine the circumstances in which the writing was produced and to enquire to what extent patronage was involved. With John Shirley, the nature and implications of the links between his career in Beauchamp service and his later activities will be discussed. All of the work by these men cannot be described as directly due to aristocratic patronage, but together, they do at least provide important evidence of the abilities of men in aristocratic service and of the kinds of interests they had.

At the end of the chapter, following the section on John Rous, the interest of the Beauchamps in their own ancestry is discussed, and the suggestion is made that the Beauchamp Pageants can be seen as part of an identifiable family tradition. This is not strictly speaking household patronage at all, but it is a continuation of a 'household' tradition (and the author of the text must have had access to someone within or close to the Beauchamp family) and it follows naturally from the Rous rolls, which deal with family history and which were composed by a chaplain who had close links with the Earls of Warwick.

William Paris and the Legend of St. Christina

The first example of literary activity took place in the drastically diminished household of Thomas Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (d.1401), during his exile to the Isle of Man by Richard II, from October 1397 until some time after August 1399.² Beauchamp was accompanied by
William Paris, a squire, who during their stay, wrote an English version of the legend of St. Christina, which ends with a touching four stanza appeal to the saint to help his lord:

Seinte Cristyne, helpe thoroughte thi prayere
Thate we may fare þe better for the
Thate hathe bene longe in prisone here,
The Ile of Mane of þat stronge cuntre.
Sire Thomas Brawchamp, ane erle was he,
In Warwike-shire was his powere,
Now is he of so poure degre:
He hathe no mane saue one squiere.

Where are his knyghtes þat withe hym yede
Whane he was in prosperite?
Where are the squiers now at nede,
That sumtyme thoughte þei wolde note flee?
Of yomene hade he grete plente,
Thate he was wonte to clothe & feede:
Nowe is þe none of þe mene
Thate ous dare se, þer lorde, fore drede.

In prisone site þer lorde alone,
Ofe his mene he hath no moo-
Bute William Parys, be seint Johne!
That withe his wille wolde noȝt hime fro.
He made this lyfe in ynglishe soo,
As he satte in prisone of stone,
Euer as he myghte tent þerto
Whanne he had ... his lorde's seruice done.

Jhesu Criste, goddeste sone of myghte,
As pou come downe to mende oure mysse
Ande in a clene virgyne þou lyghte,
Marie, þat now thi moder is:
Thou graunte alle grace þat hath herde this,
In heuene of the to haue a sighte,
To se the sitte there in thi blisse
Withe seint Cristyne, þi maydyne brighte

The *Ubi Sunt* topos which Paris uses to depict the pathos of the Earl's situation is a literary convention which here is a precise statement both of the change in Warwick's fortunes, and of the social and political importance of the lord's retinue in reflecting his status.3

Paris's name occurs in subsequent records as a retainer of Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (son of Earl Thomas), as the recipient of an annuity of £15, and as holder for life of the manor of Great Comberton in Worcestershire.5
The legend appears in a manuscript (B.L. MS Arundel 168) containing a miscellany of mainly devotional works, including among others, a poem to the Virgin, the legend of St. Dorothy, Burgh's translation of Cato's Morals and Capgrave's St. Katherine. The Paris legend is one of four extant versions of the life of St. Christina in middle English which were discussed by G.H. Gerould, and it is pre-dated by De sancta Cristina in the North-English Homily Collection and Cristine in the Scottish Legend Collection, and succeeded by Bokenham's Vita Sanctae Christinae. Gerould, though unable to make a complete comparison of the sources of these four versions, did conclude that they were all independent translations from four distinct Latin versions.

Thomas Beauchamp became Earl of Warwick in 1369. He had previously served in the French wars with his elder brother Guy, and on Guy's death in 1360, he was granted an additional pension, reflecting his increased status as heir to the Warwick earldom. He also took part in the Scottish campaign, and before assuming the Earldom, made an expedition to Prussia in 1367 with his brothers William and Roger, nine esquires, twenty yeomen and thirty horses, following in the footsteps of his father. He continued his service in the French wars in 1373 and 1375, but by this time he was nearing the end of his military career. As an Appellant of 1387, he was lucky to escape with his life when in 1397 he was impeached for treason with the Earls of Arundel and Gloucester. Of the three, Beauchamp was the only one to survive, his death sentence being commuted to perpetual imprisonment and the forfeiture of his goods and estates. The accession of Henry IV brought his imprisonment to an end, though the Earl did not survive long: he died in July 1401.

We know nothing about the Earl's literary interests. The only books mentioned in an inventory of his goods were the service books, though the Guy and Alexander tapestries he is known to have possessed might indicate a preference for historical (and ancestral) romance, if...
such interests can be transferred to a different medium. He is said to have been a man of conventional piety, so his squire's legend was probably appropriate both for the man and the circumstances. I have been unable to find any specific reason for Paris's choice of the Christina story. The Saint was a popular one and her day, July 24th, did not so far as I know, have any particular significance for Beauchamp, nor did the saint herself - though a story of imprisonment and affliction, borne with fortitude and faith and ending in triumph obviously had a relevance to the Earl of Warwick's situation - but that could equally apply to a number of Saint's legends. What might be merely a neat coincidence does however occur in a document concerning the Cistercian Nunnery at Douglas on the Isle of Man, which in 1408 lists a 'Cristina Prioress of Douglas.' As there are no documents referring to the Nunnery prior to this date, it is not known whether Christina was Prioress at the time of Beauchamp's imprisonment, but it is tempting to see a connection.

The short saint's Life (528 lines in 66 8-line stanzas), is competently written, despite some amateurish rhymes and line-fillers, such as 'y were' (5), 'y wisse' (17), and 'this is no naye' (31) and it is generally entertaining and concise, with a swift moving narrative. It is unpretentious both in aims and style and tells the story of St. Christina without display, but with an occasional feature which suggests more than just basic narrative skill, such as the play on names and words when Christina is baptised by Christ:

Criste cristynde Cristyne with his honde-he was godfadir & preste bat nghte,
Ande after Criste, I vnderstonde,
Cristyne may be hire name orighte:
Thane after hire godfadir so she highte,
Criste, that in þe see hire fonde.
Hir muste nedis be one holy wighte
That Criste thus baptiste in þe stronde.

273-280
There also seems to be an attempt to develop a theme throughout the legend with the use, admittedly conventional, of brightness and light both as a distinction between good and evil, and in a related way, as an adjective to describe Christina. Light and brightness are associated in an obvious way with heaven and the true faith; angels are bright, and when the saint finally dies, her soul ascends 'to heuene so brighte' (487). The adjective is repeatedly used to describe Christina to the extent that the act of cutting off her hair is intended to deprive her of her brightness, 'Let noght if hire here be brighte' (346). Brightness is also used to make a contrast between heavenly and earthly matters, between true and false faiths. The 'Goddes of golde & siluer brighte' (40) are shown in the next stanza to be 'but stonys & stokkes blake' (51), and the hot oven in which Christina is placed, although it is 'als hote as fiere so brighte' (383) and 'it shone as shene/ As any fiere that euer myghte be' (385-6), is no match for the bright maiden and 'aungels brighte' who sing in the fire, whose heat is compared with a bath. The extremes of earthly brightness are insignificant when compared with heavenly brightness.

As 'bright' often occurs as a rhyme word it might be argued that it is simply a convenient word, and certainly as a theme it has little originality, but at the same time, the author does seem to be consciously creating and maintaining a theme out of light and brightness and the legend ends as it begins 'Withe seint Cristyne, pi maydyne brighte' (528).

The Paris version of the legend compares favourably with the other versions discussed by Gerould. Both the English and Scottish versions are written in rhyming couplets of 306 and 310 lines respectively, to form a continuous narrative and neither exploits the dramatic or emotional potential in the way that Paris manages in, for example, the tearing of the flesh scene, where despite padding phrases (231-2), and some
desperate groping for rhymes (230 and 232; cf. 515 in the Epilogue quoted earlier), the torture is given more substance than in the other versions, and the description and therefore the torment, is extended by the use of pairs of words:

He cumand men to go bilyue
With nayles and hokes hir flesch to riuę.
Pai war willy to wirk hir wo̝gh,
Hir tendir flesch pai all to-drogh.
Scho tuke a pece vp in pat place
And kest it in hir faders face:
'Tirand, scho said, mased out of minde,
Tak pone and ett ofpine owin kinde!'  
(English) 131-138

pane commandyt he to perse hir flesch:
with scharpe nayls, pat teyndir was,
& hire lymmys to draw in twyne,
til ony lyf ware hire in.
pane cristyane of hire flesch can pul,
pat rywine wes, a handful,
& kyste [it] in hire fadire face,
& sad tyl hyme, pat angry wes:
'pu tyrand, pat bi flesch can get
of bi body, now It ete!'
(Scottish) 153-162

Vrbane commaundede thane anone:
Hire flesche, pat was so white & shene,
It s̄_ulde be scrapede of bi the bone
With hokyde nayles, sharpe & kene:
He bade that alle hire lymmes bedene
Thei shulde be brokyne, one be one.
It was grete pete, wo hade it seene,
Of suche a mayde, be seinte Johne!

Whene seinte Cristyne hire flesche se,
She toke a pece that was of kytte,
And euene she caste at Vrbans eye;
& he hade not blenchyde, she hade hyme hitte.
Thus saide ļe maydyne, fulle of wytte,
To hyme pat shulde hire fadir be:
'Haue here a morcelle, teraunte! take ite!
Of ļe flesche was getyne of the.'
(Paris, Christina) 225-240

In the same way, though these three versions all make use of the standard devices for a saint's legend such as contrast and juxtaposition of situation and behaviour, more effective use is made in the Paris version than in the other two.

The Bokenham version is much longer than the other versions, with some 1,040 lines, and is correspondingly slower in reaching the major events of the story: 240 lines before the false idols are destroyed, as opposed to 130 lines in the Paris legend, and 24 lines before Christina is mentioned by name (and to match, we are told that her martyrdom
lasted for fourteen years). Emphasis is placed on long speeches and prayers as vehicles for expressing faith and doctrine, rather than on exemplary incidents, and glossy descriptive detail is added for amplification as in the baptism by Christ:

Goddys maieste to hir she seye commynge,
And on his heed set a goldene crowne,seye;
Off purpyl pure a stolle was his clothyng;
And wyth odoure of rychels ful suete smellyng,
Beforn hym passyd aungels many oon,
And wyth ynpys & psalmys wel tonyng,
Thousandis of aungellis aftyr hym dyd goon.

In this way, the appeal of the Bokenham legend is doctrinal, devotional and celebratory, as opposed to the more inspirational appeal of the simpler Paris version.

The merits of the legend by Paris say something about the abilities of an esquire who could compose a respectable English version of a saint's life from a non-English source (as Paris emphasises at line 528), within the limitations imposed by his confinement on the Isle of Man. However, G.H. Gerould expressed an opinion on the inspiration behind the Paris legend, which transplants Beauchamp and Paris from their isolated situation. As has been said, Gerould was unable to identify the direct source of the legend but was more sure of the model Paris used for his work:

It is less easy, to be sure, to trace with certitude relationships in style and manner than relationships in subject-manner; it is not possible in the present case to submit definite proof. Nevertheless, William Paris's legend seems to me so clearly an imitation of Chaucer's Second Nun's Tale (Caecilia) that I have no hesitancy about stating my opinion.20

The qualities Gerould believed the Paris St. Christina to share with Chaucer's tale were, 'the same sobriety, the same simplicity, the same brevity, the same solidity',21 and he believed that Paris could not have achieved this had he not been a reader of Chaucer:

... I am greatly mistaken in my notions of literary art if a young retainer of a great lord could have made in 1398 or 1399 a poem with precisely the qualities of this
if he had not been a reader of Chaucer.

It is not that he used Chaucerian phrases; it is not that he refashioned the substance of his story and took Chaucer as his master of narrative art; it is simply a case where diction, turn of speech, and rhythmical movement constantly recall the manner of the great poet.22

Gerould ends with the understatement that if he is correct in identifying the inspiration behind the legend, then 'the evidence that it affords of Chaucer's influence upon the court circle of his time is not without interest.'23

It can be seen without too much effort why Gerould was of the opinion that St. Christina was modelled on Chaucer's Second Nun's Tale. His reasons for failing to provide substantial and other than circumstantial evidence are equally readily apparent, for while Christina has something of the flavour of the Second Nun's Tale, this, if indeed it is derived from Chaucer's tale, is so thoroughly integrated into Paris's work that points of contact are hard to establish and one is forced to remark instead on similarities, rather than to identify borrowings. Textual similarities are difficult to isolate. There are few revealing concurrences of phraseology and vocabulary, and though there are some similarities in detail and incident, these are probably incidental.24

However, by far the most convincing evidence for knowledge of Chaucer's writings is the stanza-form of Christina. The eight-line stanza (ababbaba), is the ballade stanza used by Chaucer in the Monk's Tale, the ABC, To Rosemounde, The Former Age, Fortune, the Complaint of Venus and Lenvoy de Chaucer a Bukton, and is one of the forms taken on by Chaucer's fifteenth century imitators, including Lydgate. The use of the ballade stanza, a 'literary' form, for a Saint's Legend, implies Chaucer's influence, indeed it is difficult to imagine how Paris would have adopted such a form, without knowledge of Chaucer's use of it, and of Chaucer's use of other high-style literary forms for Saints' Legends,
such as the rhyme-royal (ababbcc) used in the Second Nun's Tale.  

Turning to evidence of a different kind, we know that Thomas Beauchamp was a member of the royal household in which Chaucer served and it has been said that 'apart from royalty - the only noble family with whom it is certain that the poet was in repeated and close contact, were the Beauchamps'. Certainly, no less than seven members of the Beauchamp family are associated with Chaucer with varying degrees of relevance in the Life-Records. However, as is to be expected from these official documents, there is no mention of literary associations.

Thomas Beauchamp (d.1401) and Chaucer appear as members of the royal household in a writ of allowance (1st Sept. 1368) for liveries of mourning at the funeral of Queen Philippa, though in distinctly different categories, Chaucer being among the Esquires of Less Degree. The only other link between the two is in Chaucer's and his son Thomas's connection with offices concerned with the Forest of North Petherton, (from c.1390-1400), which was in the Mortimer family possession. Among farmers of the Mortimer inheritance were the Earls of Warwick, Arundel, Northumberland and John Lord Neville. It is said that Chaucer had personal associations with the Mortimers and it is interesting to note that the 11th Earl of Warwick married Catherine Mortimer.

By far the most interesting series of Chaucer-Beauchamp contacts are those with William Beauchamp, Lord Abergavenny, who was educated at Oxford University. The first specific record of Chaucer's association with Beauchamp occurs in 1378, when Chaucer acted as mainpernor for Beauchamp in the custody of Pembroke Castle and other Pembroke lands during the minority of the heir. Beauchamp was chamberlain in the royal household from December 1378 to December 1380 and in this capacity, he acted as one of the witnesses of Cecily Champain's release to Chaucer against the claims of raptus in 1380, together with John Clanvowe,
William Neville, John Philipot and Richard Morel. The editors of the *Life Records* see the witnesses as more than simple household acquaintances, though the argument seems to somewhat circular:

The witnesses to Cecily Champain's release to Chaucer appear to have been his friends, since they include Sir William de Beauchamp, chamberlain of the King's household, and other members of the court circle. 33

In July 1387, Chaucer with others, accompanied Beauchamp to Calais, where Beauchamp had been Captain since September 1383 and was to continue as such for 5-6 years. 34 In a different context, it has been noted that a number of grants bear witness to the lifelong association between William Beauchamp and his brother the Earl of Warwick. 35

Chaucer also had dealings with Roger Beauchamp of Bletsoe, a 'veteran household servant' and distant relative of the Earl of Warwick. 36 Payment of the sum of £71-4s-6d was made on the 12th July 1376 to Chaucer, the proceeds of wool forfeited by one John Kent of London for exporting wool without paying duty, 'Per ipsum nunciante Rogero de Bello Campo camerario regis'. 37 This grant does not seem to be connected with Chaucer's position as controller in the port of London, rather 'It has something of the appearance of a reward to an informer, but no evidence has been found to substantiate this supposition'. 38

These documents, while they might mask a network of more personal contacts, do not really add anything to confirm or refute Gerould's opinion. If the Paris legend is dependant on Chaucer's tale, (and the stanza form certainly suggests knowledge of some of Chaucer's writings), it is possible that opportunities for knowledge of Chaucer's work might have been provided in the course of his service to the Earl of Warwick, though they could equally have been independent of this. 39 With the lack of substantiating evidence, the validity of Gerould's claim must rest on individual judgement. However, if his claim is accepted as a possibility, then it implies that Chaucer's work was available to a
squire such as Paris. This would coincide with recent scholarship, which suggests that Chaucer's contemporary audience might have been found among 'the household knights and officials, career diplomats and civil servants, who constitute the "court" in its wider sense...'.

Finally, to return to the circumstances in which the Legend of St. Christina was written, the implications of the final four stanzas are that the legend was undertaken on the initiative of the author, during his spare time rather than at the request of Sir Thomas Beauchamp, though it is clear that the whole work was composed with the unfortunate Earl in mind. It might generously be called a kind of 'patronage by association' rather than intent - but the credit for composing the Legend of St. Christina lies with William Paris.

John Shirley and the legacy of household service

John Shirley has received a great deal of attention from scholars of fifteenth century literature and book production. The reasons for such interest are: his role as a preserver of works by Chaucer and Lydgate, the contents and nature of the manuscript anthologies which he compiled and seems to have intended for circulation, and the evident influence of his scribal activities on some subsequent manuscripts which are clearly derived from or influenced by his own manuscripts.

Though the textual value of the Chaucer works Shirley copied has been described as 'negligible', he has been credited as the main or sole authority for the inclusion in the Chaucer canon of Anelida, Mars, Venus, Pity, Steadfastness, Truth and Adam Scriveyn. He is also the sole authority for a number of Lydgate's minor poems and his knowledge of the circumstances in which works were written, as well as the informal comments about the monk and the annotations to the texts, have led to suggestions that he knew Lydgate personally and add a further interest to the works he copied and to interpretations of his significance. It
has also been suggested that Lydgate was the source of Shirley's contacts with the Chaucer family.43

The two verse prologues written by Shirley, one in B.L. MS Additional 16165, the other in a copy by John Stow (B.L. MS Additional 29729), provide interesting details of Shirley's activities.44 In the prologue in Additional 16165, he describes how the manuscript was compiled:

\begin{verbatim}
\text{Pis litell booke with myn hande}
\text{wryten I haue ye shul vnderstande}
\text{And sought pe copie in many a place}
\text{To haue pe more thank of youre grace}
\text{And doon hit bynde In pis volume}
\text{Pat bope pe gret and pe comune}
\text{May ber on looke and eke hit reede}
\end{verbatim}

(11. 13-19, Hammond)

This is followed by a list of the contents, with comments on the authors, patrons and texts:

\begin{verbatim}
\text{Pe passyoun \banne of Nichodeme}
\text{fful wel translated shul ye seen}
\text{Pe whiche of Berkeley lord Thomas}
\text{Whome gode assoyle for his grace}
\text{Lete oute of latyn hit translate}
\text{By Johan Trevysa pat hit made}
\text{A maystre in Theologye}
\text{Appreued clerk for pe maystrye}
\text{Thankepe pe lord and pe Clerk}
\text{Pat caused first pat holy werk}
\end{verbatim}

(11. 35-44)

The prologue ends with a plea to return the book to Shirley, suggesting that the manuscripts were made to be loaned to readers and returned:

\begin{verbatim}
\text{Thankepe bauctoures pat pe as storyes}
\text{Renoueld haue to youre memoryes}
\text{And pe wryter for his distresse}
\text{Which besechibe youre gentylness}
\text{Pat ye sende pis booke agyyne}
\text{Hoome to Shirley pat is right fye}
\text{If hit habe beon to yowe pleasauce}
\end{verbatim}

(11. 93-99)

However, there have been differences of opinion over the nature of Shirley's enterprise and differences in the terminology used to express it. Eleanor Hammond thought of him as one of the earliest
publishers, the proprietor and manufacturer of a lending library and probably owner of an even greater enterprise, if the four shops he is known to have owned were used for business purposes. Brusendorff similarly saw Shirley as the owner and manager of a circulating library run on business lines for fashionable London society, with his manuscripts addressed to noble customers. Further, he inferred from Shirley's 'rather prosperous' trade of transcribing and circulating books, that he had several scribes working for him. More recently however, there has been a move to question the professional and commercial interpretation and instead to emphasise a more amateur (in the true sense) enterprise. R.F. Green called Shirley an 'individual anthologist', 'amateur scribe', 'collector', 'literary apologist' and 'antiquarian', and noted that the shops he owned do not automatically imply his use of them for business purposes, or even that he used them himself.

A.I. Doyle largely concurs with this view, calling Shirley's literary activities 'perhaps more... a hobby than a business'. The most recent assessment of Shirley has brought the argument full circle, by restating the theory that Shirley was a stationer and proprietor of a scriptorium, though it has to be said that in this last discussion, some assumptions are made which cannot be supported by evidence.

Here, I do not propose to approach Shirley from the context of fifteenth century book production, but instead to look at some links between Shirley's manuscript activities and his earlier career as an important official in the service of Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (d.1439).

Shirley was employed as Richard Beauchamp's secretary at a time when it is said to have been unusual for a private nobleman to have a secretary. While Beauchamp was in France, Shirley was one of a 'constant stream of messengers' on the Earl's business between the Continent and Warwick and London. He appears elsewhere in the records
of the Earl of Warwick, receiving annuities, receiving payment for writing a letter and as a frequent visitor to the household of the Countess of Warwick, Elizabeth Berkeley, where his wife, also Elizabeth, was a lady in waiting. 53

His position as secretary suggests he was a trusted servant and close to the centre of Beauchamp's private administration and to Beauchamp himself. He was responsible for collecting money from the Exchequer for the wages of some men in Beauchamp's service in France in 1424, and was sent to England to seek payment of the arrears in the garrison's wages, with the Treasurer of Calais in 1427. 54 Earlier, he had made a loan of £27-9s-8d to Richard Beauchamp, which had been repaid in 1421-2, and was involved in negotiations with Lady Neville about a marriage in 1422/3. 55

Shirley was with Beauchamp when he returned to England to take up his position as tutor to Henry VI (1428-30) and is recorded as the recipient of a New Year's gift from the King in January 1428. In the same year Shirley was among members of the Earl of Warwick's household and family admitted to the confraternity of St. Alban's Abbey. 56 He was described as an esquire of London in 1429 and from then until the death of Richard Beauchamp in 1439, he was recorded as in the Earl of Warwick's service, and though he still had connections with the Beauchamp family and with Beauchamp employees, it is clear that he was living in London where he held a number of positions and was involved in property transactions and litigation. 57 He remained in London until his death in 1456, and it is to this latter period of his life that his manuscript activities are usually consigned.

One item in a Shirley manuscript would seem to be an eloquent legacy of his time in Beauchamp service. In the Shirley autograph manuscript B.L. MS Additional 16165 there appears the unique copy of a poem of sixty-one lines (ff. 245b - 246b), with the following title in
Balade made of Isabelle Countesse of Warr. and lady Despenser by Richard Beauchamp Forlle of Warrewyk

The balade was copied by Shirley in quatrains divided by marginal marks (aaab/bbbc/cccd etc.), though MacCracken when he printed it, put the rhyming lines together and divided the poem into three sections, and preferred to call it a virelai. The Beauchamp balade appears in a group of short poems, after some of the longer pieces in the manuscript (Chaucer's translation of Boethius, the Master of Game, the Complaint of the Black Knight), and is followed by Lydgate's Invocation to St. Anne and some of his short poems.

The subject of the poem is a conventional one and begins with the author's inability to convey the grief he feels when absent from his lady:

I can not half pe woo compleyne that dope my woful hert streyne With bisy thought and grevous peyne, Whan I not see My feyre lady whos beaute So fully preented is in me

(ll. 1-6)

The poem continues with a declaration of the lover's absolute devotion to his lady until the end of his life, begging pity and mercy from her, who is of course above all in virtue, and expressing his devotion to her in the terms of feudal obligation:

I shal, howe sore pat me smert, But right humbelly with lowly hert Hir ordenaunce Obeye, and in hir governaunce Set al my welfare and plesaunce Abydyng tyme of allegeaunce And never swerve Til pat pe dethe myn hert kerve; For lever is me hir man to sterve Than any oper for to serve.

(ll. 10-19)

The knowledge that Shirley could on occasions be somewhat 'generous' in his attributions, casts a shadow over the certainty of Beauchamp's authorship. The Shirley autograph manuscript Cambridge, Trinity College
MS R.3.20 contains a number of French poems attributed to the Duke of Suffolk and a further seventeen anonymous French balades, some of the Suffolk poems also appearing in B.L. MS Additional 34360, a Shirley-influenced manuscript. Yet some of these French poems are attributed elsewhere to other authors. Lealement a tous jours mais... , a thirteen line roundel, is described in the Trinity manuscript as 'Roundell made by my lord of Suffolk whylest he was prysonnier in Fraunce', and the heading is repeated with a few minor orthographical changes in B.L. MS Additional 34360, though the roundel is actually by Alain Chartier rather than the Duke of Suffolk. 59 Ma douce amour et dame souveraine, which also appears in the Trinity manuscript is by Deschamps. 60 Further, some of the other poems which appear in the Trinity manuscript also appear elsewhere; Qui ses besognes vault bien faire appears in a number of French collections. 61

The knowledge of reliable alternative attributions of authorship and of the common material shared with some French collections, encourages the speculation that Shirley could have adapted or obtained a translation of a French source and added the name of Richard Beauchamp for the purposes of prestige. There is always the possibility that Shirley himself composed the balade, though comparisons with Shirley's known poetic compositions (the verses introducing his manuscripts), hardly suggest this. A search among the more obvious French sources - the works of Machaut, Deschamps, Chartier, and the French and English works of Charles d'Orleans - has so far failed to produce any evidence to substantiate this suspicion. However, the possibility that a more comprehensive search would reveal a source which would qualify the claim for Richard Beauchamp's authorship must be entertained, although the conventionality of the balade makes searching for direct sources an almost pointless task. 62

If the balade is by Beauchamp, then the knowledge of his ownership
of the Froissart manuscript discussed in Chapter 3 might be relevant. The manuscript includes a number of short balades, roundels and virelays, many of which could provide models for the language, sentiment and form of the Beauchamp balade, though there does not seem to be anything that could be called a direct source. Again, similarities of phrasing and sentiment indicate the common currency of this kind of 'courtly' poetry. The virelay De tout mon coeur vous fai don,63 for example, echoes the sentiment of service and devotion of the Beauchamp balade:

De tout mon coeur vous fai don
Entirement,
Ma douce dame au corps gent,
Et le vous don
Pour tous jours en abandon
Tres liement.
....
Car plus me pov~s merir
Que je ne puis desservir
Par ma labour,
Las! quant verai-je venir
Le reconfort o~ je tir
Et par honnour.
Je suis en vostre prison
Tous liegement:
Et coeurs qui merci attent,
Grasce et pardon,
Doit avoir, s'il vit, foison
Aliement.

Other examples of similarities in theme, sentiment and vocabulary could be cited, for example the virelays, Par une amoureuse semence and Au departir de vous, ma dame, and the balade Quel mal, quel grief ne quel painne.64 If Richard Beauchamp did compose the poem, then it is probable that the examples he saw in his Froissart manuscript provided both models and inspiration.

However, without contrary evidence, we have to rely on Shirley's statement of authorship and to credit Richard Beauchamp with its composition, and can view the inclusion of the balade as a direct link between Shirley's career as secretary to Beauchamp and his activities as a compiler of manuscripts. Even if the attribution of authorship proved to be spurious, the link would still remain, as evidence of the
advantages to be gained from the association with an important and well-known statesman.

A further link between Shirley and the Beauchamp family occurs in the way in which Shirley-influenced manuscripts are largely responsible for the preservation of the three works commissioned from Lydgate by members of the Beauchamp family (to be discussed in Chapter 6), and for our knowledge of the respective patrons of each piece.

B.L. MS Harley 7333, which is derived in part (ff. 30b-118b & 132-50), from a Shirley manuscript, contains both Guy of Warwick (ff. 33-35b) and the Title and Pedigree of Henry VI (ff. 31-32b), both with the headings identifying Margaret Lady Talbot and the Earl of Warwick respectively. The Harley manuscript is the only source listed for the Title and Pedigree in the Index of Middle English Verse (and Supplement), while Guy appears in a further six manuscripts. Of these, another two are linked with Shirley, one directly and another less so. The first, Harvard University MS Eng. 530, is derived in part from a Shirley manuscript and has the same heading for Guy as the Harley manuscript. The second, Cambridge, Trinity College MS R.3.21, a volume of miscellaneous vernacular works with pen and ink drawings (c.1455-85) and owned by Roger Thorney, a London mercer (between 1471-83), was written in part (ff. 34r-49v, line 4), by a scribe active during the reign of Edward IV, whose hand has been identified in a number of Shirley-influenced and other manuscripts. Neither Guy nor the Fifteen Joys and Sorrows commissioned by Isabella Countess of Warwick, which also appears in this manuscript, occurs in the folios written by this particular scribe, but the scribe's association with such Shirley-influenced manuscripts as B.L. MS Additional 34360, B.L. MS Arundel 59 and B.L. MS Harley 2251, together with the belief that he was at work in a scriptorium where at least two Shirley manuscripts were available, is another interesting, though uncertain link. The Fifteen Joys itself, appears in a further
two manuscripts, of which one, B.L. MS Cotton Titus A.xxvi, was thought by Eleanor Hammond to show a Shirleyan archetype \(^7^1\) and contains the heading identifying Isabella as the patron: \(^7^2\)

Lo my lordes and ladyes here Begynnen pe fyfftene Ioyes of oure lady cleped pe xv. Ooes translated out of Frenshe into Englishe by daun John the Monke of Bury at pinstnace of pe worshipfull Pryncesse Isabelle nowe Countesse of Warr' lady Despenser.

The importance of Shirley in the dissemination of some of Lydgate's poetry is beyond question and Shirley is said to be the sole authority for some thirty of the minor poems. B.L. MS Additional 16165 has been called a 'major repository of Lydgate's courtly and sub-courtly poetry' and the Shirley-influenced manuscripts Additional 34360 and Harley 2251, have been described as 'of vital importance as sources for Lydgate's minor poetry.' \(^7^3\) The notion that Shirley and Lydgate were personally acquainted stems from the evidence of the manuscripts, in the friendly references to Lydgate and his need for financial support in the prologues, in the appearance of Lydgate's Envoy in Trinity R.3.20 and Ashmole 59, charging readers to return the books to Shirley, in the annotations and wry comments to the texts, \(^7^4\) and most convincingly in the headings to the poems, which give the impression of access to personal knowledge:

- Beholdepe nowe filowyng nexst here pe translacyoune of Gaude virgo mater christi. made by Daun Johan pe Munke Lydegate by night as he lay in his bedde at London. \(^7^5\)

- Here begyneth a balade whych John Lydgate the Monke of Bery wrott and made at pe commaundement of pe Quen: Kateryn as in here sportes she walkyd by the medowes that were late mowen in the monthe of Julii. \(^7^6\)

It is not at all impossible to see the origins of Shirley's association with Lydgate in Shirley's years in the service of Richard Beauchamp. We know that Shirley held an important and trusted position in Beauchamp's administration and we know of the Beauchamp family's connections with Lydgate, (see Chapter 6), more specifically of Richard Beauchamp's commission of the propaganda piece from Lydgate in France, at the time when
Shirley was employed on Beauchamp's business in France and England. Further, Lydgate's services to the Lancastrian propaganda campaign and Beauchamp's position close to the centre of the minority administration in England and France, and as tutor of Henry VI, must have provided further possibilities for contact with Lydgate. While the suggestion that Shirley's contact with Lydgate began in the context of his Beauchamp employment cannot be proved absolutely, the possibilities provided by this environment are highly suggestive.

But does any of this throw any light on John Shirley's later activities? It seems that in view of the 'courtly' and 'aristocratic' flavour of his manuscripts, expressed in the contents and in the references to noble patrons and authors, it is possible to suggest that the background of aristocratic household, royal court and foreign service was an influential factor in his choice of texts and possibly in his access to texts and contacts. This is not to say that the Beauchamps or the nobility in general should take credit for Shirley's activities or even necessarily that they were actively supporting him, but that his earlier career adequately accounts for the nature and contents of his manuscripts.

There is certainly a courtly 'feel' about the two verse prologues, especially the one in the Shirley autograph manuscript B.L. MS Additional 16165, with its backward glance at the standards and approval of 'oure elders', the reference to Lydgate's willingness 'to plese gentyles', and the references to the noble patrons and authors, Thomas Lord Berkeley and Edward Duke of York, 'Pat dyed in þe vauntwarde/ Of þe bataylle In Picardy/ At Agincourt', whose Master of the Game was for those 'gentyl of kynde'.

Stowe's copy of the Shirley prologue in B.L. MS Additional 29729, begins with an address to 'ye my lorde', and contains a plea to forgive the compiler for his 'rude vplandishe wise' and for his lack of skill:
and for I haue but shorte space
i must ye lyttler ouer pase
besechyng ye be not to wroth
ffor as I could wt outen coth
and as my febles would suffyse
in my rude vplandishe wise
thus haue I them in ordre set

(11. 9-15, Hammond)

It ends with an expression of his service and duty, in the language of the aristocratic retainer:

and so at your commaundement
It shall bene eft when you list send
wt all ye saruice yt I can
as he yt is your oune man
and all yt in this company
ben knight squyer or lady
or other estat what euer they be
ye god of loue wher so yt he ....e
be in heauen or here in yearth
he brynghe them to the heuen forth

Of course, these prologues are not unambiguous. The appeal to the audience of lords, ladies and knights could be a conventional one to create an impression of an intended audience, in the way that Caxton does in his prologues, with the works in reality designed to appeal to a much wider audience. Equally, the pleas for tolerance could be Shirley's own version of a modesty topos. However, as a whole, the prologues have an individual air about them, with nothing comparable to be found in the work of professional scribes, which perhaps adds support to the opinion that Shirley was engaged in a 'pre-commercial relationship', providing entertainment for a small, and probably in part, high-class circle of people. Though the Beauchamps did not directly sponsor Shirley in his manuscript activities, Shirley's household service provided a background and opportunities for his literary interests.

Patronage and Politics: John Rous and the Rous rolls

John Rous is known principally to medieval historians for his not entirely reliable Historia Regum Angliae and more generally for his account of Richard III which occurs in that work, where Richard is
described as Antichrist and the ominous details of his birth are recorded, 'Richard was born at Fotheringhay in Northamptonshire, retained within his mother's womb for two years and emerging with teeth and hair to his shoulders'.

John Rous was chaplain of the chantry at Guy's Cliff near Warwick, built and sponsored by the Beauchamps, from c.1445 to his death in 1491. He was born in Warwick and while most secondary authorities give the date of his birth as c.1411, McFarlane thought that a date of c.1425 was more likely. He was educated at Oxford where he was acquainted with John Tiptoft, subsequently known for his interest in Italian humanism, and it was apparently Rous who advised Tiptoft to visit the Holy Land.

Rous has also been credited with the foundation of the library of St. Mary's collegiate church in Warwick c.1464 and is said to have had a room constructed over the south porch of the church, which he furnished with books:

Johannes Rouse, Capellanus Cantuariae Gibclif qui super porticum australem librariam construxit, et libris ornavit. From an inventory of the goods of the Church, he is known to have held on permanent loan during his lifetime, five books belonging to the Church. These had been bequeathed by a William Rous, presumably a relative, on the condition that John Rous should have their use for his spiritual edification.

Apart from his duties as chantry chaplain and his involvement with St. Mary's Warwick, he also devoted his time to antiquarian and historical studies. His Historia and two genealogical rolls of the Lords of Warwick (the Rous rolls) have survived complete. Other works credited to him by Leland include writing on the antiquity of Warwick, on Guy's Cliff, on the English Universities, and a tract on Giants. A few extracts from his work on the Bishops of Worcester survive in Ashmolean MS 770 (f.33) and Leland's Itineraries contain extracts from...
his De episcopis Wigorniae and De Academis Britannicis. He is also thought by some to have composed the life of Richard Beauchamp, which appears in the Beauchamp pageants.

It is the two Rous rolls, one Latin and one English, which are of interest here, for as discussed in Chapter 3, it is probable that they were commissioned by the former Countess of Warwick, Anne Beauchamp, in order to attract attention to her situation. Anne, widow of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick, had been deprived after the death of her husband of her estates and possessions, which were subsequently divided between her daughters Isabella and Anne, wives of the Dukes of Clarence and Gloucester respectively. She had actively sought the restoration of her estates by letters and pleas to the King and members of the royal family and the rolls can be seen as an extension of this campaign. Though both rolls are thought to have been composed at about the same time (1483-85), the Latin roll has been altered and amended (some time after 1485), to give it a Lancastrian appeal appropriate to the reign of Henry VII, as opposed to the Yorkist bias of the English roll, with its praise of Richard III.

The Rous rolls are a mixture of a genealogical chronicle and heraldic roll, both of which were popular in the middle ages, as surviving originals and copies of originals made in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries testify. Genealogical chronicles were particularly common during the reign of Edward IV for propaganda purposes, where they were used to justify dynastic change and to emphasise Edward's rightful position as King through pedigrees which not only included immediate ancestors, but which encompassed biblical and legendary history. The Rous rolls were therefore popular both in kind, in their intended use as propaganda, and in their use of material other than the strictly historical.

The rolls contain an historical account of the Lords of Warwick
from earliest times until the time of writing, that is, the reign of Richard III in the English roll, with emendations suited to the reign of Henry VII in the Latin roll. The list includes a number of Kings as well as some characters from legend – Eneas the Swan Knight, Dame Felice, Sir Guy and Reinbrun – who are treated as historical characters. It continues with the historical Lords and Earls of Warwick, with some inaccuracies, covering the Beauchamps and ending with the brief reign of the Nevilles and their royal successors.

Individuals are depicted primarily in the context of their duty to Warwick, rather than in their national or international roles. Features which are singled out for particular praise are nobility of character, interest in building in Warwick, endorsement of privileges for Warwick, and support and foundation of religious institutions and elsewhere:

kyng guthelyne, or kenelyn hole kyng of grete Brytayn that comprehendyth Englond Walys and Scotlond he was a vertuus man and a grete bylder and a monge many othere as ys schewed in the abbey of Ewysham

(no 1)

It has been said of the rolls that there is no such thing as a bad Lord of Warwick, but William de Newburgh only narrowly escapes this title:

Thys lord was a whyle heuy lord to the howis of Sepulcris of Warrwik but the patriark of Jherusalem wrote to hym a ful stiryng letter weche I have rod and aftur he was a good lord to hem.

(no 33)

As a subsidiary theme, Rous is interested, not unnaturally, in anything to do with the history of Guy's Cliff and with Oxford. Most of the description of Thomas de Newburgh is taken up with an account of his wife's benefactions to Oxford.

hys worsupful lady is buryed a fore the hygh aulterre of Osney of Oxneforde Sho gau to the help of pore scolars of Oxneforde to borow by pleggys in ther nede frely vii score marke put in a cofer to ther be houe aftre there behauer to borow which is callyd unto thys
day Warrewik voucher and she has for that and odre benefectes ii massis solempe by the universite doon in the yere. She was a devout lady and large in Geftys to collagis of her dayes in Oxneford an religious placis as the sepulcris of Warrwik Osney and Godstow....

(no 36)

Roger de Newburgh, 'a holy man that divers tymes in his own person visyte the holy land', founded a number of religious houses in Warwick and:

he also gave the heremytage of Gybclyf un to the priory of Sepulcres of Warrewyk and his son Earli Wallerane confermyd his gyftes and then was hit a sel to hem and odre wylye there were chanons and after secular prestys lyueng by salaryes where they myght gete hem and with hem lyues armtyys and lyued un party by lyuerey fro the priori for then hyt was a worshipfull place and by almys from the castel and of burges of the town and of devout peple of the cuntrey....

(no 32)

Criticism of the rolls as factual history abounds. Rous has been described as 'more laborious than honest', 'wholly uncritical and undiscriminating in his approach to evidence', and the narrowness and localism of his view has also been censured. He was of course bound by the limitations of his sources, which contained their own inaccuracies and by his credulity about mythical and legendary items, which was in keeping with the attitudes of his contemporaries, such as in the matter of the descent from the Swan Knight of the Earls of Warwick, and the Swan Cup, which was kept by them, 'in whos tresori was kept ye cup made of the cheyn a for seyd I have dronk of the same I dar the better wryghten hyt' (no 18). A similar credulity is displayed in his account of Robin Hood during the time of Earl Guy Beauchamp:

A bowt his dayes or sone aftre hym and euyre eny such were suld regyne the famous outlawe Robyn hode and ltyyl John and there felawis. hit is maruel that no croniclar writis of hem.

(no 46)

However, the attempt to substantiate his material, while failing to provide the historical accuracy and veracity required by the modern
historian, is worthy of due attention and credit, and McFarlane for one thought that the 'most striking achievement' of mid-fifteenth century scholarship was 'the foundation and rapid development, along lines much the same as they have been pursued since, of antiquarian and topographical studies in England', as practiced by William Worcester and John Rous. 101

What is particularly noticeable, is the way in which Rous approached his task. He was not content simply to repeat and restate information but sought instead to authenticate it by reference to other sources and travelled to Wales and elsewhere in his search for evidence. He cites an impressive number of chronicle and historical sources: Geoffrey of Monmouth, William of Malmesbury, John Hardyng, Gyldas, various Welsh chronicles, Giraldus Cambrensis, Marianus Scotus, the Chronicle of Sir Daniel treasurer of Llandaff, and the book of the Acts of the Abbots of St. Albans, and on occasions includes more than one reference in support of a particular piece of information. He also refers to the romance of Reinbrun and mentions seeing a copy of the Reductorium Morale in the library at Oxford. 102 Among documentary evidence, he refers to the Domesday Book. Edward the Confessor,
graunt new and confermyd old priuilagis of citeis and hed towys of hys realm and in specially of tho that longyd to the crown of the wyche Warrewik was at that tyme on of hem as wel sheweth in the kygys boke in hys tresory callid domus day.....

(no 12)

A signet letter of Edward IV and records in Warwick Castle are also included along with the Patriarch's letter already mentioned:

Edwardus the fowrth....... graunt with owt fe or fyn to the burgh at the instans of hys noble brodyr Georg duk of clarance many feyre and grete preuilages as the copy wol playnly shew whech under hys signet wes send to the pryve seal.....

(no 16)

William the Conqueror granted the borough of Warwick to Harry Newburgh, with all its ancient privileges which the inhabitants still
claimed at the time of writing,

thow they have no wrytyng to show for them for they
may not cum to the tresory in the castel to seke hyt
and in hapis nevor by ofte dyspoilyng of the seyd
castel and tresery. sum where myght be found sum
copy of record of the seyd Eorl herrys creacone with
all possessions and fredoms rehercyd.

(no 13)

What confirms his spirit of enquiry as genuine, are the occasions
when he has obviously attempted but failed to find evidence. Of the
arms of the Earls of Warwick before Rohand he writes, 'I can fynd as
yet no wrytyng of' (no 19) and Thomas Newburgh 'dyed the xxvij day of
Jun and was buried at Warrwick as for as can be perceyuyd' (no 36).

There are few references to external sources when Rous reaches
more recent history, particularly with the Beauchamps in the fourteenth
and fifteenth centuries, where the accounts contain personal details
and are generally more knowledgeable. Of Margaret Beauchamp, daughter
of Richard Beauchamp from his first marriage, he wrote:

This lady to the honour of God made a decre in her
hows not her own childre owt set. that what euer
person blasphamyd owr lord by unlawfull swervng he
shuld lak that day ale wyn and chochyn and Hauet
but bred and watre.

(no 51)

Likewise, of Henry Beauchamp, son and heir of Richard Beauchamp,
he wrote:

he wold euery day be shryve and dayle sey the hole daued
sawter with owt he had gretter besines he cawd hyt
with owt the boke perfyzlle...

(no 54)

Turning to the Latin roll, the alterations made to make it more
suitable for the changed political situation occur mostly in the last
few portraits and notices, beginning with Richard Neville Earl of
Warwick and including his daughters and their spouses and offspring.

The changes consist of playing down, for obvious reasons, Yorkist
affiliations and regal connections, as well as Warwick-centred activi-
ties, presumably to disassociate Warwick as much as possible from the
previous reign. While this necessitates drastic treatment for some individuals, a few manage to retain their dignity and remain worthy of respect. The description of Anne Beauchamp, while less personal than in the English roll, contains an account of her misfortunes and describes her as 'Nobilissima Anna virtutum idificiens exemplar' 'cujus vita erat devota sed tribulationibus plena'. The treatment of Anne in the Latin roll reinforces the suggestion that Anne was behind the creation of the rolls and that Rous's personal loyalty lay with the Beauchamp family.

Anne's husband Richard Neville is depicted in terms of his national activities, and references to his intended involvement with Warwick and with Guy's Cliff in particular, are omitted. His knightly deeds which in the English roll 'had be so excellent that his noble and famous name cowd neuer be put owt of laudable memory' (no 57), are conveniently forgotten.

The original accounts of Neville's two daughters presented their own problems. Isabella becomes in the Latin roll simply, 'uxor Ducis Georgij et prima filia Ricardi Nevill comitis Warr', rather than 'wyfe to the noble and myghty prince Georg duke of Clarance eldyst dowhter to the most famus and dred and louyd lord sir Rychard Neouel' (no 58). The Duke of Clarence himself is depicted in a tabard of his arms and wearing a ducal cap, rather than in the armour and crown of the English roll. The description in the Latin roll is brief and factual and there is no glimpse of the 'myghty prince semly of person and ryght witty and wel visagid' (no 59) of the English roll. Details of his interest in Warwick are omitted as is the reference to how his plans for the area were interrupted when 'froward forteon maligned soor a geyn hym', (no 59).

Edward, the son of Isabella and Clarence, is depicted in a tabard like his father, instead of in armour and is also given the briefest
factual treatment, in which sensibly, no reference is made to him as 'a noble lord and of the Royal blode' (no 60). The reference to his being knighted by Richard III at York during the first year of his reign at the same time as Richard's own son, is also omitted.

Anne Neville, daughter of Richard Neville and Anne Beauchamp and wife of Richard III, receives the most strikingly different treatment. In the portrait, all signs of her royal status are removed and she is dressed in a similar fashion to her sister Isabella. In her notice, details of her virtue and personal beauty are omitted, the reference to her being an heir of Richard Neville is muted, and the glowing terms which described her and her station in the English roll as 'The moost nobyll lady & pryncesborne of the ryall blode of dyuers realmes lenyally descendyng from pryncys kyngys emperowris & mony gloryous seyntes dam Anne by the gret pervysyonn of god quene of ynglond & of fraunce & lady of Irellond' (no 62) are absent. Instead, only the briefest and most unobjectionable details of her birth, family and death are given.

Obviously, as wife and Queen of Richard III, there was little that could be said in her favour in the Latin roll, though an attempt was made to loosen her ties with the House of York and to emphasise a link with the Lancastrians, with the insertion into the roll of a portrait of Edward Prince cf Wales, son of Henry VI, in full armour and with a sceptre, between the portraits of Anne and Richard. Half of Edward's brief notice is taken up with his marriage to Anne Neville, 'primus maritus prenobilis domine Anne secunde filie et une heredum Illustris Ricardi Nevill Comitis Warwici et laudabilis memorie Anne uxoris sue Comitisse'. This obvious attempt to stress Anne's first marriage is in striking contrast to the brief mention of the same marriage in the English roll, where Edward's death is merely the means by which Anne was 'marvelously conveyed by all the corners and partyes of the whole
of fortune & eft sone exaltyd a geyne herre than evyr she was to the
moost hye trone & honour ouer all other ladys of thys nobyll realme
anoynyd and crownyd Quene of ynglond wyfe unto the moost victoryus
prince kynge Rychard the thryd' (no 62).

Richard himself in the Latin roll is depicted in a tabard,
instead of the armour of the English roll, where he had been described
as:

moost myghty prynce Rychard by the grace of god kynge
of ynglond and of fraunce and lord of Ireland by verrey
matrimony with owt dyscontynewans or any defylynge yn
the lawe by eyre male lineally dyscendyng from kynge
harre the second.....

(no 63)

The controversial claim to rightful inheritance is of course
missing from the Latin roll and the description of King Richard, punisher
of offenders, cherisher of the virtuous and beloved of all his subjects,
becomes 'Ricardus tertius Rex Anglie Anne Regine filie secunde Ricardi
Nevill,Comitis Warwici et Anne Comitisse, uxoris sue, infelix Maritus'.

As a consequence of the insertion of Edward, son of Henry VI,
another Edward, son of Richard and Anne is demoted. He appears in tabard
and ducal cap and is deprived of the armour and royal insignia of the
English roll and he is no longer the 'noble and myghty prynce..... of
Walys duke also of cornewale and Eorle of Chestyr Son & eyre to the most
hye & excelent prynce kynge Rychard the thryd and hys moost noble lady
and wyfe Quene Anne enherytour to bothe Royall possesions...' (no 64),
but 'illustris Princeps Wallie Regis Ricardi terciij et venerabilis
consortis sue Anne Regine Anglie unica Proles & Heres, immo heres Celli,
quem in sancta anima nunquam infecit macula culpe sed ante parentes
infans obijt...'.

The contents and tone of the rolls seem to reinforce Kathleen
Scott's suggestion that they were intended to draw attention to Anne
Beauchamp's situation, presumably by being presented to someone with
the ability and the authority to remedy it: Richard III or Henry VII.
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The more personal nature of the information about members of the Beauchamp family in the fifteenth century and the extended descriptions of Richard and Henry Beauchamp, respectively father and brother of Anne, add weight to the suggestion, but the way in which Anne Beauchamp herself is described provides the strongest evidence.

Her claim to the Warwick title is stressed, 'by trew enheritans countas of Warrewik which goode lady had in her dayes grete tribulacon for her lordis sake Syre Rychard Neuel.... by her tityll Eorl of Warrwik...' (no 56), which is repeated in the notice of Richard Neville himself, 'by his ladi and wyfe dam An Beauchamp Eorl of Warrewik...' (no 57). The description of Anne's character is full of praise and affection:

This gode lady was born in the manor of Cawersham by redyng in the counte of oxenford. and was euer a full deuout lady in Goddis seruys fre of her speche to euer person familiere accordyng to her and thore degre Glad to be at and with women that traueld of chyld. full comfortable and plenteus then of all thyng that shuld be helpynge to hem. and in hyr tribulacons sho was euer to the gret plesure of God full pacient. to the grete meryte of her own sowl and ensample of all odre that were vexid with eny aduersyte. Sho was also gladly euer companable and liberal and in her own persone semly and bewteus and to all that drew to her ladishup as the dede shewid ful gode and gracious. (no 56)

On the other occasions when she is mentioned, it is with the same respect, 'noble lady dam An' (no 58), and 'worschypphull lady and wyfe dam Anne' (no 62). 107

The account of her in the Latin roll also notes her misfortunes, but more directly than in the English roll, where some delicacy would have been needed as Richard's Queen, Anne daughter of Anne Beauchamp, was a beneficiary of her mother's situation:

post mortem vero comitis viri sui diu apud Bewle juxta Southampton sub franchesida dicta Lea, pauperime latuit, ab hinc in plagam borealem cautelose evadens ad maiorem strictitudinem evolut, omnibus suis hereditarie possesionibus authoritate Parliamenti exuta q. ex electione Anne filie sue ducisse Glocestrie dum vixit...
Turning to the Beauchamp pageants, of which Anne is also probably the patroness, and which portray the life of Richard Beauchamp, Court- hope in the introduction to the rolls, and the DNB are unanimous in ascribing the text of the pageants to John Rous, and follow Thomas Hearne, who prefaced the text in his Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi II with the title 'The Contents or Arguments of John Ross's Book... of the Story of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick'.\textsuperscript{108} Hearne had as his authority William Dugdale, from whose manuscript he printed the text, where Rous, 'a dilligent searcher of Antiquities, and Chantery Preist of Guy-Cliffe' is confidently credited with authorship.\textsuperscript{109}

It has to be said that there is no direct evidence for Rous's authorship but at the same time, Rous is a plausible candidate on many counts. We know of Rous's historical and genealogical interests both from the rolls, which are slightly earlier in date than the pageants, and from his Historia Regum Anglie, which is slightly later.\textsuperscript{110} His known associations with the Beauchamp family increase the likelihood of his having had a hand in the pageants: his position as a priest of a chantry founded by Richard Beauchamp, his evident loyalty and affection for Anne Beauchamp, and his apparent access to details of the lives, deeds and characters of members of the Beauchamp family, as expressed in the rolls. It is also interesting to note that his description of Richard Beauchamp in the English roll is the longest of all the narratives and manages to include a brief history of his life and career as the King's representative at the Council of Constance, knight at jousts at Mantua, Captain of Calais, 'Father of Courtesy', tutor of Henry VI and King's Lieutenant in Normandy, as well as detailing the advantages he brought to Warwick and mentioning the founding of Guy's Cliff (no 50). Richard also appears in the notice of George Duke of Clarence (no 59), who carried out some improvements to Warwick Castle 'as the good noble Eorl Sir Richard Beauchamp has purposyd the
It is difficult to find corroborating evidence for Rous's authorship through a comparison of the respective styles of the text because of the difference in material, approach and technique of the texts of the rolls and the pageants. The text in the pageants, apart from presenting a continuous account of the exploits of an individual as opposed to a genealogical series, and describing national and international rather than regional concerns, is also concerned with describing events in relation to a pictorial representation and follows a 'Here shewes' formula. If anything, the texts of the pageants are expressed more concisely than the notices of the English roll but this is probably to do with the physical and pictorial constraints of the format of the pageants.

There is however, an interesting link between the manuscripts of the rolls and the pageants. Kathleen Scott wondered if the rolls were the product of the same atelier as the pageants, pointing to the similarity of the format of the pen and ink drawings with short text, and how the artist of the rolls worked 'in a technique and spirit very close to that of the Caxton Master', the artist of the pageants. She also noted that the Earls of Warwick are depicted both in the rolls and the pageants as having close connections with royalty. 111

On balance, while one cannot be certain that Rous was the author of the text of the pageants, he does at present, seem to be the best candidate for composing or supplying the material for them.

Anne Beauchamp received a pension of five hundred marks from Henry VII in 1485 and her estates were restored in 1487, though only to be returned to the Crown by her. Whether the Rous rolls or the pageants had any influence cannot be judged, but it is clear that they were a serious attempt to highlight her plight, and the rolls were undertaken in a spirit of historical enquiry and with an awareness of
political propriety.

Patronage and family ancestry: the Beauchamp pageants and Guy of Warwick

The Beauchamp Pageants have already been discussed as a response to a specific political circumstance, and as a fine example of the work of a foreign-trained artist based in London. Both of these aspects emphasise the individuality of the pageants, through the originality of the format on the one hand, and the precise circumstances which caused their creation on the other. However, I believe it is also possible to see the pageants as part of an identifiable Beauchamp family tradition of preserving and promoting their family name privately and publicly, through their famous, though often mythical, ancestry. This interpretation of the pageants far from diminishing the individuality and significance of Anne Beauchamp's patronage, places it at the apex of a tradition spanning some two centuries.

The Beauchamps were not alone in their interest in the ancestry of their family. Other families such as the Bohuns, and through them the Staffords and the Courtenays, claimed descent from the Swan Knight (along with other English families including the Beauchamps, and numerous Continental families),112 and expressed their 'ancestry' by using swan badges or crests or by owning or commissioning texts which reminded them of their 'origins'.113

Nor was the Beauchamp interest in their ancestry the only tradition of the family. Traditions of military service to the Crown, and the foreign pilgrimages and crusades of three generations of Beauchamp Earls of Warwick can also be identified. But it is the ancestral tradition which is particularly interesting as it spans a number of generations, includes both male and female members of the family, and incorporates different means of promoting their ancestry, including literature and art.
The beginnings of the tradition which culminated in the Beauchamp Pageants can be seen in the deliberate cultivation by the Beauchamps, of the memory of their famous, though legendary ancestor, Guy of Warwick. According to the romances, Guy, mythical ancestor of the Earls of Warwick, saved the kingdom through his deeds of valour, and his piety and devotion served as a model for future generations. The Anglo-Norman Gui de Warwic, dated c.1232-1242, is thought to have been composed to flatter the Earl of Warwick of the time, and when the Beauchamps inherited the Warwick earldom, they took over the Guy legend with the title, and Guy became a family name. The heir of the first Beauchamp Earl was named after his illustrious 'ancestor' and was subsequently famous as one of the Earls who played a major part in the capture and execution at Warwick Castle of Edward II's favourite Piers Gaveston. Guy himself is known to have owned a copy of the story of Guy of Warwick, as 'Un Volum del Romaunce de Gwy', appears in a list of the books he gave to Bordesley Abbey. His heir, Thomas Earl of Warwick (d.1369), named his eldest son (who predeceased him), Guy, and raided the romance for the name of another son, Reinbrun, the legendary son of the legendary Guy.

However, if the use of some names is seen as a mere gesture towards a vague and legendary past, the will of Earl Thomas (6th September 1369), bears witness to the seriousness with which ancestral items were taken:

To Thomas, my son and heir, a ring and cup with a cover, the best next to that which my daughter Stafford may choose, also the coat of mail sometime belonging to that famous Guy of Warwick...

The importance of the bequest is clear not only from its intended destination, but also from the precedence it took over such dazzling items as 'a cross of gold, which the Lady Segrave gave me, and which had sometime belonged to the good King Edward, wherein is a part of the very cross of Christ, and other reliques', 'a casket of gold, with a
bone of St. George, which Thomas Earl of Lancaster bestowed on me at
my christening', and 'a cross of gold, wherein part of the very cross
of our saviour is contained, enamelled with the arms of England'. The
holiest of relics from good kings and venerated public figures were
subordinate to symbols of family honour and ancestry.

The famous Guy of Warwick could refer to the father of Earl
Thomas, who was probably something of a legend himself half a century
after his death, especially to his son who was only two when he died,
though it is more likely to refer to the legendary Guy. Earl Guy had
left his best coat of mail to Thomas (d.1369) in his own will,\textsuperscript{117} and
the later bequest might refer to that, though if so, it is curious that
the source of the coat of mail was not mentioned, when the origins of
other items in the will are clearly labelled. But it really does not
matter if there was some confusion over the real and the legendary
Guy, what is important is the recognition of the coat of mail as a
valuable heirloom symbolising the noble ancestry of the Beauchamp
family.\textsuperscript{118}

Little ambiguity over which Guy legend was being propagated exists
with the next Earl Thomas (d.1401), who received the coat of mail, and
who was responsible for building the great tower at the north-east
of Warwick Castle - Guy's Tower, which may have been begun by his father.
On his exile to the Isle of Man in the last years of Richard II's reign,
his goods were forfeited (as discussed earlier in this chapter), to
Thomas Holland Duke of Surrey, who had a special grant from the King
to obtain a series of tapestries containing the story of Guy of Warwick,
which had belonged to Thomas, and which were eventually returned to
Beauchamp when his estates were restored.\textsuperscript{119} In his will Thomas left
to Richard, his son and heir, 'My blessing and a bed of silk embroidered
with bears and my arms, with all thereto appertaining, also a ***
wrought with the arms and story of Guy of Warwick, and the sword and
coat of mail, which was that worthy Knight's, likewise the harness and ragged staves; also I will that the said sword and coat of mail, with the cup of the swan, and the knives and salt-cellar for the coronation of a King, shall be, and remain to my son and his heirs after him. The tapestries and whatever it was that was wrought with Guy's story refer to the legendary Guy, the Swan Cup is legendary, and the coat of mail, even if it was the one bequeathed by the Earl's grandfather, is here bequeathed as an heirloom of the legendary Guy. The clause that the items should pass from heir to heir is confirmation that the memory of a famous ancestor was being deliberately preserved and handed on to succeeding generations. Again, the sanctity conferred on the ancestral items by their juxtaposition with the coronation items is worth noting.

The next Earl of Warwick, Richard Beauchamp (d.1439), the subject of the Beauchamp pageants, continued to commemorate the legendary Guy. He improved and restored Guy's Cliff, where according to tradition Guy had spent his last years disguised as a hermit. He established a chantry for two priests there, because he had 'a great devotion to the place', according to Dugdale. He also erected a nine foot high statue of Guy, which was still to be seen inside the chapel when Dugdale was writing, and made careful provision for the place in his will:

Also I will, that in all haste after my Decease, when ever God will that it be, all the Remon_st of livehood, which faileth yet from my Chanteries att Guycliffe, be assigned, delivered and made sure to my said Chanteries and Priests there for ever more, and that this be even as the said Executors of my last Will will answer afore God; And also I will, that the Chappel of Guycliff, and dwelling Houses for my Priests there, be built and made sufficiently, that is to say, Chappell as I have devised, and the Housing for my Priestes there, as they may reasonably and holsomly and goodly dwell therein.

His daughter from his first marriage, Margaret Lady Talbot, brought the legendary and literary tradition full circle by commissioning Lydgate
to translate into English, 'the lyf of pat moste worpy knight Guy of Warwike, of whos bloode shee is lyneally descended', a version of the 'historical' part of the romance dealing with Guy's return in disguise to defeat Colbrond the Danish champion, and his subsequent journey to Warwick where he lived as a hermit, only revealing his true identity to his loyal wife on his deathbed. The result unlike its subject, is neither inspiring or memorable, but it confirmed the claim of the Beauchamp family on a legend which originally had little to do with them, and the use of the 'historical' material indicates the seriousness with which the story was taken within the family.

With such a well-established and visible tradition in the family, it is not surprising that Anne Beauchamp should have turned to reminders of family ancestry and genealogy at a time of crisis, nor is it surprising that she chose her father as the subject of the Beauchamp pageants, as Richard Beauchamp's life and career provided eminently suitable material for such heroic treatment. The way in which she chose to depict her father's life has some interesting links with the other family hero Guy, and indicate that Richard was to be perceived as belonging to the same tradition (as well as to the same family), as the legendary figure.

The rubric of the first pageant announces the birth of Richard Beauchamp and clearly defines the approach the remaining pageants will take - 'whose notable actes of chevalry and knyghtly demenaunce been also shewed in the pagentis hereafter ensuyng'. A major technique of 'characterisation', if it can be called that when so little individual character is shown, is to present Richard, both in the illustrations and narrative as a model, someone conforming to an ideal code of behaviour, expressed artistically in pictures of Richard in stylised situations. Richard jousts at the coronation of Queen Joan (pageant 5), 'Where he so notably and so knyghtly behaved hym self as redounded to
his noble fame and perpetuell worship' and similarly at the battle of Shrewsbury (pageant 7), he 'ful notably and manly behaved hym self to his greet lawde and worship'. He did 'greet honour . worship' to the order of knighthood (pageant 3), and had 'greet worship' at tournaments on his return journey from Jerusalem (pageant 22). The repetitive descriptions suggest and reinforce the sense of a fixed standard of knightly activity which Beauchamp represents and the same thematic repetition occurs in the drawings, the main focus of the work, where Richard appears visually at the forefront of battles and tournaments, or the scene is composed in such a way that all attention, including that of the viewer is drawn towards him.

Richard's knightly demeanour as well as his knightly activities are subject to the same sort of treatment. At the Whitsuntide feast given by Charles of France (pageant 12), Richard's behaviour again conforms to a high standard, 'he so manerly behaved hym self in langage & nurture that the Kyng and his lordes wt all other people gave hym greet lawde'. However, the response of the Emperor Sigismund (pageant 35) takes Richard beyond the status of a merely perfect knight and instead holds him up as a standard by which knighthood and courtesy should be judged:

And the EmperOr said to the Kyng that no prince cristyn for wisdom nortur & manhode hadde suche a nother knyght as he hadde of therle of warrewyk addyng thereto that if al curtesye were lost yet myght hit be founde ageyn in hym And so ever after by the Empero's auctorite, was called the fadre of Curteisy.

The praise of the Emperor indicates the other major method by which Richard's character is presented – through the responses he evokes from the famous and powerful throughout the world. And again as with his knightly behaviour, the uniformity of these responses suggest a constant and unchanging standard. Emperor Sigismund and the King of France have already been mentioned. By the Duke of Barr' his cousin 'he was ful lovyngly and worshipfully resceived' (pageant 10); at
Venice he 'was right worshipfully receved of the Duc and lordes' (pageant 15); at Jerusalem he 'was worthely receved by the Patriarkes depute' and also by Sir Baltirdam, the Sultan's lieutenant who was 'joyful of hym and with greet honoure received hym and desired hym and his mayny to dyne with hym in his owne place' which of course Richard 'ful manerly behavyng hym' accepts (pageants 16 & 18). Finally on his return journey from Jerusalem, having again been 'worthily receved' by the Duke and the lords spiritual and temporal of Venice, 'al the Citee gave lovyng to God that he hadde so wele and prosperously spedde in his Jorney to the holy londe' (pageant 21). The fame of Richard Beauchamp evidently crossed the boundaries of nationality and religion and encompassed whole states in appreciation of his virtue.

However, national activity is not neglected and whether dealing with heretics, the French or his responsibilities as tutor to Henry VI, his sense of duty is paramount, and this is the theme which runs throughout the pageants. He returns to England from his pilgrimage to find a Lollard uprising threatened and instantly 'for thaccomplisshment of the Kynges entent & pleasir' 'ful coragiously wt good circumspeccion and forsight avaunsed hym self to the subdewyng of the said traitours & heretikes' (pageant 24). He is equally successful as Captain of Calais' where he ful notably gwided al thynges undre his governaunce though, in the only mention of his regional role, he does not forget his responsibilities at home, for he only sets out for Calais 'when he hadde seen al his londes & sette al thyng in dewe ordre' (pageant15). His bravery in the public interest is seen in the negotiations for the marriage between Katherine and Henry V, when despite ambushes by the Dauphin, he manages to bring Katherine's reply to a delighted Henry (pageants 39-42). The two subsequent pageants (pageants 43 & 44), the marriage and the birth of Henry VI, are an eloquent witness to the importance of his mission. As Kathleen Scott writes, 'we have thus seen
no less than Richard Beauchamp (almost) single-handedly assuring the
succession of the English crown and of the Lancastrian dynasty!'.

One final example, as Lieutenant of Normandy, one of his last appoint­ments, he 'so nably, and discretely behadde hym self that bothe English and Frensh were gladde of hym playnily perceivynge by his gwidyng that
god was wt hym' (pageant 51).

Again he is the model of the good governor, loyal subject and
public servant, and the lack of individuality in the description of his
exploits is not due to poor characterisation. It is no part of the
purpose of the pageants to suggest individuality, rather the aim is to
hold up Richard Beauchamp as an example, an ideal figure and model,
with as little personality as the hero of a romance. Indeed the way
Richard Beauchamp is portrayed corresponds closely to the pattern of a
romance hero such as Guy of Warwick: the hero as a standard and example,
the emphasis on activity and action rather than personality, the stylised
character, the episodic nature of the exploits with the hero-figure
providing the link between changing scenes, the fate of nations chan­nelled into the exploits of the central figure. The theatricality of
the tournament which takes up six pageants at the centre of the pictorial
history, in which Beauchamp appears in disguise, bearing Guy's arms on
the last day, is reminiscent of the scenes in a romance. It is diffi­
cult to think of a genre other than romance which could provide models for the
story of a knight, especially one only relatively recently dead.

However, some details in the pageants, alongside other evidence
of the way Richard was regarded after his death by members of the family,
suggest that the romance conventions of the pageants were more than
just a convenient framework for presenting his 'biography'. For it
seems that within the family, there was a keenness to represent Richard
as a family hero, comparable to the way in which they regarded Guy.

However, as I will suggest at the end of this section, this in itself
was not without political motives.

Within Beauchamp's immediate family, an awareness of his importance was reflected after his death in the care and expense taken to carry out his wish to be buried in a newly constructed chapel at St. Mary's, Warwick, and the will of a daughter of his first marriage to Elizabeth Berkeley, written some forty years after his death, further expresses the persistence and durability of his memory. In her will, dated 28 September 1480, Elizabeth Lady Latimer refers to her father in a tone and with an image of him in mind, similar to the pageants:

My body to be interred in the Chapel of our Lady in the Collegiate Church at Warwick, which the right famous renowned honourable and Christian Prince of noble memory my Lord my father Sir Richard Beauchamp late Earl of Warwick, caused and ordained to be made, and that my said body be laid over both the head of my said Lord and father, between my natural born son Harrie Latimer, and Oliver Dudley, late my son-in-law....

The Chapel itself was ordered in Richard's will:

... I will, that in such Place as I have devised (which is known well) there be made a Chappell of our Lady, well, faire, and goodly built, within the middle of which Chappell I will, that my Tombe be made; and in the mean time my Body to be laide in a clean Chest afore the Altar, that is on the right Hand of my Lord my Father's Tombes, till the Time that the said Chappell and Tombe for me be made....

The Chapel was begun in 1441, and the contracts associated with it show that the executors deliberately sought the best materials and craftsmen they could obtain. John Prudde of Westminster and glazier to the King, was engaged for the stained glass of the Chapel, with the following instructions:

to glasse all the windows in the new Chapel in Warwick with glasse of beyound the seas, and with noe glasse of England, and that in the finest wise with the best, cleanest, and strongest glasse of beyond the seas that may be had in England, and of the finest colours of blew, yellow, red, purpure, sanguine, and violet, and of all other colours that shall be most necessary and best to make rich and embellish the matters, images, and stories that shall be delivered and appointed by
the said Executors by patterns in paper, afterwards to be newly traced and pictured by another Painter in rich colour at the charges of the said Glasier. All which proportions the said John Prudde must make perfectly to fine, glase, eneylin it, and finely and strongly set it in lead and souder it as well as any glasse is in England. Of white glasse, green glasse, and black glasse, he shall put in as little as shall be needful for the shewing and setting forth of the matters, images and storyes.

Two London Carpenters were engaged for the deskes and organloft, and the work was to be 'made... and ordered in as good sort as those in the Quire of St. Maries Church in Warwick'. John Brentwood of London was engaged to paint the Domesday on the West wall of the new Chapel in 'fair and sightly proportion... with the finest colours, and fine gold'. Kristian Coleburne, described as a painter living in London, was employed to paint 'in most finest, fairest, and curious wise', four Images of Stone for the new Chapel (of the Virgin, Gabriel, St. Anne and St. George), using 'the finest oyle colours, in the richest, finest, and freshest cloathing that may be made of fine gold, of fine azure, of fine purpure, of fine white, and other finest colours necessary, garnished, bordered, and poudred in the finest and curiousest wise'.

William Austen, a London founder, was engaged to cast the image of the Earl and to cast and gild the weepers and angels 'of the finest latten to be gilded that may be found'. Austen was also engaged with Roger Webbe (a barber), John Massingham (a 'kerver') and Barthilmew Lambespring, Dutchman and London goldsmith, to prepare the image for gilding. The Marbler and Coppersmith for the plates on and over the tomb also came from London, while the Marbler for the tomb itself came from Dorset and agreed to make the tomb 'well, cleane, and sufficiently, of a good and fine marble, and as well coloured as may be had in England'.

The accounts of the executors in 1442-1443 amounted to over two hundred and ninety pounds and in the following year were over three hundred and thirty two pounds. Respect for the wishes and memory of a close relative was not unusual, yet the scope, expense and quality...
of the Chapel indicate a sense of the stature of the dead Earl which went way beyond the confines of family loyalty.

The Chapel took some twenty years to complete and was finished at a cost of over two and a half thousand pounds. In 1468, a number of items were handed over to St. Mary's for use in the new Chapel, including a fine jewelled gold image of the Virgin which had been bequeathed by Beauchamp. Other items included chalices, ornaments and vessels, some marked with ragged staves, (a Beauchamp badge), vestments and banners. Some fine service books were also handed over:

\[\text{ii pleine mass bokes wherof one is right feire coverede with grene cloth of gold havyng rounde claspes of silver over gilde & in either claspe a scochyn of Warrewyk armys & this boke is made of fyne velym,\textsuperscript{134} richly lymned and florisshe\textsuperscript{w} gold throug al the book, and it hath under the patible in the margin afore the canon viii baners of diverses armes of my forseide lord late Erle, and the other massbook lacking claspes is larger & of bigger velym & every leef thereof conteyneth in length xviii unches the cheef festes therin lymned with gold....\]

\[\text{.... i feir nyewe book of velym welbounde hilled wt a doo skyne & lyned wt rede the claspes of coper gild called a lectornarie \\& collectorie....}\]

\[\text{.... ii large nyewegrailles made of gode velym wel \textsuperscript{134} bounde one of heme clasped wt claspes of coper gild \\& ye other ye claspes ar brokyn of.}\]

The time between Richard's death and his commemoration in the pageants has already been referred to. However, as the Chapel was only consecrated in 1475, there would have been constant reminders of Beauchamp right up to the decade preceding the creation of the pageants, giving a greater continuity to his memory than would otherwise be expected, and as I suggest later, there were other reasons that kept Earl Richard in the minds of members of his family.

Returning to the pageants, there are some deliberate links made between Richard Beauchamp and the legendary Guy, indicating that Richard was to be seen as belonging to the same knightly tradition. Pageant 18 depicts Richard on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem where:
Sir Baltirdam a noble lorde the Soldans lieutenaut
that tyme beyng at Jerusalem heryng that Erle
Richard was there and that he was lynyally of blode
descended of nole Sir Gy of Warrewik whoes lif they
hadde there in bokes of their langage.

Sir Baltirdam's reference to the Guy story in his own language is
somewhat suspect, as is his admission in pageant 19, that he was a
Christian, though he dare not admit it in public.

A further link with Guy is established some ten pageants later,
when Richard appears on the climactic third and final day of the jousts.
For the contests of the first two days, he had carried the arms of
de Tony and Mauduit (pageants 29 and 30), and his face was covered.
On the third day he appeared with his face uncovered, bearing the arms
of Guy and Beauchamp quarterly. 136

In the Rous rolls too, Beauchamp is identified as the heir of
Guy of Warwick, on this occasion sanctified. Rous describes Richard's
founding of the chantry at Guy's Cliff (no 50):

he did hyt by the styrryg of a holy anchoras namyd
dam Em Rawghtone dwelling ac all halows in the
northestrete of york and for hyt to her apperyd our
lady vii tymes in on yer and seyd that in tyme to
cum hyt shuld be a regal collage of the Trinyte of
a kynges fundacone and hyt shuld be a gracious place
to seke to for eny dises or gref and on of
Seynt Gyes Eyris shuld bryng hys Reliks a geyn to the same
place.

The description of Guy in the English roll as the epitome of
knighthood, the 'flour and honour of knyghthode' and 'callyd the
verthiest knyght lyuyng in his dayes' (no 21), echoes the position
said to be held by Richard Beauchamp during his lifetime, the 'fadre
of Curteisy', 'for wisdom nortur & manhode... no suche a nother knyght'
(pageant 35). The English inscription on Beauchamp's tomb 137 is in
the same vein, 'Preieth devoutly for the Sowe1 whom god assoi11e of
one of the moost worshipful knightes in his dayes of manhode & conning
Richard Beauchamp late Forl of Warrewik'. 138

The Beauchamp pageants celebrating the life and deeds of Richard
Beauchamp can be seen as a continuation of a Beauchamp family tradition of interest in their ancestry. Intentional links were made in the pageants (and in the rolls), between Richard and an earlier family hero, and the creation of a new hero in the pageants represents an extension of the tradition already mentioned. The choice of one of the best available illustrators in London is further evidence of the importance attached to promoting family history, and indicates one way in which household knowledge and interests and professional expertise could be combined.

However, while respect for family ancestry and for Richard Beauchamp's memory is undeniable, there is another layer to be added when interpreting the Beauchamp family's deliberate cultivation of Richard's memory. In his last will made in 1437, Richard had intended that all four daughters should be his heirs if the male line failed, and Anne Beauchamp's claim to the full inheritance was disputed by her three half-sisters, Margaret, Elizabeth and Eleanor. The lands were kept in custody by Henry VI until a final decision was made in favour of Anne Beauchamp and Richard Neville on 15 February 1454. Margaret, a veteran of the disputed Berkeley inheritance campaign, did not relinquish her claim and seized some Beauchamp manors, and was probably supported by her two sisters, as all three daughters of Richard Beauchamp's first marriage died seized of a total of nine Beauchamp manors. An agreement was reached on 15 November 1466, by which the inheritance was settled on Anne's issue, and in the case of default, Warwick and the neighbouring estates were to go to Margaret. So, for all four daughters of Richard Beauchamp, there were concerns other than those of simple filial piety, in reminding themselves and others of their parentage.

There is a further twist. By the terms of Richard Beauchamp's will, his lands could only pass to his heirs when all of its provisions
had been carried out (including the instructions for his chapel), using the income from his lands. There is no need to attribute the construction of the tomb to the worldly considerations of the heirs - the care taken to employ the very best workmen and materials denies purely material considerations, and proper respect for the soul and body of the departed was deeply enough rooted in medieval society. However, the delays over the completion of the chapel and tomb, all the more curious when they in turn delayed the inheritance of the estates, are more clearly assigned to worldly considerations. The chapel and tomb were ready by 1459, vestments, ornaments and plate for use in the Chapel were handed over in March 1468, and members of the family had been buried there since 1469. Yet the licence for the consecration and final interment of Richard Beauchamp was dated 2 December 1475.

It has been suggested, on the evidence of three petitions to the Chancellor, that Anne Beauchamp was deliberately prolonging the Trust, while her elder sisters were trying to accelerate matters so that they could recover their inheritance. The petitions, from the heirs of Margaret, Elizabeth Lady Latimer, Anne Neville and Richard Duke of Gloucester (Anne Beauchamp's heirs), and the heirs of Elizabeth and Eleanor, declared all four daughters to be entitled to the estates and claimed all the enfeoffed lands. The Trust finally came to an end in 1487 when Countess Anne surrendered all her lands to Henry VII.

The provisions of Richard Beauchamp's will secured the perpetuation of his memory through a fine tomb and chapel, and whatever the combination of motives, Anne Beauchamp's patronage which produced the Beauchamp pageants, gave to posterity an image of her father which has been accepted as historical fact, in much the same way as Guy's image as a national hero, had historical authenticity for the middle ages.
The sporadic nature of the evidence for household patronage prevents any absolute conclusions being made concerning the relationship between the aristocratic household and some men in its service who engaged in literary activities. However, of the three incidences of writing discussed in this chapter, two were produced at a time of political crisis for the Beauchamp family (exile and dispossession), and provide further evidence of the links between patronage and ownership of manuscripts, and political circumstances, discussed in chapter 3.

Returning to the idea of patronage, the Legend of St. Christina owed nothing to the direct influence of Earl Thomas Beauchamp other than the circumstances which found its author sharing his lord's exile, that is, social rather than literary patronage. The activities of John Shirley did not arise as the direct result of household patronage either, but there were a number of links between his time as a household officer and the contents of his manuscripts, which suggest that he made use of the opportunities afforded by his employment, his social circumstances influencing his literary activities. On the other hand, the Rous rolls are the product of a strong and active relationship between their patron and a cleric in Beauchamp service.
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CHAPTER 6: PUBLIC PATRONAGE: LYDGE, HOCCLEVE AND CAXTON

The examples of household patronage discussed in the previous chapter indicate some of the ways in which literary and social patronage coincided through employment in the Beauchamp household. In this chapter, the examples of literary patronage are of a more public nature. There is less of a sense of patronage reflecting individual tastes or representing the demands of particular circumstances. On the contrary, the overwhelming sense of commissions to authors is of conformity to current and established traditions of taste, rather than of originality, and when authors approach patrons it often appears to be the social status of the patron which is of significance. The examples to be discussed in this chapter provide a wealth of information as to how members of the nobility were regarded by authors seeking patrons.

This chapter is concerned with Beauchamp and Neville patronage of Hoccleve, Lydgate and Caxton. Lydgate had literary associations with the Beauchamp family (as mentioned in Chapter 5), and Hoccleve approached more than one member of the Neville family with pleas for patronage, and a comparison of the two reveals differing aspects of literary patronage. The section concludes with Caxton who, in promoting his printing venture in England, provides an important focus for the study of the place of literary patronage and the role of the patron in the last quarter of the fifteenth century.

'Patronage' is often used as a general, all-purpose term to describe and in some cases to obscure a variety of relationships between author, text and patron. Some of the uncertainties involved in examining evidence for patronage may be illustrated by two examples drawn from the Neville family. Anne Neville (d.1480) and her husband Humphrey Stafford Duke of Buckingham (d.1460), each had a work dedicated to them: to Anne, an anonymous poem *The Nightingale* (a translation
of John Peckam's *Philomena*, and to Humphrey, Stephen Scrope's translation the *Epistle of Othea*, from Christine de Pisan's *Epître d'Othea*.

The *Nightingale*, dated c.1446 on internal evidence, is a poem of fifty nine 7-line stanzas, the first six of which are taken up with the dedication and introduction. A direct translation of its source, it is an allegory of Christ's sacrifice, Christian history and Man's soul, told within the introductory framework of a sleepless author who hears a nightingale singing of her death, according to the canonical hours, for a night and a day, the bird dying at the end of the evening:

> Be this nyghtingale, that thus freshly can
> Bothe wake and singe, as telleth vs scripture,
> Is Crist hym-self and euery cristen-man
> Soule vnderstande, whch oweth of nature
> Ande verray reson do diligence ande cure,
> Oute of the sleep of synne to a-wake, & ryse,
> Ande to remenbre, ande fully aduertise,
> 113-19

There are some good descriptive passages (stanza 14 for example), and the climax of the poem is handled with skilful and moving simplicity:

> The oure of none, as lewes hym desyred,
> Thirled and persed thorgh his hert & side.
> He, seyng then: "Consummatum est," expired
> And heed enclyned, the gost yaf vp pat tyde
> Vnto the fader. The sunne, compelled to hyde
> His bemys bright, no lenger myght endure
> To see the deth of the auctor of nature.
> 386-92

All the strands of the poem are brought neatly together at the end so that allegory and story are in perfect harmony:

> Thus hath this brid, thus hath this nyghtyngale,
> Thus hath this blessed lord pat all hath wroght,
> That doun to yerth fro heuen can a-vale,
> Upon a crosse oure soules dere y-bought
> Ande yeuen vs cause in hert, wyll, & thought,
> Hym for to serue & euer loue and drede
> That, vs to saue, wold suffre his blod to shede
> 393-99

There is no doubt that the poem was dedicated to Anne in Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 203. The first two stanzas begin with a
conventional formula addressing the book:

Go, lytyll quayere, And swyft thy prynses dresse,
Offringe thyself wyth humble reuerence
Vn-to the ryght hygne and myghty pryncesse,
The Duches of Bokyngham, and of hur excellence
Besechinge hyre, that, of hure pacyence
Sche wold the take, of hure noble grace
Amonge hyre bokys for the Asygne A place,

Vn-to the tyme hyr ladyly goodnesse
Luste for to call vn-to hyr high presence
Suche of hyre peple, that are in lustynesse
Fresschly encouragyt, as galantus in prime-tens,
Desyrous for to here the amerouse sentence
Of the nyghtyngale, and in there mynde enbrace,
Who fauoure moste schall fynd in loues grace,

However it is not clear whether Anne commissioned it or whether it was an offering by a poet hoping for patronage, though which poet we do not know. The author himself does not say that he was fulfilling a request, and if he had undertaken a commission, it would be unusual if he had failed to remark on it, most authors taking advantage of the first available opportunity. The dedication offers no clues either, the description of the Duchess and her qualities owing more to literary convention than to personal knowledge of Anne, her household and her books. Manuscripts do not help either, as no manuscript containing signs of Anne's ownership is known, so it cannot even be safely assumed that she had a copy of The Nightingale.

As a result, little can be said about Anne's role in promoting or passively encouraging literary production and perhaps the most positive statement to be made is that The Nightingale, whatever its origins and subsequent history, was evidently thought of as something suitable for the Duchess of Buckingham, and from the evidence we have of her tastes from the books mentioned in her will, a copy of The Nightingale would not be out of place.

The Epistle of Othea by Stephen Scrope raises another not dissimilar set of uncertainties about the role of Humphrey Stafford. Scrope's
translation of the extremely popular work by Christine de Pisan is constructed, as the title suggests, around a letter from the goddess Othea to Hector, giving advice and foretelling future events. Each part of the letter has a gloss explaining the text, usually with reference to an ancient philosopher, and an allegory where 'we schal applique Holi Scripture to edificacion of the soule' (p.7), which contains references to Church Authorities, ending with a biblical quotation and reference. There are one hundred of these three-part sections, with the text after the first five sections usually consisting of only four lines. So in sections 7-12 for example, each text is taken up with one of the gods and goddesses after whom the days of the week are named, and whether and how Hector should or should not incline to them. Each gloss discusses the qualities or vices of their respective planets and each allegory links these with the qualities of the good spiritual Christian knight. Section 9 (pp.19-20) on Apollo is one of the shorter examples:

Texte

Lete thi worde be clere and trewe in kynde,
Appollo schall yeue it the in mynde,
For he be no mene may noon ordure
Suffre no wise vnder couerture.

Glose

Appollo or Phebus, that is the sonne, to whom the Sonday is youen and also the metall that is callid golde. The sonne be his clernes schewith thinges that be hidde; and therfore trouthe, the which is clere and schewith secrete thinges, may be youen to him. The which vertu scholde be in the herte and in the mouth of euery good knyght. And to this purpos seith Hermes: Loue God and trouthe, and yeue good councell.

Allegorie

Appollo, the which is for to sey the sonne, be whom we notifie trouthe, we may take that man scholde haue in his mouthe the trouthe of the verray knyghte Ihesu Crist and flee all falsnes. As Cassiodor seith in the book of the Preysing of Seynt Paul: The
condicion of falsnes is such that, where as it hath no geynseyng, yt it fallith in him-self; but the condicion of trouth is to the contrarye, for it is soo sette that the more geynseyng of aduersaries that it hath, the more it encrceth and reisith hymself. To this purpos seith Holy Scripture: Super omnia vincit veritas. Secundi Esdre iiij° capitulo.

There is no doubt that the dedication was meant for Humphrey Stafford. Some fifty four lines preceding the text are taken up with fulsome praise of the Duke:

Praisynig be to God at this begynnyng,  
In alle my wordes and soo folowyng.  
To the right noble, hiʒ, myghti lyon  
In whome there deliteth right many oon,  
And than to you excellent prynce of wisedom,  
Full myghti duke, vertuous of custom,  
Redoubted Homfray, cosin to the kinge  
Of Englande, to whom longeth myche thinge.  
Duke of Bokyngham he is with hole sovne,  
Erle of Herford, Stafford, and Northamtovne.  
Benygne and hiʒ prynce, louer of wisedom,  
In the grete lârgenes I trust all and som.  
Of mekenes, the which your noble persoon  
Ledith, as in the worlde seith many oon,  
I am brought vn-to you to make present  
Of this litell newe book with hooll entent.

1-17 (Prologue)

The dedication is not so spontaneous as it sounds, being a close rendering of Christine de Pisan's original dedication to Jean Duc de Berry, with only minimal changes to make it suitable for the Duke of Buckingham. 6 Nor is the dedication of the Epistle unique, as the same work in other manuscripts is dedicated by Scrope to two other people, Sir John Fastolf, and an unknown 'hye princesse'. 7 As Scrope says himself in the Longleat manuscript of the Epistle (MS 253) that the translation was made at the request of Sir John Fastolf, Humphrey Stafford cannot be credited with the commissioning of the work, nor is Scrope's claim expressed in the dedication, to be offering a 'newe book', quite accurate. Alternative dedications and even dedication pictures are not uncommon, and it would seem that lack of success in soliciting
due rewards from his step-father Fastolf encouraged Scrope to seek patronage elsewhere.

We do not know if Humphrey Stafford was obliging in this matter.

The manuscript which contains the dedicatory prologue to the Duke of Buckingham (Cambridge, St. John's College MS H 5), might be the dedication copy, and though its fine illustrations encourage this idea, there is no further evidence. It is clear that Humphrey was not the original patron of the work, but it is not clear what part he played, if any, in the subsequent support of the author and promotion of the work.

John Lydgate and the Beauchamp Family

We are however on more solid ground with Beauchamp family patronage of Lydgate. Though not chronologically first in the examples of patronage to be discussed in this chapter, Beauchamp patronage of Lydgate is relatively straightforward in its relationship between poet and patron and represents what is most generally understood by the term patronage. Three members of the family commissioned three separate pieces of writing from Lydgate and there are no grounds for doubting the provenance of any of the works.

Lydgate is often referred to as the poet-laureate of the fifteenth century, not so much for the quality of his work, but for the ubiquitous nature of his writings, and for the wealth and variety of his patrons, among whom he could count royalty, nobility, and gentry, as well as civic and religious institutions. The three commissions Lydgate received from Earl Richard (d.1439), Isabella, Richard's second wife, and Margaret, a daughter of Richard's first marriage, reflect nothing unusual or unique, rather they show that these three shared in a fashionable activity. What the commissions do indicate however, are different interests, different purposes in patronage, and the range of material Lydgate could turn his pen to, which here includes political propaganda,
religious devotion, and romance-history.

Richard Beauchamp, in his public role as servant of the English Crown under the Duke of Bedford in France, commissioned Lydgate in 1426 to translate into English the Title and Pedigree of Henry VI. The original French version, composed by Lawrence Calot an Anglo-French royal notary, described the descent of Henry VI from the royal Houses of France and England. It was circulated with a picture genealogy of the descent from St. Louis IX, and both were posted together on the walls of churches in northern France. The Duke of Bedford had commissioned Calot's account for propaganda purposes, more precisely as J.W. McKenna describes it, to manipulate French public opinion by the use of symbols and symbolic representations of the dual monarchy.

Beauchamp's commission appears to be propaganda of exactly the same sort, a defence of Henry's claim to the French throne, though aimed at an English rather than a French audience, perhaps because of dissatisfaction with the war at home:

Trouble hertis to sette in quyete,
And make folkys their language for to lette,
Which disputen in their opynyons
Touching the ligne of two regions,
The right, I mene, of Ingland and of Fraunce,
To put awey all maner [of] variaunce,
Holy the doute and pe ambyguyte,
To sette the ligne where it shuld[es] be,
And where hit aught iustly to abide,
Wrongfull claymes for to set aside...

Lydgate makes it clear in the prologue that Richard Beauchamp was following the example of the Duke of Bedford, and was motivated by his loyalty and duty towards young King Henry:

I meved was shortly in sentement
By precept first and commaundement
Of the nobly prince and manly man,
Which is so knyghtly & so moche can,
My lord of Warrewyk, so prudent & wise,
Beyng present that tyme at Parys
Whan he was than repaired agein
From Seint Iulian of Mavnys, oute of Mayn,
Resorted home as folkys telle conne,
From the castell pat he had [de] wonne
Thurgh his knyghthode and his hy noblesse,
And thurgh his wysdom & his hy prowesse.
Gladly he chevith what so he begynne,
Sesyng not tyll he his purpos wynne,
The fyn berof berith witnessing.
Lyf and goodis for title of his kyng
He sparith not to put in iuperdly,
Oonly the right for to magnifie
Of him that is to him moste souerain,
Henry the Sext, of age ny fyve yere ren,

Lyf and goodis for title of his kyng
He sparith not to put in iuperdly,
Oonly the right for to magnifie
Of him that is to him moste souerain,
Henry the Sext, of age ny fyve yere ren,

The text was to be an accessory to the illustrated pedigree to explain and expand the genealogical diagram, as Lydgate points out:

Verily, liche as ye may se,
The pee-degre doth hit specifie,
The figure, lo, of the genelagye...

This figure makith clere demonstracioun...
... As ye may se, ...
... That we may se with evry circumsta\(c\)nce
Direct the lyne of Engelond & of Fraunce.

It is unfair to judge the Title and Pedigree by the same literary standards reserved for other works by Lydgate. Its purpose after all was not to persuade by its literary merit and Lydgate was capable of greater dramatic emphasis than appears at what would have been the climax had it been an independent account of the birth of Henry VI:

And of this Henry, of knyghthode moste famous,
Moste avisy, and moste victorious,
From Seint Lowys in the right[\(e\)] lyne,
I sey, of him and of Kateryne,
Down in ordre by corious lyneall,
Descendid is from pe stok riall
Of Seint Lowis, who can vndirstond,
Henry the Sext, borne in Eng[\(e\)]lond,
For to possede by enheritaunce
Crownes two of Engelond & of Fraunce,
By true title, as ye haue hard toforne,
The first yere in soth that he was born.

The Title and Pedigree, by virtue of the nature of its contents and its purpose, was a commission seriously given and undertaken, and is another witness to the importance of literature in conjunction with the visual arts, in promoting political aims. Its proper place is in the context of official Lancastrian propaganda alongside news-letters campaigning against Joan of Arc, new Anglo-French coinage.
bearing important, and in some cases novel political symbolism, and
pageants and coronation festivities in London and Paris designed to
reinforce the impression of the justice and validity of the dual monarchy, rather than among the literary patronage of the Beauchamp family. While its existence is due to aristocratic patronage, it is not a valid indicator of aristocratic taste, but it may give us an idea of an acceptable standard for public propaganda.

The request of Isabella, Richard Beauchamp's second wife, for the Fifteen Joys of Our Lady from Lydgate is a commission different both in kind and purpose. The poem is a Rosary prayer of twenty eight stanzas, with each of the fifteen Joys separated by an Ave. The Joys include events from the Annunciation to the Assumption of the Virgin, and incorporate miracles and incidents from Christ's childhood:

Tercium gaudium.

O sterre of hevene! O maryner[i]s gyde!
Hem to releve in all byre troble and payne,
For pilke & Ioye þer hadist vn eche syde
Whan thoue feltest awxe þi flankes tvene
By blessed sune, be lord most souereyne,
To þy plesaunce moeven too and froo,
Be my deffence in al myscheef and woo.

And blessed lady of mooste Excellence
In eury-thing þat shoulde thy servante greeue
Helpè to thy sonne þat I do none offence,
But him to serue, stere myn herte and meve,
And in all myscheffe þat thoue me releve,
For to þy grace, as to mooste cheeff socoure,
For helpe I fle in all worldly laboure.

Aue Maria 64-77

The imagery is conventional. In addition to the examples just given, Mary is also described as 'Moder ecallyd of grace and of pyte,/
Welle of goodnesse, þat sprang most souerainly, /Clere as cristalle in
by virgynite,' (2-4). Apostrophes abound as rhetorical devices rather than as instruments of personal appeal but the devotional intention of the poem is retained. Among the conventional imagery and rhetoric there are some simple and lucid passages:
Preserve me that I be not loste thoroughge synne
But thoroughge þy mercy þat I may be fonde,
Lat þy pitee neuer fro me twynne,
And that þy grace to mewarde euer Rebounde,
Suffre none enemy þy servant to confounde,
But in al myscheef þat shoulde me dyscoumfort,
Vn-to þy helpe þat I may ay Resorte

Ave Maria 120-26

Apart from differences in the nature of the respective commissions of Earl Richard and his second wife, there would also seem to be differences in the circumstances of each commission. The heading which identifies Isabella as the patron (discussed in the preceeding chapter), mentions no specific circumstance, only that it was translated from French to English by Lydgate 'at þ-instance of þe worshipfull Pryncesse Isabelle nowe Countasse of Warr' lady Despenser'. Isabella's commission was probably of a private rather than a public nature, and it may represent a particular devotion to the Virgin.

However, particular devotion or not, the Fifteen Joys bridges the public and private spheres once again, by belonging to a very popular genre of religious literature devoted to the Virgin, just as Isabella's patronage, while probably arising from personal motives, also belongs to the fashionable world of aristocratic ladies (and a whole range of other patrons) commissioning Lydgate to produce devotional and religious writing. Alice Countess of Suffolk, daughter of Thomas Chaucer, commissioned the Virtues of the Mass; 16 Anne Countess of Stafford commissioned the Invocation to Seynte Anne; Anne Lady March, daughter of the Countess of Stafford, commissioned the Legend of St Margaret; 17 and Lady Sibille Boys of Norfolk commissioned the Epistle to Sibille, an amplification of Proverbs 31: 10-31. 18 Beyond this, the Devoute Invocacioun to Sainte Denys was written for Charles VI, 19 the Legend of St George for the London Armourers, 20 the Life of St Albon and St Amphabell for the Abbot of St. Albans, 21 and The Legend of St Petronilla for the leper's hospital at Bury. 22
The third example of Beauchamp patronage of Lydgate also spans the worlds of private and public interest. Margaret Beauchamp, daughter of Elizabeth Berkeley and Richard Beauchamp has already been mentioned as the owner, with John Talbot her husband, of some fine books of Hours. She was also mentioned in Chapter 5 in connection with the family interest in Guy of Warwick, as she commissioned an English version of the romance, probably c.1425, from Lydgate. The heading in B.L. MS Harley 7333 (a mid-fifteenth century manuscript, derived in part from a Shirley manuscript), explains her interest in the story:

... translated in to Englishe be Lydegate daun Iohan at the requeste of Margarite Countas of Shrowesbury Ladye Talbot fournyual and Lisle of the lyf of pat moste worpy knyght Guy of Warwike, of whos bloode shee is lyneally descendid.24

The claim of direct descent from the legendary hero, already seen in the Beauchamp pageants discussed in Chapter 5, is repeated. It is interesting that Lydgate's version deals only with the historical part of the story where Guy returns to England in disguise to defeat Colbrond, the champion of the Danes who had invaded and are threatening Athelstan. It ends with Guy's return to Warwick, still disguised as a pilgrim, where he receives alms from his own wife. He retires to a hermitage, only revealing his identity to his wife on his deathbed, and the faithful Felice soon follows him to the grave. This version omits the popular romance part of the story which sees Guy questing for the love of Felice, and it is possible that Margaret Beauchamp requested this, perhaps wanting a more historically 'respectable' account of the founder of her family.

To provide historical veracity and authority Lydgate used as his source the chronicler Giraldus Cornubiensis:

For more auctorite as of this mateer, Whos translacioun is suych in sentence, Out of Latyn maad by the cronycleer
Callyd of old Gerard Cornubichen,
Wich wrot the dedis with gret dilligence,
Of them that wern in Westsex crowned kynges,
Gretly comendyng for knyghtly excellence
Guy of Warwyk in his famous writynges.

569-76

In the chronicle account, Guy's life and virtuous deeds are outlined. He is described as 'vir fortissimus ac in pugna robustissimus', 'miles strenuus et insignis', and the episode serves to emphasise his service to his king and country, much as the Beauchamp pageants emphasise the debt of the realm to Richard Beauchamp.

As with some of the examples of Beauchamp patronage discussed in Chapter 5, it may be that political or family circumstances prompted the commission to Lydgate. There is no direct evidence, but it is interesting to note the Beauchamp claim on the Berkeley inheritance, initiated by Earl Richard and carried on with vigour, tenacity and ruthlessness by Lady Margaret. It is no more than speculation, but it is possible that the commission to translate the life of Guy was given at a time when it was advantageous to promote the Beauchamp name, and of course, the claim to descent from Guy would also be convenient later in the fifteenth century, when Margaret with her sisters from Earl Richard's first marriage, claimed their share of their father's inheritance.

Lydgate's version of the Guy story is not a novel retelling of the legend; it was an attempt to distance the 'true history' from the popular legend, providing an instructive account of true piety and loyalty. It belongs to the Beauchamp family tradition of nurturing their famous ancestry which provides one context for Margaret Beauchamp's patronage, it may have been prompted by specific circumstances, and it also bears witness to the tradition of loyal service which so many of the examples of Beauchamp family patronage are keen to display. The Guy story itself was a popular one and was regarded as part of the history of England, and is evidence of the confidence with which the Beauchamp family viewed
their ancestry and of the claims they made on it in presenting a contemporary view of their status.

Taken together, the value of the three commissions given to Lydgate by members of the Beauchamp family lies in the indications they provide of contemporary taste.

The Search for Patrons: Hoccleve and the Neville Family

Lydgate, with the additional security of his religious order, was perhaps the closest to a 'professional' writer of the fifteenth century. Hoccleve wrote in very different circumstances and earned his living during the whole of his working life (c.1387-1424), as a professional scribe in the Privy Seal Office. Despite the numerous complaints in his writings about lack of money, he would appear to have been paid at the standard rate of 7½d per day, two robes per annum, and lodgings at Chester's Inn while a bachelor, not to mention occasional perquisites such as a share of the value of confiscated goods, as well as his annuity for life of ten pounds in two instalments from 1399, which was raised in subsequent years. Recent researches have however admitted that delays in payment of his annuity and reductions in the amount due when finally received did contribute to financial hardship, especially in conjunction with Hoccleve's self-confessed love of comfortable living. Perhaps it was this which led him to undertake free-lance scribal work, and certainly these circumstances of his life and work are partly responsible for the difference in the relationship between Hoccleve and his 'patrons' and Lydgate and his supporters.

However, before discussing Hoccleve's connections with the Neville family, two relevant and inter-related issues have to be tackled. First, the nature of the relationship between Hoccleve and people named in his works, often called his patrons, and secondly, the nature of some of Hoccleve's writing, especially the status of some of his shorter poems.

The result is certainly an impressive list of patrons and one that can rival Lydgate's known patrons later in the fifteenth century, but how strong is the evidence for this patronage and what sort of patronage is it? If some of the works mentioning these patrons are examined more closely, it can be seen that very few of them are acknowledged as having commissioned the respective poems, and many are openly approached for their support. There can be little reason to doubt the origins of the Balade to the Virgin and Christ which begins with 'Ceste balade ensuyuyte feust translatee au commandement de mon Meistre Robert Chichele', or the Item De Beata Virgine, 'Ce feust faite a l'instance de T. Marleburgh', the London stationer and master to the guild of Limners and Textwriters in 1423. The Compleynte of the Virgin before the Cross would seem to be equally secure, ending with 'Ceste Compleynte paramont feut translatee au commandement de ma dame de Hereford, que dieu pardoynt' though some doubts have been cast on the origin of the work. Of the remaining instances, none can be connected so securely with named patrons, and the nature of Hoccleve's alleged royal patronage is particularly suspect.

Concerning Hoccleve's connections with royalty, R.F. Green suggests that the anti-Lollard Address to Sir John Oldcastle, A.D. 1415, might
have been an official commission for propaganda purposes, although as
Green also admits, the evidence surrounding the 'temptation to suppose
that Henry himself commissioned it' is largely circumstantial. The series
of balades written on Henry V's accession are addresses to the King
and show no signs of commission. As Green suggests they 'seem more likely
to have sprung form personal conviction than from official commission'.
However, M.C. Seymour suggests that Hoccleve became acknowledged as a
quasi-official writer of verse after Henry became King (1413), as a result
of the approval gained by his Regement of Princes.

The Regement shows more solid connections with the royal family, with
its dedication to Henry V when Prince of Wales, and by the existence of
manuscripts which are evidently presentation copies. The sense given in
Hoccleve's dedication is not of a commission, but of a request for accep-
tance and approval, which implies a request for patronage. Covert references
to finances hint at Hoccleve's need for support and conventionally, his
reluctance to ask for it:

Right humbly axing of you [the] licence,
That with my penne I may to you declare
(So as that kan my wittes innocence,)
Myne inward wille that thursteth the welefare
Of your persone; and elles be I bare
Of blisse, whan pat the colde stroke of deth
My lyfe hath quenched, & me byraft my breth.

Though that my livelode and possession
Be skant, I riche am of beneuolence;
To you therof kan I be no nygon:

Hoccleve's Dialogue with the Beggar which introduced the Regement,
reinforces the financial theme in the dedication. Hoccleve, encouraged
by the beggar, talks of his good fortune in receiving his annuity of twenty
marks from Henry IV, but laments the delays in payment:

Mighte I ay paid ben of pat duetee,
It schulde stonde wel ynow with me;
But paiement is hard to geteadayes;
And pat me put in many foule affrayes.
He is equally concerned for the future:

ffor syn þat I now, in myn age grene,
And beyng in court, with grete payne vnneth
Am paid; in elde, and oute of court, I weene
My purs for þat may be a ferthyngh shethe.
Lo, fader myn, þis dullith me to deth;
Now god helpe al! for but he me socoure,
My futur yeeres lik ben to be soure.

834-40

He continues the lament for his situation and for those in similar circumstances for some twenty nine stanzas, then begins again at line 1219.

The beggar conveniently suggests a possible solution:

Syn þou maist nat be paiéd in thesheger,
Vnto my lord pe prince make instance
Þat þi patent in-to pe hanaper
May chaunged be...

1877-80

Though this is rejected by Hoccleve, the beggar comes up with a more satisfactory solution:

Writte to hym a goodly tale or two,
On which he may desporten hym by nyghte,
And his fre grace schal vp-on þe lighte

1902-04

In view of the emphasis on financial insecurity, the anticipated nature of the 'fre grace' can be guessed. The resolution with which this final solution is lighted upon, allegedly as a substitute for more direct financial action, and the range of other issues raised (marriage, benefices, the fate of old soldiers), disguises the skilful manipulation of the Dialogue in presenting its central theme of the anxiety of poverty and its effects on Hoccleve in particular.

The prologue to the Regement is however a literary rather than a financial petition (though financial rewards were to be anticipated), and the Regement represents a serious endeavour to attract royal patronage. This seriousness is attested to by the subject-matter and length of the Regement, by the presentation copies which exist, and by the appearance of the Chaucer 'portrait' alongside Hoccleve's praise of his 'Master' in some manuscripts (B.L. MS Harley 4866; removed from B.L. MS Arundel 38),
drawing attention to Hoccleve's literary pedigree.

Both Arundel 38 and Harley 4866 (both dated c.1411), are thought to be presentation copies, probably written under Hoccleve's supervision. The dedication to Prince Henry, and the Envoys to the Dukes of York and Bedford imply the existence of at least three presentation copies. Arundel 38, one putative presentation copy, has the arms of England differenced for the Prince of Wales on f. 1, and a presentation picture and Fitzalan arms on f. 37, leading Seymour to suggest that this may have been a presentation copy for the Fitzalan family. Harley 4866 (possibly intended for the Duke of Bedford or the Duke of York?), is lacking both its first and last leaf, which would probably have carried arms to identify the owner and a dedicatory entry.

B.L. MS Arundel 38 was illuminated by an artist of the Scheerre school, and it has been suggested that this manuscript, the Harley manuscript and the Ellesmere manuscript of the Canterbury Tales (Huntingdon Library MS EL 26. 6. 12), were the products of one atelier in London or Westminster, and that the cost of producing such a presentation copy in 1412 was at least ten shillings, which even taking account of reduced rates through Hoccleve's professional contacts, would still be a costly undertaking, and is further evidence of the seriousness with which Hoccleve set about attracting royal patronage.

If the request for assistance is somewhat muted in the dedication to the Prince of Wales, there are many more blatant appeals in Hoccleve's works, and many of his short poems are no more than 'conventional poems of solicitation for money'. A distinction needs to be drawn between these short, often witty and well-written poems appealing for the immediate financial assistance of Hoccleve the Privy Seal clerk, and the longer works, written with the object of providing 'a goodly tale or two' and presumably the hope of providing additional support for Hoccleve the author and
translator.

The request for money on behalf of himself and his fellow clerks to King Henry V could not be more obvious and open in its intent:

Victorious Kyng, our lord ful gracious,
We, humble lige men to your hynesse,
Meekly byseechen yow (o kyng pitous!)
Tendre pitee haue on our sharp distresse;
For, but the flood of your rial largesse
Flowe vp on vs gold hath vs in swich hate,
Dat of his loue and cheertee the scantnesse
Wole arte vs three to trotte vn-to Newgate.

Likewise, the Balade to my maister Carpenter is a plea for aid to pay his creditors:

Tho men whos names I aboue expresse,
Fayn wolden pat they and I euene were:
And so wolde I god take I to witnesse!
...
If pat it lykid vn-to your goodnesse,
To be betwixt [hem] and me, swich a mene
As pat I mighte kept be fro duresse;
Myn heuy thoghtes wolde it voide clene.
As your good plesance is this thyng demene!
How wel pat yee doon & how soone also,
I suffre may in qwenchynge of my wo.

The Balade to my Lord the Chacellor is yet another request to speed up payment of his arrears:

I, your seruant at your commandement,
Byseeche vn-to your excellent noblesse,
Dat my patente bere may witnesse
That myne arrerages been granted me:
Right as your staf your warant wole expresse
Byseech I, y, yow so my patente be.

The balade and roundel to Henry Somer is a similar request, though more light-hearted and jocular than some of the preceding appeals:

Now, syn pat sonne may so moche auail,
And moost with Somer in his soiournynge,
That sesoun bonteuous we wole assaill.
...
Aftir your good lust, be the sesonynge
Of our fruytes this laste Mighelmesse,
The tyme of yeer was of our seed ynnynge,
The lak of which is our greet heuynesse.
It is clear that these 'patrons' were in no way responsible for the production of the works in which their names appear, beyond providing the focus for an appeal.

Hoccleve is in respectable company in his use of a poetic appeal for both financial and literary support. Chaucer’s Complaint to His Purse, addresses that article, lamenting its light weight, each verse carrying the refrain 'Beth hevy ageyn, or elles mot I dye', for the purse is 'my lyf... myn hertes stere' (line 12). It ends with an Envoy to Henry IV:

... by lyne and free eleccion
Been verry kyng...
...
Have mynde upon my supplicacion

Later, Lydgate too approached the problem of his empty purse in his Letter to Gloucester, by addressing Duke Humphrey in the language of the feudal petitioner:

Riht myhty prynce and it be your wil
Condescende leiser for to take
To seen the content of this litil bille
Which whan I wrot myn hand I felte quake
Tokne of mornyn doeryd clothis blake
Cause my purs was falle in gret rerage
Lynyng outward his guttys were out shake
Oonly for lak of plate and of coignage

There are one or two occasions which suggest that Hoccleve might have received some form of patronage from those named in his verses. In his Balade to my gracious Lord of York, Hoccleve mentions an earlier occasion and a request by the gracious Duke. Hoccleve orders his 'little pamfilet' to:

Remembrance his worthynesse, I charge thee,
How ones at London, desired he,
Of me pat am his servaut & shal ay,
To haue of my balades swich plente
As ther weren remeynynge vn-to me;
And afor nat wole I to his wil seyn nay,
But fulfille it as ferfoorth as I may,
Be thow an owter of my nycetee,
For my good lordes lust, and game, & play.

Some form of earlier contact with the Duchess is also suggested when
Hoccleve voices his regret that he has no more to give her 'at the tyme' (line 3)),56 and the mention of Prince Edward and 'Maister Picard' (lines 38, 40) might suggest a certain familiarity with the Duke's household. However the Balade still has the tone of an offering rather than of a commission, and the mention of the Duke's request sounds more like a hopeful reminder than the fulfillment of a commission.

The York Balade and its sister, the Bedford Balade, both presumably to be appended as envoys to presentation manuscripts of the Regement of Princes for the two men, are different to the petitionary appeals mentioned above. They are both similar in structure, language and tone, and represent the appeals of the literary petitioner, unlike the petitions of the employee or servant mentioned above. Both use the 'Go Little Book' formula ('Go, little pamfilet', York line 1; 'Thow book', Bedford line 19), both have the conventional disclaimer of the author to any poetic skill, with fear that each will be read by a named 'Maister' in each household (Picard, York line 40; Massy, Bedford line 10), and the disclaimer is expressed with reference to rhetorical terms - colours, sentence and metre:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I dreede lest pat my maistir Massy,} \\
\text{Pat is of fructuous intelligence,} \\
\text{Whan he beholdith how vnconnyngly} \\
\text{My book is metrid how raw my sentence} \\
\text{How feeble eek been my colours; his prudence} \\
\text{Shal sore encombrid been of my folie;} \\
\text{Bedford 10-15}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{If pat I in my wryntyng foleye,} \\
\text{As I do ofte, (I can it nat withseye,) } \\
\text{Meetryng amis or speke unfittingly,} \\
\text{Or nat by iust peys my sentences weye,} \\
\text{And nat to the ordre of endytyng obeye,} \\
\text{And my colours sette ofte sythe awry; } \\
\text{With al myn herte wol I buxumly,} \\
\text{It to amende and to correcte, him preye;} \\
\text{York 46-53}
\end{align*}
\]

We also have with due regard for rank, Hoccleve's own word in the Dialogue with his friend, that the Duke of Gloucester, a known patron of the arts, was his firm supporter: 57
Next our lord lige, our kyng victorious,
In al this wyde world lord is ther noon
Vn-to me so good ne so gracious,
And haath ben swich yeeres ful many oon:
God yilde it him as sad as any stoon
His herte set is and nat change can
ffro me, his humble servant & his man.

However, the language of the discussion between Hoccleve and his Friend (lines 526-714) about the book owed to the Duke, while full of praise for him, and containing serious discussions about the sort of work suited to him, is carefully constructed to give the impression of intimacy with the Duke and knowledge of his interests without ever stating the nature of their contact and relationship. And whatever it was, it did not prevent Hoccleve including the Dialogue and the work written for Humphrey in a presentation manuscript for another 'patron'. Like the envoys to the Dukes of York and Bedford, the verse is that of the 'literary' Hoccleve, Hoccleve the hopeful courtly poet, rather than the impecunious clerk.

This then is the context for two addresses to members of the Neville family, neither of which contains anything to suggest they were commissioned. The first, La Male Regle ends with an address to 'my lord the Fourneval' (line 417), Thomas Neville Lord Furnivall and Lord Treasurer, to see that Hoccleve's annuity is paid:

Lo, lat my lord the Fourneval, I preye,
My noble lord pat now is tresoreer,
From thyn Hynesse haue a tokne or tweye
To paie me pat due is for this yeer
Of my yeerly .x.li. in theschequeer,
Nat but for Michel terme pat was last:
I dar nat speke a word of ferneyeer,
So is my spirit symple and sore agast.

Hoccleve is unwilling to appear a shameless cravour (line 429) but,
The proverbe is 'the doumb man, no lond getith;'
Who-so nat spekith & with neede is bete,
And, thurgh arghnesse his owne self forgetith,
No wondir thogh an othir him forgete.

It is a very obvious appeal to Neville to use his influence to speed up payment to the Privy Seal clerk, tacked on at the end of a catalogue of Hoccleve's self-inflicted misfortunes and subsequent repentance. Beginning with an address to Health (which may contain a pun in view of the address at the end), who has now been driven away by the excesses of youth, Hoccleve continues with a description of his former life of eating, drinking, spending, flirting, general indolence and indulgence, digresses on flattery and its dangers to lords, and concludes with the compounded effects of excess:

The feend and excesse been conuertible,
As enditith to me my fantasie:
This is my skile if it be admittible:
Excesse of mete & drynke is glotony;
Glotonye awakith malencolie;
Malencolie engendrith werre & stryfe;
Stryf causith mortel hurt thurgh hir folie:
Thus may excesse reue a soule hir lyfe.

But the most immediate and pressing effect, in keeping with the appeal at the end, is that 'My body and purs been at ones seeke' (line 409).

The autobiographical details given by Hoccleve which form the substance of the poem also serve a practical purpose, and although they have individuality of voice and detail also conform to literary conventions. La Male Regle is an extended, more elaborate and skilful version of the shorter petitionary poems discussed earlier, and the details of Hoccleve's life and career serve to identify the petitioner as both deserving and in need. The address to Neville has the measured tone and cautious deference of the courtly petitioner, 'I kepte nat to be seen inportune/In my pursuyte I am ther-to ful looth' (lines 425-26).
At the same time, there is muted though firm and respectful insistence on the justice of the petitioner's request, and the sense that the petitioner is conquering his natural timidity and pride. The request ends with a reminder both that Hoccleve is deserving - he is only asking for what is due to him - and that he is in need for his body and purse are 'seeke'. This unites the two themes of penury and ill-health which run through *La Male Regle*, and brings the poem back to the address to Health with which it began:

And right wole eek pat I me entremete,
For ṭat I axe is due as god me spede!

And ṭat that due is thy magnificence
Shameth to werne as ṭat I byleeue.
As I seide reewe on myn inpotence,
Pat likly am to sterue yit or eeue,
But if thow in this wy[s]e me releeue.
By coyn, I gete may swich medecyne
As may myn hurtes alle, ṭat me greeue,
Exyle cleene & voide me of pyne.

Though it is not made explicit in the petition to Neville, Hoccleve is doubly deserving because he has repented of his mis-spent youth. The confession of his past sins in *La Male Regle* is rounded off with contrition and repentance:

O god! o helthe! vn-to thyn ordenance,
Weleful lord meekly submitte I me.
I am contryt & of ful repentance
Pat euere I swymmed in swich nycetee
As was displesaunt to thy deitee.

The religious overtones of this are obvious, and it has been convincingly argued that *La Male Regle* belongs to the genre of the penitential lyric, to the conventions of which it both conforms and parodies. Like the penitential lyric, *La Male Regle* has both an autobiographical and homiletic content, but it also parodies the address to God, the Trinity, or an interceding Saint often found in the penitential lyric with the address to Health, and by the quasi-religious
language used to describe the power of health. Without Health's 'grace' (line 7), one lacks 'hertes gladnesse' (line 13), and is 'bare/Of ioie' (lines 14-15), and 'ryche of euel fare' (line 16). Health's love is 'lyf' (line 19), sickness is 'mortel fo' (line 22), and Hoccleve needs Health's 'socour and releef' (line 55) and 'mercy' (line 57), to lead him ('wrecche', line 63), back to 'felicitee' (line 72). The theme of a mis-spent youth followed by repentance in old age, and the link between sin and ill-health are also themes belonging to the penitential lyric, which often treat significantly of the seven deadly sins either in part or as a whole. 63 These also appear in La Male Regle, though not necessarily by name:

Reson me bad & redde as for the beste,  
To ete and drynke in tyme attemprely;  
But wilful youthe nat obeie leste  
Vn-to pat reed ne sette nat ther-by.  
...  
But .xx. ti wyntir past continually,  
Excesse at borde hath leyd his knyf with me.  
105-8, 111-12

No artistic conflict or conflict of intention arises from the mixing of genre in La Male Regle. Autobiographical details both identify Hoccleve the petitioner, and form the basis of the confessional for the penitent, which in turn identify the petitioner as a worthy, repentant character. The petitionary plea arises in part from the petitioner's concern for bodily welfare which is in part due to a mis-spent youth, and the circumstances of the petitioner and the penitent are inextricably connected: finances are needed because of ill-health, ill-health and age have brought about repentance, repentance indicates that the petitioner is deserving, and being deserving he merits financial support.

La Male Regle concludes with a financial petition which belies the literary nature of the poem as a whole, which in the context of other works by Hoccleve mentioned above, lies somewhere between the literary petition to Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and the short appeals
for aid.

So, what is the nature of the relationship between Neville and Hoccleve? It is clear that Hoccleve was addressing Neville in his official capacity to secure what was due to him as a clerk, not in order to solicit patronage for the creation of the work, though that of course may have been a side-effect to be hoped for. There is no sense in the contents, of material chosen to appeal to a particular patron, rather the contents reflect the needs of the writer and reinforce the address at the end by stressing the present effects of lack of finance, admitted in the light of past excess. One wonders, assuming of course that the work ever reached Neville, how it was received. Presumably it was meant to motivate by its mixture of humour, self-deprecation, repentance and respectful pleading for what was due. Still, considering that La Male Regle is not the short balade appealing for funds already discussed, but a long and coherent account (448 lines including the address), it would seem to be a major investment both of time and effort, not to say a risk, if it was written with the sole purpose of encouraging the Lord Treasurer to see that the clerk's annuity was paid.64

In this context, it has been suggested that the work was written for friends and colleagues of Hoccleve, particularly in view of the references to individuals working in the Privy Seal.65 While there is no evidence to confirm this or to suggest this 'audience' as an alternative to Neville (which would give the address at the end a different status), it would help to account for both the substance of La Male Regle and the difference between this and other appeals for payment of arrears mentioned above.

Unless further evidence of Neville's support of Hoccleve emerges, it is fair to believe that no connection other than official existed between the two. Certainly the work itself does not give any grounds
for suspecting this, if anything it makes clear the distance between Hoccleve, clerk and poet, and Neville the Lord Treasurer.

The second Hoccleve-Neville literary association with Joan Beaufort Countess of Westmoreland (d.1440), wife of Ralph Neville Earl of Westmoreland (d.1425), differs in content, in the nature of the connection and in evidence of the writer's intention. To take the last first, a manuscript exists, Durham University Library MS Cosin V.III.9, neatly written in Hoccleve's own hand, compatible both in format and decoration with being a presentation copy and ending with an even more carefully written dedication:

Go, smal book to the noble excellence
Of my lady of Westmerland and seye,
Hir humble servaunt with al reuerence
Him recommandith vn-to hir nobleye;
And byseeche hire on my behalue, & preye,
Thee to receyue for hire owne right;
And looke thow in al manere weye
To plese hir wommanhede do thy might.

Humble servaunt
to your gracious
noblesse
T:Hoccleue.68

The dedicatory envoy clearly identifies the difference in the nature of the respective appeals to Thomas Neville and Joan Beaufort. This is clearly a plea to accept the book, presumably in the hope of receiving some form of patronage, as there is nothing to suggest that any of the works contained in the manuscript were commissioned by the proposed recipient. On the contrary part of it, Jereslaus's Wife, was intended for the Duke of Gloucester as Hoccleve himself relates.69 It cannot even be assumed that the book definitely reached or was accepted by the Countess of Westmoreland as there are no indications in the manuscript of contemporary ownership and none of the scribbles and names in the margins are medieval despite Furnivall's contrary comments in his edition.70
equally readily apparent. The manuscript again contains autobiographical revelations in the Complaint and the Dialogus cum Amico which follows it, though here they are concerned with Hoccleve's illness rather than with his pecuniary difficulties, and serve both as an introduction to and link with the rest of the contents. The remainder of the manuscript is taken up with Hoccleve's versions of some very popular stories, presumably by their popularity, designed to appeal to the dedicatee. There are two Gesta Romanorum stories both with moralizations, Jereslaus's Wife and Jonathas and Fellicula, separated by an English Lerne to Dye. Great care is seen to be taken not only over the choice of texts but also to link them, a sense of continuity being created through the use of the 'Friend' to discuss, alter, or promote what is to follow.

The collection begins with Hoccleve's Complaint arising as the prologue describes, from thoughts of mutability and mortality one November night, in which Hoccleve laments the reaction of friends to his past illness and their current refusal to believe that he is cured. Hoccleve decides on patience and resignation and his Friend arrives beginning the Dialogus cum Amico, where he disapproves of Hoccleve's plan to publish the Complaint, doubts the wisdom of publishing Lerne to Dye, and reminds him that he owes a book to the Duke of Gloucester, suggesting that something which would also redeem Hoccleve with the ladies would be more suitable. Hoccleve decides to write a tale 'in the Romayn deedis' (line 820) and this paves the way for Jereslaus's Wife, a moral story of a wronged Empress undergoing a series of out-of-the-frying-pan-into-the-fire adventures, beginning with an attempted seduction by her brother-in-law, a framed murder-charge by a Steward after another unsuccessful seduction attempt, a kidnapping and attempted seduction by a sea-captain (assisted by a thief who himself had earlier
been saved from death by the Empress), a shipwreck, and a final retreat to a nunnery. She lives in anonymity, until drawn by her great healing powers, the four oppressors now in various states of physical decay (respectively: leprous; blind, deaf and palsied; lame and gouty; and frenzied), come to be healed. Confessions fall like dominoes, all is remorse and repentance and the Empress is assured of a happy life to follow. A link between this and the allegorical Moralization is provided by the return of the Friend who supplies Hoccleve with a version to translate 'In prose wrytynge it hoomly and pleyn' (line 25).

From the Moralization, where the Empress becomes the Soul and the brother-in-law sinful man, it is a short step to the morally and spiritually instructive Lerne to Dye, a treatise on the correct Christian life which in turn ensures eternal bliss. The continuity is preserved at the end of the treatise once again by the intervention of the Friend who asks Hoccleve to prolong the book by translating a tale warning young men away from wicked women. A query by Hoccleve about the effect this will have on women considering he is hoping to redeem himself with them, is another sign of the care taken to preserve the unity and continuity of the book and that it was conceived and to be perceived as a unified whole, not a random collection of translations. The final item is another moral tale, the story of Jonathas and Fellicula, in which good (Jonathas) finally triumphs over evil, and it is concluded with a prose moralization where Jonathas becomes Christian Man, and Fellicula, the Wretched Flesh. The dedication to Lady Westmoreland follows this.

It can be concluded that the Durham manuscript represents a very obvious attempt at soliciting patronage. There is no request or appeal for money as in some of the occasional 'begging' poems, nor is there the sense of a commission being fulfilled, however it is clear that
it was a carefully constructed attempt to reach a potential patron who was a prominent figure, through contents designed to be of popular and universal appeal, in the care taken to preserve the unity of the book, and in the appearance of the manuscript.

A number of reasons can be suggested for Hoccleve's choice of Joan Beaufort as a possible patron. The Duke of Gloucester and Henry V whom Hoccleve claimed as his patrons, were Joan's nephews, and success, or lack of it, with them may have encouraged him to turn to other eminent members of the House of Lancaster. The earlier contact with Thomas Neville, Joan's brother-in-Law, formal as it probably was, does not encourage the idea that Hoccleve's approach to Joan was motivated by particular affinities with the Neville family. In both cases, it was probably connections with the House of Lancaster which encouraged Hoccleve. For Thomas Neville, apart from being wealthy and Hoccleve's 'employer', was also a staunch Lancastrian and 'one of the conspicuous figures in the politics of the early critical years of Henry IV's reign'. In this respect, the Beaufort name probably had a stronger attraction than Neville, and a further attraction of the Countess of Westmoreland may have been the links between her father John of Gaunt and Hoccleve's literary 'master', Chaucer.

We do not know if Hoccleve was successful in attracting the attention and support of Joan Beaufort. What is clear is that Hoccleve did not have direct access to the ranks of aristocratic patronage in the way that Lydgate did.

Caxton and the Continuing Importance of Patrons

The justification for including Caxton in the discussion of Beauchamp and Neville patronage rests on the husbands of three Neville women, themselves all sisters of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick (the
Kingmaker, d.1471). While this might seem to be extending the cultural credit of the Nevilles somewhat, it provides a valuable opportunity of examining both individual patronage of Caxton and of comparing this with the examples of patronage already discussed, and while it is not strictly speaking Neville patronage at all, it is too important an area to exclude. Of course, the example of three men hardly offers a comprehensive view of Caxton and his patrons. However between them they raise a number of issues concerning the place and function of patronage as it affected Caxton in establishing and promoting his press in England, and they provide a useful conclusion to the chapter on patronage, indicating the continuity of certain traditions of patronage and leading into more general considerations of the role of the nobility.

The three men in chronological order of their involvement with Caxton were: William Lord Hastings (executed 1483), who owned a number of Flemish manuscripts, and whose wife Katherine had a printed book among other books in her will; William Fitzalan Earl of Arundel (d.1487), owner of manuscripts of works by Hoccleve, Gregory's *Homilia* and the *Legenda Aurea*, who married Joan Neville; and John de Vere, 13th Earl of Oxford (d.1513), who owned a number of service and chapels books, as well as a chest full of unidentified French and English books, and who married as his first wife Margaret Neville in about 1465 (she died c.1489).

Fortunately, Caxton took great pains to promote himself and his press and included many details of the alleged involvement of individuals in the prologues and epilogues to his editions, so by comparison with some other evidence of patronage, we are relatively well-informed about the patrons and recipients of his books and the circumstances surrounding the production of a text.

Examining each case individually, it appears that Lord Hastings
was to be the recipient of a gift of a translation from French of the Mirror of the World, finished 8 March 1481, which Caxton translated,

... at the request, desire, coste and dispense of the honourable and worshipful man Hugh Bryce, alderman and cytezeyn of London, entedyng to present the same unto the vertuous, noble and puissant lord, Wylliam Lord Hastynges, Lord Chamberlayn unto the most Crysten kyng, Kyng Edward the Fourthe, ... and Lieutenaunt for the same of the toyne of Calais and Marches there; whom he humbly besecheth to resseyve in gree and thanke. 78

Clearly it is Bryce, the London goldsmith and civic leader who was the patron of the work and Hastings has no claim to be considered any sort of patron of Caxton, though a work which could boast his name, in whatever context, did have a value for Caxton which will be discussed later.

Bryce, alderman of London (1476-96), 79 served as deputy at the Royal Mint under Hastings 80 and it was probably from this association that his gift of a book to Lord Hastings arose. He has been described as a 'generous lender', 81 to the Crown, and early in Edward's reign some of the royal jewels were pawned to him to help to meet the expenses of the preparations for the marriage of the King's sister Margaret to Charles of Burgundy, which took place in 1468. 82 In addition to this specific connection with the royal court, his position as an important London goldsmith would have allowed him access to court circles. 83 He belonged to the group of men described by Thrupp as merchant knights and was an important enough civic figure to have the Archbishop of Canterbury named as an overseer of his will. 84 So when Bryce commissioned a work to present to Hastings, Master of the Mint, it seems unlikely that it was a attempt to ingratiate himself with his superior after the fashion of Hoccleve. It is unlikely that someone in such a strong commercial and civic position with access to high circles would need to do this,
although the possibility that Bryce was concerned to keep the good lordship of the influential Hastings should not be ruled out.

Fitzalan, unlike Hastings, can be called a patron of Caxton but his patronage seems to have been of a passive nature. Caxton had evidently begun a translation of the popular *Golden Legend* but decided to abandon it because the work was 'grete and overchargeable' and because of the length of time it would take to translate and print it, though Blake suggests that it was political changes rather than intellectual disability which caused Caxton to think of leaving his work. In either case, the work would have been abandoned,

> ne had it be at th'ynstaunce and requeste of the puysant, noble and veruous erle, my Lord Wylyyam Erle of Arondel, whiche desyred me to procede and contynue the said werke....

More than this, Fitzalan 'sente to me a worshypful gentylman, a servaunte of his named John Stanney, whych solycyted me in my lordes name that I shold in no wyse leve it but accomplisshe it,...'. How Fitzalan knew of Caxton's endeavour is not clear. Perhaps it was his retainer John Stanney who was instrumental in obtaining the support of his lord, and the work was completed on 20 November 1483.

De Vere takes the discussion of Caxton a step further, by actual commissioning works and providing a text for translation. In the prologue to the *Four Sons of Aymon* (c.1489), Caxton describes how he had already translated from French 'at the request and commandement of the ryght noble and vertus erle, John Erle of Oxeford, my good synguler and especial lorde', a life of his ancestor, Robert Earl of Oxford, though this work has not survived. The translation of the *Four Sons* was made because of de Vere's wish 'to have other hystories of olde tyme passed of vertues chyvalry' and he sent a French version to Caxton to be translated. A third translation, the *Feats of Arms* (14 July 1489), from the original by Christine de Pisan, seems to
have arisen as a commission from Henry VII, ably assisted and perhaps engineered by de Vere. Caxton confidently states the circumstances of his royal commission:

Whiche boke beyng in Frenshe was delyvered to me, William Caxton, by the most Crysten kyng and redoubted prync, my naturel and soverayn lord, King Henry the vii Kyng of Englon and of Fraunce, in his palais of Westmestre the xxiii day of Janyvere, the iii yere of his regne.....

qualified only slightly a few lines later by, 'and so delyvered me the said book thenne my lord th'Erle of Oxenford awayting on his said grace'

In view of de Vere's own commissions to Caxton, it seems likely that his role on this occasion might have been more than simply conveying the book.

The examples of de Vere and Fitzalan indicate different aspects of the place of a patron in relation to the text produced. In the case of de Vere it is the kind of active patronage seen with Lydgate earlier where a patron commissioned a translation or piece of writing, the choice of which was governed by the personal taste or interest of the patron. Fitzalan on the other hand played a more passive role in supporting and effectively underwriting the completion of the translation of the *Golden Legend* some time after it had been begun, and it suggests that it was a willingness to aid Caxton rather than a particular interest in a translation of the *Golden Legend* which prompted his support. He did himself own a French version of the *Legenda Aurea* but this cannot be used to support a claim for a particular interest in the translation *per se*.

The suggestion that Fitzalan played a more general role, might be enhanced by the nature of the support he provided for Caxton. John Stanney, Fitzalan's servant, promised in Caxton's words, that 'my sayd lord shold duryng my lyf yeve and graunte to me a yerely fee, that is to wete a bucke in sommer and a doo in wynter;', and more
directly, Fitzalan in requesting the work to be continued, 'promysed me to take a resonable quantyte of them when they were achyeved and accomplisshed'. The promise of a buck and a doe was probably the result of Fitzalan's position as Master of the Game of the King's Forests (south of the Trent). The agreement to take a quantity of finished texts is an interesting and unique one and could be used to suggest that Fitzalan did have a strong interest in promoting copies of the Golden Legend. However in conjunction with the twice yearly material support, I see it more as an expression of Fitzalan's support of the man and his venture, than as a particular commitment to the text itself. After all as has already been said, the Golden Legend was popular enough and had a sufficiently widespread appeal not to need personal sanction of the text itself (Caxton's original decision to translate and print it is evidence of that), though a new translation and translator might benefit from the evident approval of a member of the nobility. Finally, though it is often perilous to argue from absence of evidence, it must be said that Caxton does not impress upon his readers the fact that the Earl of Arundel had a particular personal interest in the translation of the Golden Legend, which he does in many other cases.

The kind of support to be provided by de Vere is not precisely stated, but Caxton took the opportunity in the prologue to the Four Sons of Aymon to remind his patron of his financial obligations towards the book he requested:

Whyche booke, accordynge to hys request, I have endevoorde me to accomplyshe and to reduce it into our Englyshe, to my great coste and charges as in the translatinge as in enprynting of the same; hopying and not doubtyng but that hys good grace shall rewarde me in suche wise that I shal have cause to pray for his good and prosperus welfare.

How representative are these examples of patronage? As was said
at the beginning, these few examples cannot offer a comprehensive view of Caxton and his patrons, however they do seem to be reasonably representative of the kind of patronage Caxton received and sought.

For example, there was a precedent for Fitzalan's intervention while a translation was in progress some ten years earlier, at the beginning of Caxton's career as translator and printer. In the prolog to the *History of Troy*, Caxton tells how he began his translation in Bruges on March 1 1469, but after translating five or six quires, abandoned the work for two years, for reasons similar to those given for the *Golden Legend*: the translation was too difficult for him, this time because of his lack of skill in French and English, having never been to France and handicapped by his upbringing in the Weald of Kent. However, as with the *Golden Legend*, it has been suggested that the real reasons for interrupting the translation were political rather than stylistic. Again, Caxton was fully prepared to abandon it:

tyll on a tyme hit fortuned that the ryght hyghe excellent and right vertuous prynces, my ryght redoughted lady, my Lady Margarete by the grace of God suster unto the Kynge of Englond and of France, my soverayn lord, Duchesse of Bourgoine, of Lotryk, of Brabant, of Lymburgh and of Luxenburgh, Countes of Flandres, of Artoys and of Bourgoine, Palatynee of Heynawd, of Holand, of Zeland and of Namur, Marquesse of the Holy Empire, Lady of Fryse, of Salius and of Mechlyn, sente for me to speke wyth her good grace of dyverce maters. Among the whyche Y lete her Hyenes have knowleche of the forsayd begynnyng of thys werke, whiche anone comanded me to shewe the sayd v or vi quayers to her sayd grace.

Margaret then finding a fault in his translation, ordered him to correct it and then to continue and to finish the translation:

Whos dredefull commandement Y durste in no wyse disobey because Y am a servant unto her sayde grace and resseive of her yerly fee and other many goode and grete benefetes and also hope many moo to resseyve of her Hyenes;

The book was duly finished and printed and accepted by Margaret, who 'largely rewarded' Caxton.
Like Fitzalan later, the Duchess of Burgundy did not play any part in selecting the work to be translated, though it seems that she was more interested than the Earl of Arundel in the quality of the translation, and in both cases the translation was of a popular work. The large rewards Caxton received when she accepted his book were evidently for the completion of the work. The earlier mention, cited above, of Caxton’s receipt of a yearly fee is reminiscent of the 'yerely fee' promised by Fitzalan and though Caxton’s use of the present tense to describe the benefits he received, might imply (or be intended to imply), that the support he received was related to his work as translator (and printer), one wonders if it might be related to other duties, the 'dyverce maters' he talks of, perhaps associated with Caxton’s position as Governor of the English Nation at Bruges, representing a reward for general services, not particularly those connected with translations.

To return to the other examples, there are also instances of members of the nobility commissioning works from Caxton and providing texts for translation comparable to the patronage of John de Vere Earl of Oxford. Caxton presented his version of Blanchardin and Eglantine (c.1489) to Margaret Beaufort Duchess of Somerset, mother of Henry VII, 'whiche boke I late receyved in Frenshe from her good grace, and her commaundement wythalle for to reduce and translate it into our maternal and Englysh tonge;'. Earlier, c.1484, Caxton produced his translation of the Curial ‘Whyche copye was delyverid to me by a noble and vertuous Erle, at whos instance and requeste I have reduced it into Englyssh’, probably Anthony Woodville Earl Rivers. And at about the same time (31 January 1484), Caxton translated the Knight of the Tower, 'Which boke is comen to my handes by the request and desyre of a noble lady which.....desired and required me to translate and
reduce this said book out of Frenssh into our vulgar English...,'
who has been identified as Elizabeth Woodville. 105 Three other works
which Earl Rivers delivered to Caxton to print, the Cordial, Dicts
or Sayings and Moral Proverbs, had already been translated by Rivers
himself. 106

There are no strictly comparable examples for Bryce and Hastings.
However, there are examples of merchants and officials commissioning
works from Caxton, though they are either described as personal friends
or their names are not mentioned. Charles the Great (1 December 1485),
was requested 'by a good and synguler frende of myn', 107 William
Daubeney, a Treasurer of the Jewels under both Edward IV and Richard I:
and a searcher of the Port of London; the Book of Good Manners (11 May
1487), was requested by 'an honest man and a specyal frende of myn, a
mercer of London', 108 William Praat, who delivered the book to be tran;
lated to Caxton; and the Royal Book (c.1484) was translated at the
request and desire of 'a synguler frende of myn, a mercer of London',
which Blake suggests might be the same William Praat. 110

The works produced as a result of the patronage of Fitzalan,
Bryce and de Vere are equally representative of the kinds of books
Caxton translated and printed. Most obviously, they were all transla-
tions into English from French (or in the case of the Golden Legend,
a combination of French, Latin and an earlier English version),
and they were all in their own way either popular texts or belonged
to a popular genre. The Mirror is an encyclopaedia, the Golden Legenc
a popular collection of Saints' Lives, and the works associated with
de Vere are all concerned with chivalry or knightly deeds.

They offer no real insight into individual tastes. Only the
life of Robert Earl of Oxford commissioned by de Vere, suggests any
particularly personal interest on the part of the patron and even the
the work probably took the form of a popular romance - 'life' of a hero. The two other books with which he was involved, both reveal a similar interest in works concerned with knightly activities. The *Four Sons of Aymon* was a popular Charlemagne-romance, a French version of which had appeared in the fine manuscript given to Margaret of Anjou by the Earl of Shrewsbury over forty years earlier, and the translation of the *Feats of Arms*, requested by Henry VII assisted by de Vere, was another work valued for its chivalric content, and one which had been fashionable for some time. So, although there is a sense of individual taste here, the kind of literature the Earl of Oxford chose was representative of fashionable reading at the time.

The translation which was to be presented to Lord Hastings and the version of the *Golden Legend* which was supported by the Earl of Arundel, tell us little about individual taste. The *Golden Legend* collection of Saints' Lives, as has already been said, had widespread popularity, and as Caxton said himself in the prologue, it was intended for a general audience:

> ... and bycause me semeth to be a soverayn wele to incyte and exhorte men and wymmen to kepe them from slouthe and ydelnesse and to lete to be understonden to suche peple as been not letterd the natyvytees, the lyves, the passyons, the myracles, and the dethe of the holy sayntes and also somme other notorye dedes and actes of tyme past, I have submysed myself to translate into Englysshe the Legende of Sayntes....

The *Mirror of the World*, the first printed book in England with pictures, also had a general rather than a specific appeal. As the title suggests, it is a comprehensive account of Man, the Earth, Heavens and human knowledge, all of which are constantly referred back to God, divided into three parts. The first part includes an account of the history, physics and development of the universe, discussing such questions as why the earth was created and why Man was made in God's image, as well as giving an account of Nature, the founding of
the seven liberal arts, the elements, the form of the Earth and heavenly motion. The second part is concerned with geographical, anthropological, botanical, zoological and meteorological aspects and among other things, discusses the regions of the Earth, their inhabitants, flora and fauna, with particular reference to India. The final part is a more detailed examination of the motions and features of the heavens, the dimensions of the Universe and philosophy all ending fittingly with Paradise. Nothing can be said about the tastes of Lord Hastings from this and it was probably the encyclopaedic nature and general appeal of the Mirror which made it a gift unlikely to offend against the taste of the recipient.

However, although I have suggested that these works had or were anticipated as having a widespread appeal, it was still beneficial to be able to cite the support and approval of well-known public figures. So, apart from financial or material rewards, there was a further advantage to be gained by Caxton from a patron: the use of his name to promote a text to a buying public.

The prologues and epilogues are littered with the names of noble and royal figures, some of whom were not patrons at all, and bear witness to the importance of displaying well-known and influential names when selling a book, particularly if the people concerned could be shown to be close supporters of Caxton.

The Golden Legend provides an example of the way in which an impression of a close relationship between the patron and Caxton could be created. In the prologue Caxton discusses the timely intervention of Fitzalan and describes him as the 'chyef causer of the achyevyng of hit'. However, by the epilogue, Fitzalan's role has become much more direct, 'Whiche werke I have accomplisshed at the commaundemente and requeste of the noble and puysaunte erle and my special good lord,
Wylliam Erle of Arondel'.

In addition, political as well as commercial considerations also applied, governing in a general way the fortunes of the press and making some individuals highly desirable as patrons, either because of the status they could confer on a work or because of the access they might provide to influential, especially court circles. N.F. Blake has convincingly outlined the relationship between changes in the political situation in England and Caxton's success or otherwise in attracting patrons, also indicating how a change in the political status of an individual had an equivalent effect on his or her value to Caxton as a patron, in some cases making mention of their name or acknowledgement of their support a disadvantage to Caxton and necessitating concealment of his or her identity.

It is worth outlining Blake's arguments, as the pattern he puts forward does have a bearing on the men discussed here. He argues that Caxton abandoned the translation of the History of Troy for two years before completing it with the support of Margaret Duchess of Burgundy, because of dramatic changes in the political situation in England.

He suggests that the translation, begun in Bruges on the 1 March 1469, was intended for the luxury book trade in England, but Warwick's rebellion a few months later and King Edward's subsequent retreat to Burgundy in 1470, effectively quashed any realistic hopes of the success of the venture. Similarly, a few years later, after setting up the press in England at a more favourable time, Caxton gained attention in court circles by attracting the patronage of members of the Woodville family, the influential in-laws of the King, but the death of Edward in 1483, the supremacy of Richard of Gloucester and the consequent decline of the Woodvilles, both removed his patrons from an influential position and prevented Caxton from using their
names to his advantage.\textsuperscript{118} The years from 1485-89 according to Blake's pattern, were marked by the publication of books which were mainly devotional in content and for a general audience, a few books commissioned by merchants, and a general lack of success in attracting aristocratic and influential patrons. A change in both the kind of books printed and the people commissioning them occurred by 1489 and Caxton began to regain the kind of position in relation to the court that he had held before the death of Edward IV.

It is possible to see the three men discussed here in terms of this general pattern and also in terms of their commercial and political suitability for Caxton. To return to Lord Hastings, there was an obvious advantage to be gained from mentioning his name. As an important, influential and long-standing councillor and friend of Edward IV, the holder of positions such as Chamberlain of the Royal Household (from 1461 until his execution in 1483), Captain of Calais (1471) and Master of the Mint (from 1461 until the end of the reign),\textsuperscript{119} his name could be seen to represent approval by the highest in the land. Blake suggests that Caxton made a particular point of mentioning that the translation of the Mirror was commissioned by Bryce in order to deflect possible Woodville disapproval arising from his association with Hastings, as the Woodvilles and Hastings were on far from friendly terms.\textsuperscript{120} This might be the case, but if so it had a double advantage for Caxton, for what he also gained from it was the mention of both Bryce, an important London citizen, and Hastings, an important and influential court figure, as well as providing the opportunity of bringing in 'the most Crysten kynge' Edward IV in connection with Hastings' positions, and not forgetting a passing if inaccurate reference to Jean, Duc de Berry.\textsuperscript{121}
The circumstances surrounding the translation of the Golden Legend were not so advantageous. The completion of the translation belongs to the period immediately following the loss, for all practical purposes, of Caxton's Woodville patrons and it seems that Caxton found a politically safe patron in Fitzalan. At the time of his intervention, Fitzalan was an old man and only four years from his death. He was cousin by marriage to Edward IV and Richard III and it seems that his value to Caxton, apart from his material support, was his respectability. His age aside, he was no longer politically active, was said to be trusted by Richard III, and had no strong past or present affiliations which might threaten his or Caxton's position. However, Fitzalan did not prove to be a permanent substitute for the Woodville patrons, as he is only known to have supported this one venture.

The patronage by de Vere belongs to the more secure period of the reign of Henry VII and is proof itself of the way in which Caxton was regaining access to court circles. De Vere like his father and brother who were executed in 1462, was a staunch Lancastrian and had understandably poor fortune during the reign of Edward IV. He returned to England with Henry Tudor, commanding part of his army at Bosworth and was rewarded with a number of important positions from the beginning of the new reign, including those of Privy Councillor, Admiral of England, High Steward of the Duchy of Lancaster (south of the Trent), and was made K.G. before April 1486. Important positions continued to come his way and he was nominated one of the executors of Henry VII's will. It can be seen why his support was valuable to Caxton; he was an important and established court figure, with access to the King, as the circumstances surrounding the commission to translate the _Feats of Arms_ demonstrates. This afforded Caxton an
opportunity for court patronage on a basis not experienced for quite some years.

Although a considerable number of decades separates Caxton from the earlier examples of Lydgate and Hoccleve, the conditions and patterns of patronage seem to have remained consistent. Caxton, like Lydgate, received commissions for translations and copies of texts from a range of people - civic figures, aristocracy, 'gentlemen', royalty - while at the same time catering for a wider audience both in commissioned and non-commissioned works. Like Hoccleve, Caxton also mentioned people in his prologues and epilogues who were not patrons, but whose names added to the status of a work. He also dedicated works to members of the royal family, who were clearly not patrons in the strict sense, and these dedications served to increase the status of both the work and the translator, and were probably also intended to bring Caxton to the attention of those in influential circles. Though Caxton may have anticipated more positive and direct benefits, these are not the direct solicitations for reward of Hoccleve. Caxton's translation of Jason (c.1477), chosen no doubt because of its appeal in courtly circles and to Edward IV in particular, was presented to the Prince of Wales and not to Edward himself, even though the work was achieved under the 'proteccion and suffraunce' of the King, because Caxton assumed that Edward already had a copy in French! The Order of Chivalry (c.1484) was translated by Caxton at the request of a gentle and noble esquire, but the book was presented to 'my redoubted, naturel and most dradde soverayn lord, Kyng Rychard', not of course to solicit a reward for the translator, but that the book might be read to young lords and knights. Likewise, in the next reign, the translation of Eneydos (c.1490) was to be presented to Arthur Prince of
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Wales, son of Henry VII, where again the intrinsic instructive merit of the book not the skill of the translator, is stressed.

Of course, it is hardly surprising that Caxton should follow well-established traditions of patronage in setting up his business venture in London - it was sound business sense. However, it is this idea of 'business' which separates Caxton from the other examples discussed in this chapter. For obviously Caxton was not only a translator (and writer of prologues and epilogues), but also a bookseller and it is probably the latter interest which was responsible for his interest in translation rather than vice versa. In view of this, it is tempting to look for signs of 'bookshop' patronage and for clues which give a sense of a commercial venture to contrast with the examples of Hoccleve and Lydgate. Fitzalan's promise to take a quantity of copies of the Golden Legend is the most obvious example and the examples of the Cordial and Dicts or Sayings of Lord Rivers could probably also be cited, along with Margaret Duchess of Somerset's request for a translation of Blanchardin and Eglantine (c.1489) from a French book she sent to Caxton, 'whiche boke I had longe tofore solde to my sayd lady'. The Cordial had been translated by Rivers and delivered by Caxton to him 'for to be enprinted and so multiplied to goo abrood emonge the peple', and the Dicts, also translated by Rivers, was given to Caxton 'to oversee' and 'that don, to put the sayd booke in enprlnte'. In both cases, it is Caxton's position as a copier and distributor of books which is important. Having said this however, this kind of 'bookshop' patronage exists alongside many other examples which conform to the traditions of the literary commissions received by Lydgate and Hoccleve.

The place of members of the nobility within these patterns of
patronage seems to be fairly consistent throughout the examples discussed in this chapter. The impression created by these albeit limited examples is not so much of enthusiastic culture-conscious patrons avidly seeking to promote literary endeavour for its own sake, but of a more limited and practically based patronage. They commission authors and works for themselves and for public motives, and provide financial and other support for works produced. But what emerges from the examples discussed above is a strong sense of their value to writers. They were the recipients of hopeful dedications, they were seen to have the potential to provide financial or other material support, and the sanction of their names or evidence of their support was seen to be important in promoting a text or an author.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blanche</th>
<th>m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry (later</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Gaunt</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Bedford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Bohun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Beaufort</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Swynford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Neville</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

73. Ross, 'The Yorkshire Baronage', p.61. For an outline of Thomas Neville's career, ibid., pp.59-65. He is said to have lent the crown sums totalling E6,362 between December 13 1404 and December 11 1406, ibid., p.62.
74. B.L. MS Additional 54782 (Hours); B.L. MS Royal 18 E. i (Froissart's Chroniques), in the same format and probably executed in the same scriptorium as B.L. MS Royal 18 E. ii, another Froissart manuscript, made for Edward IV; Harvard Law School Library MS 25 (Registrum brevium); Madrid, Fundación Lázaro - Galdiano MS Inv. nr. 15503 (Prayer book), belonging to the stylistic milieu of the Master of Mary of Burgundy (Scott, 'The Caxton Master', p.52; D. Rogers, Appendix B in G.I. Lieftinck, 'Boekverluchters uit de Umgeving van Maria van Bourgondie, c.1475-1485', Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke
See note 135 to Chapter 2.
These are noted in Chapter 4.
His will dated 1509 and an inventory of his goods made in 1513, are printed in St. John Hope, 'The Last Testament and Inventory of John de Veer, thirteenth Earl of Oxford'. Among bequests in his will are included his 'Secund portues', 'a Booke calld a Cowcher', 'A Masse booke', his second Antiphonar, two 'grayles oon of the best another of the worst', three processioners, a complete legend, and his best Antiphonar. Books listed in his inventory include, 'A Matteyns Boke' with a silver clasp 'wich my lorde was wont to vse hymself', 'ij Portuous an older and a newer an old masse boke written/ and a masse boke in prynte', two psalters (one red, one black), another psalter with silver clasps, and numerous other service books including two printed mass books, a valuable 'Gospell boke' covered on one side with silver and bearing a picture of Christ, and a tantalising chest full of French and English books. De Vere's arms appear on f.1 of B.L. MS Harley 3862, a fifteenth century manuscript containing Lydgate's Life of the Virgin.
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Ibid.
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Blake, Caxton and His World, pp.90-91.
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100. Prologue to the History of Troy, Caxton's Own Prose, p.98.
101. Ibid.
102. Epilogue to the History of Troy, Caxton's Own Prose, p.100.
103. Prologue to Blanchardin and Eglantine, no 6 in Caxton's Own Prose, p.57.
104. Prologue to Curial, no 26 in Caxton's Own Prose, p.72. For the identification, Blake, Caxton and His World, p.93.
105. Prologue to the Knight of the Tower, no 73 in Caxton's Own Prose, p.111. Identified by Blake, Caxton and His World, p.93, and 'The "noble lady" in Caxton's The Book of the Knyght of the Towre', Notes and Queries, 210 (1965), 92-3.
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107. Epilogue to Charles the Great, no 16 in Caxton's Own Prose, p.68. For Daubeney, see Blake, Caxton and His World, pp.95-96.
108. Prologue to the Book of Good Manners, no 9 in Caxton's Own Prose, p.60.
110. Caxton's Own Prose, p.171.
111. Prologue to the Golden Legend, Caxton's Own Prose, p.90.
112. B.L. MS Royal 15 E. vi.
113. Caxton's Own Prose, p.89.
114. O.H. Prior, ed., Caxton's Mirrour of the World, p.v. The manuscript Caxton used for the translation (B.L. MS Royal 19 A. ix), was written in Bruges in 1464, ibid., p.vii.
115. Caxton's Own Prose, p.91.
116. Ibid., p.96.
117. 'Investigations into the Prologues and Epilogues by William Caxton', and Caxton and His World, pp.84-87, 90-98.
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120. Caxton and His World, p.90.
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CONCLUSION

Various points have been made at the end of each chapter, but it remains to draw these together and to make some additional general points about the two families who have been the focus of this study.

The manuscripts known to have been owned by individual members of each family indicate, with one or two exceptions, a desire to own books of good quality, if not always of the highest quality. Their books of Hours and service books in particular, contain some of the best decorative work, and manuscripts such as the Hours of Henry Beauchamp, the Trinity College missal, the Wingfield Psalter and the Neville Hours at Berkeley Castle, are held to be among the best English illumination of their time. The same sort of discrimination is seen when service books and books of Hours are obtained in Europe, as is shown by the French books of Hours belonging to Margaret Beauchamp and John Talbot, and the Paris Neville Hours with the added "portraits". In many ways such manuscripts seem to epitomise the popular conception of aristocratic interest in books as an overwhelming preoccupation with the physical appearance of a book and a willingness to pay for it. A similar willingness to acquire well-decorated and expensive manuscripts is seen with those books which were intended to be gifts. The Polychronicon manuscript from Humphrey Stafford to William Gray and the volume of romances from John Talbot to Margaret of Anjou are perhaps the best examples of this, and the care taken in their preparation and appearance must have been consciously intended to reflect on the donor, the quality of such a gift denoting the man in much the same way as other visible signs of display, as well as serving a more immediate political purpose in the case of the Talbot gift.

Only a handful of the manuscripts represent the least expensive end of the scale of commercial manuscript production. The majority,
excluding those previously mentioned, belong to the middle or upper scale of commercial production in England, France and the Low Countries, of pleasant, if often conventional decoration, the acquisition of books from France and the Low Countries accurately mirroring the administrative and military involvement of individual members of the aristocracy in the fifteenth century. A somewhat less conventional choice of pen and ink illustrations occurs in the Beauchamp pageants.

What is arguably one of the most interesting aspects of the manuscripts discussed here are those occasions when "household" and professional expertise are combined. The Trevisa manuscript belonging to Richard Beauchamp, together with the Rous rolls and the Beauchamp pageants, were the finished products of commercial book-producers, but the contents of the respective manuscripts had their origins within a network of family relationships, contacts and interests. From the examples of Trevisa and the Berkeleys and Rous and the Beauchamps, it would seem that the aristocratic household continued to contain or have access to men of ability in its locality, while at the same time making use of the expertise of professional metropolitan craftsmen. If as some literary historians have suggested, there were separate "cultures" in the fifteenth century, the means of expressing them were shared.

The language in which the manuscripts were written, leaving aside the service books and books of Hours, an indication of an increasing interest in and wish to possess copies of works in English. Although it is not always possible to judge the status of the contents of a manuscript in relation to its appearance, the fact that so many of these manuscripts were in English is significant. There are perhaps surprisingly few manuscripts in French, even from the earlier part of the years studied illustrating, if any further evidence was
needed, the increasing status of English as a literary language among all classes of society in the late middle ages. Books in French which have survived include older books in the hands of later owners such as Richard Beauchamp's Froissart manuscript, the Neville Roman de la Rose, William Fitzalan's manuscripts of the Golden Legend and Gregory's Homilies, as well as manuscripts which were traditionally written in French such as the Statutes, whereas contemporary manuscripts such as Richard Neville's L'enseignement de vraie noblesse are more rare.

The subject-matter of the various manuscripts is for the most part unsurprising and conventional and includes works of devotion, instruction, history and reference. Apart from one or two exceptions there is no sense of innovation or experiment, or of the individuality or personality of the owner. Once again, the exceptions are perhaps the Beauchamp pageants and the Rous rolls which were commissioned as a result of personal circumstances and personal conviction.

It is possible to see a more intimate involvement with literature and patronage on the part of the Beauchamp family, partly because of their interest in family history and ancestry and the sense of 'family' which this promotes, partly because of the involvement of a number of their retainers and household officials in writing and independent researches. However, neither family offers particularly convincing examples of avid and discriminating collectors of manuscripts or of patrons of literature for its own sake. On the contrary, there are constant reminders of the more pragmatic aspects of literary patronage in the use of books and literature for personal and political propaganda.

Looking beyond the two families it is clear that members of the aristocracy continued to have a "public" role in relation to
literature during the period studied. Works for a general audience are commissioned such as Lydgate's *Title and Pedigree* and *Guy of Warwick*, the latter work reinforcing a link between public and family history. Although in the case of Lydgate members of the aristocracy were far from being his only class of patrons, individual members did commission a significant proportion of the Monk's literary output. More indirectly, previous aristocratic employment and the contacts thus afforded had a part to play in John Shirley's writing and distribution of manuscripts, and it was as a direct result of such "employment" and social patronage that John Rous produced the Rous rolls and was able to undertake his own historical researches.

That aristocratic sanction and support is seen as an important and influential factor in promoting an author and his work is signalled most clearly by Hoccleve's concern to recruit aristocratic patrons, often by careful choice of subject matter. This is paralleled by Caxton's concerns later in the fifteenth century. However, a distinction needs to be made here. The evidence of Caxton's Prologues and Epilogues indicates that towards the end of the fifteenth century, this "public purpose" is defined in more passive terms, its role being to provide the sanction of proven good taste. The essential inspiration does not come, for the most part, from those members of the aristocracy Caxton so graciously praises and thanks, nor are the products of his press directed towards either particular individuals or a solely aristocratic audience. The audience he aims to satisfy is a much wider one.

To return to some of the issues mentioned in the opening chapter, the evidence presented and discussed here confirms the late middle ages as an age interested in literature, though it is an interest which is expressed in terms of conformity and continuity rather than
innovation. The distinction noted in the first chapter of differing or alternate cultures would not seem to be a particularly helpful or appropriate one in this context. To talk of two audiences for late medieval literature is to suggest differences of taste. However, I would suggest, with the exception of Richard Beauchamp's Froissart manuscript, there is nothing peculiarly aristocratic about the contents of the books and manuscripts discussed here. Manuscripts containing the works of Chaucer, Lydgate and Hoccleve had a wide readership, as did romances, reference works and saintly lives. Manuscripts such as the Beauchamp pageants and Rous rolls should be considered as the products of individual rather than aristocratic taste, though arguably an interest in heraldry and ancestry was more limited to those of gentle birth or pretensions. Further, as has been said, members of the aristocracy were not alone in their patronage of authors such as Lydgate, and writers such as Hoccleve strove to find patrons among men who were not members of the aristocracy.

The examples of patronage and authorship, the evidence of taste, interests and documented social contacts, imply again and again an inter­mingling of both literary taste and the means of expressing it among a wide range of literate society. If anything can be identified as more specifically, though increasingly not exclusively, aristocratic, it is the quality and amount of decoration in a manuscript, and this, with some exceptions, is surely more often a matter of finance than of taste.

However, as I hope to have shown, there is more to aristocratic book-owning and patronage in the late middle ages than a simple interest in the appearance of a book, and a study of this aspect of the literary culture of the period will indicate that all members of the aristocracy should not automatically be relegated to the cultural level of the Nobleman, one Richard Beauchamp no less, who at the beginning of Scene IV
Now this is what I call workmanship. There is nothing on earth more exquisite than a bonny book, with well-placed columns of rich black writing in beautiful borders, and illuminated pictures cunningly inset. But nowadays, instead of looking at books, people read them. A book might as well be one of those orders for bacon and bran that you are scribbling.
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? - indicates possible ownership

[ ] - indicates MS often attributed to this person, but unlikely or insufficient evidence
B. BEAUCHAMP PATRONS AND BOOK-OWNERS

(Guy's Grandfather - Lancelot)

Guy
m (2) Alice Leyburn


Earl Thomas
m Katherine Mortimer

Books to Bordesley

Earl Thomas d.1401
m Margaret Ferrers

Served in royal household
at same time as Chaucer.

Service books
Stafford missal
Legend of St. Christina by
his squire.

Earl Richard d.1439

B.L. MS Addit. 29194 - Trevisa

Bib. Nat. MS f. fr. 831 - Proinsart

Bib. Nat. MS français 12421 -
Boccaccio (to Duke of Gloucester)
Wrote balade (B.L. MS Addit. 16155)

Tutor of Henry VI
Shirley in household
Commissioned Lydgate's Title & Pedigree

Margaret

FitzWilliam Mus. MS 41-1950 - Hours

?Edinburgh Nat. Lib. MS Dep. 221/1 - Hours

Commissioned Lydgate's Guy of Warwick

[MS Bodley 686 - Cant. Tales]

m

John Talbot

FitzWilliam Mus. MS 40-1850 (Hours)

B.L. MS Royal 15 E. vi - Romances
(to Margaret of Anjou)
College of Arms MS B. 29 - armorial

Anne

Beauchamp Pageants
Rous Rolls
?Corpus Christi MS 61

m Richard Neville

Geneva, Bib. de la Ville
MS fr. 166 - L'enseignement
de vraie noblesse

Henry

Pierpont Morgan
MS 893 - Hours

?Harvard Law Library
MS 21 - Statutes

m Cecily Neville

B.L. MS Royal
18 D. iv - Family
of Princes

(See Neville MSS)

Isabel m Duke of Clarence

Anne m Richard of Gloucester

(See Neville manuscripts)

Prince Edward

m (2) Isabella Despenser
Commissioned
Lydgate's Fifteen
Odes

(2) Edmund Beaufort

Elizabeth

[MS Laud 600 - Cant. Tales]

m

George Neville
Lord Latimer

m (1) Elizabeth Berkeley

d.1423

Berkeley tradition of
patronage.

Commissioned John
Walton's Boethius
Mass book from father

m (1) Thomas Roe

(2) Edmund Beaufort

Eleanor

[m (2) Sir Matthew Gurney
B.L. MS Royal 19
D. iv, v - Bible
Historiages]

Wrote balade (B.L. MS Addit. 16155)

Tutor of Henry VI
Shirley in household
Commissioned Lydgate's Title & Pedigree
E. MARRIAGES BETWEEN THE BEAUCHAMP AND NEVILLE FAMILIES

Earl Thomas Beauchamp m Katherine Mortimer
d.1369

Earl Thomas m Margaret Ferrers
d.1401

William Beauchamp m Joan Fitzalan
Earl of Abergavenny

Richard m (1) Elizabeth Berkeley (2) Isabella Despenser
Earl of Warwick m  d.1423  d.1439

d.1439

Margaret m John Talbot
( previously married to Maud Neville,
daughter of Thomas Lord Furnival)

Richard Beauchamp Earl of Worcester

Margaret

Richard m Elizabeth Berkeley
Earl of Warwick d.1439

Margaret m John Talbot

Margaret

Elizabeth m George Neville
Earl of Westmoreland

Richard Beauchamp
Earl of Abergavenny

Richard Beauchamp
Earl of Abergavenny

Anne

Henry

m Richard Neville
m Cecily Neville

both children of
Richard Earl of Salisbury
APPENDIX 2 - MISCELLANEOUS REFERENCES TO THE BEAUCHAMP
AND NEVILLE FAMILIES

Items listed here include a number of miscellaneous references to books and other items which belonged to members of cadet branches of the main family, or to unidentified individuals bearing the name of Beauchamp or Neville. A few manuscripts noted in preceding chapters which came to my attention too late to be investigated or incorporated in the main body of the thesis, are also included.

BEAUCHAMP

1. John Beauchamp

Thomas Ringstede (d.1366) left a missal to 'fratri Johanni Beauchamp s.t.p.'


2. Richard Beauchamp Bishop of Salisbury

Richard Beauchamp Bishop of Salisbury (d.1481) gave to Edward IV, 'magnam et suptuosam bibliam meam'.

Bartle, 'A Study of Private Book Collections', p.133.
3. **Sibil Beauchamp**

Henry Lord Scrope (exec. 1415) gave a Primer and Matins of Our Lady in English to a Sibil Beauchamp.


4. **William Beauchamp Lord Abergavenny**

Oxford, University College MS 97 is made up of two parts. The second (beginning f. 85) is earlier in date and comprises three booklets containing: (1) Latin and English writings of interest to a parish priest, chaplain, or educated lay person (2) Homiletic works including *The Two Ways* (3) Works of more personal devotion in English, and some works in Latin. A number of documents follow this including one referring to the presentation by William Lord Abergavenny of William Countour to a Worcestershire parish church.

Dr. Doyle suggested that Countour may have compiled the miscellany for William Beauchamp or his family.

   Doyle, 'University College, Oxford, MS 97'.

---

**NEVILLE**

1. **Thomas Neville of 'Darlton'**

In 1449, Lady Margaret de la Zouche left him 'my fair gret Sawter'.

   TE, 2, no 120.
2. Dame Jane Neville

'To Thomas Neville, my son, my grete primer.'

*North Country Wills, 1383-1558*, ed. J.W. Clay,

Surtees Society, 116 (1908), no 35.

3. A Missing Manuscript of the Ordinal of Alchemy

A manuscript copy of this work was described by Elias Ashmole
(Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum, 1652). It was said to be
'almost identical' in illumination to B.L. MS Additional
10302, and carried the Neville coat of arms. George Neville
Archbishop of York (brother of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick)
has been noted as a 'patron' of Norton's *Ordinal* - perhaps
the missing manuscript was his.

*Thomas Norton's Ordinal of Alchemy*, ed. J. Reidy,


4. The Neville and Gascoigne Families

A missal in Boston (U.S.A.) Public Library (MS Med. 151),
contains birth and death notices of members of the Neville
and Gascoigne families. A Joan Neville married Sir William
Gascoigne c.1440.

Z. Haraszti, 'Addition to the Rare Book Department',

*Boston Public Library Quarterly*, IX

(1957), 60-61.
Sixteenth Century References

5. Margaret Neville (d.1559)

The Rutland MS of Lydgate's Fall of Princes (3rd ¼ of the 15th century), contains a note on the flyleaf that the MS was presented to Margaret Neville, daughter of Ralph 4th Earl of Westmoreland by her mother, Katherine Stafford (daughter of Edward 3rd Duke of Buckingham). On the bottom of the f. lv is written, 'as off then as you one thes loke ren'ber me that wrote yn yore boke your louyng mother Katheryn Westmorland'.


6. Margaret Neville (1520-1575)

Blackburn Museum and Art Gallery MS 091.21040 (a mid-fifteenth century English book of Hours), was bequeathed by Elizabeth Hull Abbess of Malling, to her god-child Margaret Neville. (Inscription, f. 7.)


7. Augustine Neville

B.L. MS Harley 937 (Astronomical Calendar in English, 1430), has a 16th century inscription on f. 2, 'Augustine Nevell ex dono Thome Newell'.

Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c.700-
8. Thomas Neville, Master of Trinity College Cambridge, 1593-1615

A list of over one hundred volumes given by Neville to the College is given in M.R. James, The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Cambridge, II (Cambridge, 1901), p.xvi-xix. I have not yet connected any of these with earlier Neville ownership.

9. William Neville (fl. 1518)

He was the second son of Richard Lord Latimer and Anne Stafford, and author of The Castell of Pleasure, printed in 1518.

DNB, 'William Neville'.

10. Frances, Lady Abergavenny, wife of Henry Neville Baron Abergavenny

"There is a book in the possession of the Earl of Abergavenny splendidly bound and gilt with the Family Arms upon it entitled Lady Nevill's Music Book". It was said to have been written by a famous copyist of the time of Queen Elizabeth and belonged to Frances Lady Abergavenny (d.1576).

She was also said to be the author of a book printed in 1577, "Precious Perles of perfect Godliness, etc. begun by Lady Frances Aburgaunney and finished by John Phillip", and the author of prayers for various occasions in Bentley's Monument of Matrones (1582).

APPENDIX 3 - MANUSCRIPTS OF DOUBTFUL OWNERSHIP OR FOR WHICH
THERE IS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

BEAUCHAMP

1. LONDON, B.L. MS Royal 19 D. iv, v - Bible Historiale

Around the edges of the two manuscripts when closed, are
somewhat indistinct painted coats of arms. These have been
tentatively identified as the arms of Beauchamp and Gurney,
which suggests that the owners of the two volumes may have
been Sir Matthew Gurney and his wife (after 1362), Alice
Beauchamp (d.1384), daughter of Thomas Earl of Warwick (d.1369).
The manuscripts belong to the first half of the fourteenth
century.

Warner & Gilson, Catalogue of Western Manuscripts
in the Old Royal and King's Collections, 2.

2. OXFORD, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 686 - Canterbury Tales

"The only clue in the MS to earlier ownership is in the word
"Belthiam" or "Belchiam" on f. 139, ... if this was intended
for Beauchamp."

Manly & Rickert, The Text of the Canterbury Tales, 1,p.69.

They note as owners of fine manuscripts, Margaret Beauchamp,
daughter of Earl Richard and wife of John Talbot, and Margaret's
daughter who married Sir George Vere, but as they point out,
the evidence for Beauchamp ownership is extremely slim.

3. OXFORD, Bodleian Library MS Laud 600 - Canterbury Tales

On f. 114 is an inscription which Manly and Rickert read as
"Bedmin...". They suggest that this might be the beginning of "Bedminster", a manor near Bristol held by Eleanor Duchess of Somerset during the reign of Edward IV. Eleanor was a sister of the Margaret Beauchamp mentioned in connection with the previous manuscript, and noting certain similarities between this manuscript and Bodl. MS 686, they suggest that the two sisters could have owned similar manuscripts (Margaret, Bodley MS 686; Eleanor MS Laud 600). Again the evidence is extremely circumstantial.


The final reference does not concern a manuscript:

4. Richard Beauchamp and Thomas Malory

Sir Thomas Malory, author of the Morte D'Arthur, has been traditionally linked with Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick (d.1439). Dugdale identified him as an esquire in Beauchamp's retinue from an undated retinue roll compiled between 1414 and 1420. However, a recent investigation of the roll and of a number of gentlemen of the same name has demonstrated that Malory the author could not be the person of that name in the roll.


NEVILLE

1. OXFORD, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 939 - Private prayers in Latin and English

The name of the person for whom the prayers were compiled is
given in the manuscript as 'Elina' and 'Aleanora'. Madan suggested as a candidate for ownership, Eleanor Neville (d.1482), daughter of Joan Beaufort and Ralph Neville, who married Henry Percy Earl of Northumberland, though no reasons for this conjecture are given.


2. OXFORD, Bodleian Library MS Douce 115 - Geoffrey of Monmouth,

Brut Chronicle

This is a thirteenth century English Manuscript in Latin and French. At the end of the volume on f. 71v is the inscription, 'Iste liber constat Johanni Stwarde militi filio Io. Scotangli militis ex dono prepotentissimi & nobilissimi dompni dompni ducis Bedford...', together with the arms of Steward, and 'Iste liber constat Ricardo Styward filio Thome Styward anno domini 1491'. Madan tentatively identified George Neville as the Duke of Bedford of the inscription. He was created Duke of Bedford in 1470 but degraded in 1477.

Madan, A Summary Catalogue, IV, Part II, no 21689,


I have been unable to find anything to confirm that Neville was the Duke of Bedford of the inscription. The only John Steward I have located is a John Stewart who was among those created Knights of the Bath on St. George's Day, 1418, at Caen (W.A. Shaw, The Knights of England, 2 vols (London, 1906), 1, p.130). The wording of the reference to the Duke of Bedford, together with the John Stewart previously mentioned, may suggest that the Duke of Bedford might be more appropriately identified
as John (d.1435), brother of Henry V. A Sir John Stiward (perhaps the same?) is also mentioned in the biography of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester by Vickers, in connection with the trial of Eleanor Duchess of Gloucester in 1441. During a remand in the trial, she was committed to Leeds Castle in Kent, under the care of Sir John Stiward and Sir John Stanley (Vickers, op.cit., p.271). After completing her penance she was committed to life imprisonment under the care of these two men (ibid., p.273).

A number of manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales have been linked with various member of the Neville family:

3. LONDON, B.L. MS 18 C. ii - Canterbury Tales

A number of inscriptions in the manuscript have been read as pointing indirectly to the Neville and Stafford families. One name on f. 272v, 'Seyer' leads perhaps to a John Sayer whose wife's aunt was a niece of Anne Neville, daughter of Joan Beaufort and wife of Humphrey Stafford. Another name is Thomas Cobham. A Cobham married a daughter of Anne Neville and Humphrey Stafford. There are a number of other names which indicate links with the Cobham family and with the family of Chetwynd. The first certain owner of the manuscript was a Philip Chetwynd, an usher in the household of Henry VIII. The Chetwynds had previously been in the service of the Stafford family.

A fragment of two 'inquisitions post mortem concerning the lands of Lady Elizabeth Neville, wife of John Neville (eldest son of Ralph Neville and his first wife, Margaret Stafford) occurs on the verso of the front flyleaf.
As Manly and Rickert suggest, there are a number of pieces of evidence which conjure up the names of Stafford and Neville, but at present, there is insufficient concrete evidence to claim this as a Neville manuscript.


4. LONDON, B.L. MS Harley 1239 - Troilus and Criseyde, 5 Canterbury Tales
   An hypothesis, but only an hypothesis, has been made that the manuscript may have been intended for Richard Neville Earl of Warwick (the Kingmaker). There is no strong evidence for this.

Manly & Rickert, The Text of the Canterbury Tales, 1, p.196

5. OXFORD, Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson Poetry 223 - Fragments of Lydgate's Troy Book and Canterbury Tales
   The manuscript was an expensive copy of the Canterbury Tales, and Manly and Rickert looked for owners of wealth, who moved in the same social circles as owners of other manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales. They note a number of owners who are linked by marriage or descent with the Neville family, though this is not necessarily a clue to ownership, as a significant proportion of the peerage could claim some sort of kinship with the Nevilles, as a result of the numerous offspring of Ralph Earl of Westmoreland and Joan Beaufort and their marriages. A shield on f. 128 in dry point, and on ff. 44v + 45v, is that of the Nevilles, but again fails to provide conclusive evidence of Neville ownership and "may easily be explained as coincidental".

The name "Thomas Devenysh" appears on f. 16. A gentleman of this name had family connections with the Neville family, though they are not in any way suggested as owners of this manuscript.

Manly & Rickert, The Text of the Canterbury Tales, 1, p.419.
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