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### A – Codicological descriptions of manuscripts containing the prose translation of *De re militari*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library</td>
<td>MS Add. 8706</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, MS Add. 4713</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, MS Add. 14408</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 285</td>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, MS Royal 18 A.XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, MS Sloane 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M 775</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 233</td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 291</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 416</td>
<td></td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B – Codicological descriptions of manuscripts containing the verse translation of *De re militari*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Pembroke College</td>
<td>MS 243</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C – Codicological descriptions of manuscripts containing the R translation of the *Quadrilogue Invectif*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, St John's College</td>
<td>MS 76 DI</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Newberry Library, MS f.36, Ry 20.</td>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS Arc.L.40.2/E.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson A 338</td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D – Codicological description of the manuscript containing the U translation of Chartier's *Quadrilogue Invectif*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, University College, MS 85</td>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E – Codicological description of the manuscript containing the English translation of Pizan’s *Livre du corps de policie*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library</td>
<td>MS Kk. 1.5</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F – Codicological description of the manuscript containing William Worcester’s *Boke of Noblesse*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, MS Royal 18 B.XXII</td>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

This thesis is an examination of English attitudes towards war and defeat, using the evidence supplied by translations of French and Latin military texts, and the manuscripts in which they survive, datable to between c. 1445 - c. 1475. It explores the different ways these texts on warfare were read, and demonstrates that they were interpreted, altered and rewritten to accord with contemporaries' experience of defeat in the Hundred Years War and subsequent civil war in England. This thesis also argues that, through the production, dissemination and reception of these texts, there was a significant process of diagnosis of the reasons for military defeat.

The first chapter briefly discusses the historical context in which these texts circulated and outlines the methodological approach employed in the thesis. The second chapter argues that these military texts were new works, which were updated and recontextualised by their translators, scribes and owners. It discusses the evidence derived from a close study of translation change, the manuscript context and scribal and readers' annotations. The third chapter argues that the evidence for ownership of these manuscripts suggests that a wide range of the political community were interested in reading about war. The fourth chapter considers both the ways in which readers of these texts diagnosed military defeat and the way that their readings interacted with, and were shaped by, other concerns and discourses of the third quarter of the fifteenth century. It argues that readers of military texts explained defeat as being the result of poor counsel, lack of unity and financial mismanagement, whilst also explaining defeat in a more complex way: translation change and readers' annotation drew attention to the 'demilitarisation of society'. The final chapter offers an analysis of the role that the end of the war with France played in contemporaries' interpretations of civil unrest. It argues that although modern historians have marginalised the impact of the end of the war upon the subsequent civil wars, it was central to the way in which some fifteenth-century readers explained them. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the other ways in which civil war was explained by these texts and argues that translators rewrote their source texts to accord with their own experiences.
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Defeat in France was a prospect which few Englishmen and women would have envisaged at the beginning of Henry VI's reign. Less than thirty years later, they witnessed a startling turnaround of military fortunes and the withdrawal of English soldiers from Normandy. In August 1449, after the breakdown of the Truce of Tours (1444), Charles VII led his forces into Normandy. With the surrender of Cherbourg on 12 August 1450, after a campaign of little over a year, more than thirty years of English rule in Normandy came to an end. The French continued the offensive into Gascony in 1451 and, despite a brief period of success for the English with the recapture of Bordeaux the following year, by 1453 the Hundred Years War was effectively over. The battle of Castillon on 17 July that year marked the end of English hopes in France, with the death of the famous veteran of the French wars, John Talbot.

From then on, England was threatened by the prospect of French invasion; a threat that was exacerbated as England declined into a state of civil war over the course of the 1450s. Public bills and letters referred to French designs on the country, fears which were realised when, in 1457, the port of Sandwich was attacked. Although English military ambitions in France were revived in the early 1470s at the prospect of a new campaign in France, those hopes were dashed by the Treaty of Picquigny, in which Edward IV agreed to withdraw from France in return for a substantial pension from the French king, Louis XI. As one contemporary put it, the 'ignominy of his returning so
soon, after such vast preparations, would be a greater disgrace and stain to his arms than all the honour he had gained' in any of his former victories.¹

The question of why Lancastrian France fell in the early 1450s has stimulated much debate among historians.² The related issue of how contemporaries explained or thought about the defeat has not been subject to the same level of scrutiny or attracted the same interest.³ This thesis aims to focus on precisely these issues: how did contemporaries explain and come to terms with the defeat in France? My aim is not, then, to offer another analysis of the causes of the defeat in France, but to concentrate on how it was explained by those who experienced it, and to investigate the cultural materials with which contemporaries could view, describe and shape their political and social experience of defeat.

In this thesis I shall use a body of evidence derived from the codicological and textual study of a group of texts on warfare translated from Latin and French to explore how contemporaries thought about defeat and war in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. I shall demonstrate that these texts can be used as alternative sources for understanding the way in which contemporaries came to terms with their experiences.

³ The way in which defeat in general was explained by contemporaries in the later middle ages has been neglected by historians, with most research being confined to specific battles or sieges; see, for example, K. DeVries, ‘God, Leadership, Flemings and Archery: Contemporary Perspectives of Victory and Defeat at the Battle of Sluys 1340’, American Neptune 55 (1995): 224-242; K. DeVries, ‘Contemporary Views of Edward III’s Failure at the Siege of Tournai’, Nottingham Medieval Studies 39 (1995): 70-105.
As Kevin Sharpe has argued, 'literature presents the cultural historian with uniquely rich evidence, the opportunity to hear contemporaries airing questions and anxieties that seldom find expression in the traditional materials of political history'.

Whilst scholars working on other periods are accustomed to using the literature produced and read in their period to explore how contemporaries came to terms with their experiences, such an approach is less common for the fifteenth century. McFarlane's emphasis on 'personal politics' has stimulated important work in relation to patronage, the localities and so on, but the study of other areas of the fifteenth century, particularly research into concepts and ideas, has been somewhat neglected. In consequence, it has been left to literary scholars to draw connections between fifteenth-century literature and the historical contexts which gave rise to the production of such literature. Field and Riddy, for example, have explored the way in which Malory's *Morte Darthur* was a response, conscious or unconscious, to his experiences in the 1450s and

---


5 There are notable exceptions to this trend. For example, Morgan sees the proliferation of household writing in the mid-fifteenth century as being the result of a 'process of political unsettlement'; D.A.L. Morgan, 'The House of Policy: the Political Role of the late Plantagenet Household, 1422-1485', in D. Starkey (ed.), *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Harlow, 1987), p. 34. In his recent study of Henry VI, Watts regards the literature read by the nobility as a 'source of ideology', which represents 'a public treasury of familiar terms and concepts'; J. Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 11 and 53.

1460s. Similarly, Helen Cooper has addressed how romance as a genre underwent change as a result of the experience of civil war. Likewise, manuscript scholars have seen the production of Books of Hours as a reaction to the experience of the Hundred Years War. However, historians have rarely utilised these types of evidence.

In part, this neglect is understandable: neither romances nor Books of Hours provide direct evidence and very little new writing was produced during the period that explicitly diagnosed the reasons for defeat in war. However, if we focus upon the proliferation of English translations of French and Latin military texts, rather than on strictly 'new' texts, we get a very different picture. Many translations of French and Latin military texts were undertaken in the third quarter of the fifteenth century, while an earlier English military text began to proliferate from c. 1445 onwards. These translations offered fifteenth-century English audiences explanations for military defeat and, as I shall demonstrate, were updated throughout the period to accord with the changing context of defeat and civil war. Moreover, readers could re-interpret the advice given by the texts to accord with their own agendas, political affiliations and experiences of defeat and civil war.

This thesis will consider the production and reception of English military texts, and the manuscripts in which they survive, which were circulating in England in the

---

9 Harris has argued that Victoria and Albert Museum, MS Reid 7 and BL, MS Harley 1251, which were illustrated by the Fastolf Master in Rouen, can be 'read as memoriae of the Lancastrian occupation'; K. Harris, 'Patrons, Buyers and Owners: The Evidence for Ownership and the Role of Book Owners in Book Production and the Book Trade', in J. Griffiths and D. Pearsall (eds.), *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 181.
fifteenth century prior to the introduction of printing. These texts are: the English prose translation of *De re militari* which was produced in 1408 for Thomas, Lord Berkeley, and proliferated between c. 1445 and c. 1475; the 1460 verse translation of *De re militari* known as *Kayghthode and Bataile*, which survives in three manuscripts dating from the 1460s and 1470s; the English translation of Christine de Pizan's *Livre du corps de policie*, which is extant in only one manuscript dating from the early 1470s, and the two translations of Alain Chartier's *Quadrilogue Invidit* which were produced in c. 1470 and survive in a total of five manuscripts dating from the 1470s and 1480s; and William Worcester's *Boke of Noblesse*, which he began in the early 1450s and presented to Edward IV in 1475.

These texts proliferated between c. 1445 and c. 1475. I shall argue that the experience of defeat in the Hundred Years War in the late 1440s and early 1450s and subsequent civil unrest in England helps to explain the interest in these works. The connection between the popularity of these texts in this period and the context in which they circulated has not, so far as I am aware, previously been made. This is partly because the effect of defeat in the Hundred Years War has been marginalised by historians. It has generally been assumed that the defeat in France did not initiate a

---

10 This study could be extended in the future to include texts that place emphasis on the wider dimensions of warfare, such as translations of Alain Chartier's *Traité de l'Esperance* and Pizan's *Épître d'Othéa la déesse à Hector*, and to incorporate William Caxton's translations of military and chivalric manuals. Unfortunately, Caxton's prolific output of such works and the quantity of surviving printed copies has meant that he has been excluded from this study so that I have a manageable quantity of texts to consider for a thesis. I have also excluded Giles of Rome's *De regimine principum* because, although there was an English translation in existence in the fifteenth century, there is no evidence that it was read or used; see R. Hanna, 'Sir Thomas Berkeley and his Patronage', *Speculum* 64 (1989): 878-916; C.F. Briggs, 'MS Digby 233 and the Patronage of John Trevisa's *De regimine principum*', *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 7 (1998): 249-263.

11 Eight of the eleven extant manuscripts containing the prose translation were produced between c. 1445 and c. 1474. See table one, in chapter two, p. 24.

12 Interest in these works at this point can, of course, be explained in a range of ways, as, for example, a product of humanism or Burgundian court culture. The following chapter will explore the different way these texts were read. However, on the evidence of translation change and readers' annotations, I shall argue that the interest in these works was predominantly a product of the experience of defeat and civil war.
widespread response. As Lander states: 'The significance of the Hundred Years War has been seriously misunderstood for the fifteenth century, largely because the enthusiasms of a small but vociferous 'war party' have been mistaken for popular, national feeling'.

This impression has been compounded by the argument that towards the end of the war there was a lack of enthusiasm for, and interest in, maintaining the Anglo-French possessions and that there was a division of interest between those who fought in France and those who stayed in England.

Yet this oversimplifies things considerably. First, defeat must have had an impact: the war in France was seen not only as affecting the king and his private rights but also the realm as a whole. The 'Articles of the Captain of Kent' of 1450, for example, stressed that as a result of the loss of Normandy 'trewe lordis, knightes and squiers and many good yoman [were] loste and solde or they wente, the whiche ys a grete pite to here of the grete and grevous losse to our soveraigne lord and his resume'. Moreover, the extent to which the Lancastrians publicised the war in France and attempted to enlist the aid of the country has been recognised. As Ormrod states, 'the investment of the profits of war in conspicuous consumption undoubtedly created important tangible symbols of England's military fortunes which could have a powerful

14 See Keen, 'The End of the Hundred Years War', pp. 297-311. The suggestion that declining interest in the war meant that there was no reaction to defeat is implicit in many accounts of the 1450s. For example, Pollard suggests that the interest in the defeat in France shown by William Worcester was representative of no-one but 'a small group of passé ultra conservatives', a statement which he then supports with the comment that 'even during the early years of Henry VI's reign his government had difficulty persuading gentlemen actually to serve in France'; A.J. Pollard, The Wars of the Roses (London, 1988), p. 57.
15 Keen, The End of the Hundred Years War, p. 297.
impact on more general public perceptions of the war'. It seems somewhat limited, therefore, to argue that there was no experience of defeat or collective ‘national’ shame.

Secondly, the whole concept of declining interest in the war, and particularly that of a ‘division of interest’, is problematic. A significant proportion of the political community remained involved in the wars in France into the 1440s. This was especially true in coastal counties like Kent, where soldiers like Sir Thomas Kiriell, Gervase Clifton and Clement Overton remained involved both in local affairs and in the conduct of the war. Furthermore, even if it is accepted that there was a decline in military participation and a lack of enthusiasm for paying for the war, it does not necessarily follow that the loss of the French possessions did not initiate some form of diagnosis of why the defeat came about.

The impact of defeat has also been played down perhaps in reaction to the Stubbsian interpretation of the fifteenth century, which blamed the end of external war for internal instability and war. This view was challenged in 1964 with the publication of McFarlane’s lecture on the Wars of the Roses in which he argued that civil war was not caused by a ‘demoralized, unpaid, and mutinous soldiery’ or by ‘magnates themselves, deprived of the profits of war which had compensated them for falling rents, [who]

---

18 Ormrod, 'The Domestic Response to the Hundred Years War', p. 95.
19 The ongoing work of the 1422-1460 section of the History of Parliament continues to demonstrate that a significant proportion of men combined active political roles at home with military service abroad.
20 Vale has also argued against the notion that there was a divide between those men who fought in France and those who remained in England. He cites the examples of Sir William Harrington, bailli of Caen from 1438 to 1450, who increased his English lands while in France and, when back in England, was elected M.P. for Lancashire in 1450-1 and Sir John Popham, who held land in Normandy, but served as M.P. for Hampshire in the parliaments of 1439-40 and was then elected Speaker for the House of Commons in 1449; M.G.A. Vale, ‘The End and Aftermath of the Hundred Years War’, in N. Saul (ed.), England in Europe 1066-1453 (London, 1994), p. 156.
sought to escape threatened ruin in the lottery of civil war'. Subsequently, most historians have continued to stress that the end of the Hundred Years War did not cause the civil war in England. J.R. Lander was perhaps the most vocal in this respect, arguing that 'there is no connection other than a near coincidence in time between the expulsion of the English from Normandy and Gascony and the beginning of the Wars of the Roses'. One consequence of this has been that the experience of defeat has only been studied in terms of its impact on civil war and not as an area of study in its own right.

Paradoxically, the effect of defeat in the Hundred Years War has also been marginalised because it was used so much in Yorkist propaganda. The defeat in France was a fundamental element of York's justification for opposing the government and it continued to be referred to, albeit with different emphasis, by the Yorkists throughout the 1460s. Yet, although it is accepted that York and his supporters used the defeat in

---

23 The main impact of defeat on the civil wars has been identified in the sphere of public discourse or propaganda. As Keen suggests, the defeat in France undermined the Lancastrian government to such an extent that it was difficult for it to recover the support and confidence of the political community. He further argues that 'without the defeat abroad, without the sense that it was not just a partial interest but the common weal of the kingdom that had been damaged by the misgovernment of the king's friends, his [York's] armed interventions would have been very hard to justify and very unlikely to succeed'; M.H. Keen, England in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1973), p. 456-7; McCulloch and Jones, 'Lancastrian Politics', Speculum 58 (1983): 95-138.
24 For the use of theme in the 1450s, see chapter four, n. 2. Propaganda produced in the 1460s linked the diplomatic concessions that had led to the cession of Maine and the fall of Normandy to Lancastrian willingness to cede England and to dispossess Englishmen. For example, a letter from Edward IV to Thomas Cook, dated 13 March 1462, stated that Margaret of Anjou had agreed to relinquish the title to all the French lands including Calais. Another letter, dated 1463, stated that Margaret had granted to the Scots seven 'shirffewyks' of England, the archbishopric of Canterbury to the bishop of St. Andrews, and bishoprics throughout England. 
France as a rhetorical weapon in the early 1450s, this acceptance seems to have made it more difficult for scholars to treat the experience of defeat as anything more than ammunition in a rhetorical debate. This is partly the result of the way in which historians have interpreted propaganda. First, there has not been sufficient recognition that propaganda, if it is to be an effective form of political discourse, has to correspond in some way to its recipients' understanding of their world. Secondly, as Watts has shown, historians have tended to treat York's reasons for opposition, as given in his public bills and manifestos, as nothing more than a front for his own ambitions: his use of the theme of defeat has been discounted in a similar way.

This view of propaganda has had two related effects. It has meant that those who used the theme of defeat have been regarded as doing so only in order to advance their own particular political agenda, and not because they might actually have been concerned about why England was defeated and the implications that might have on the country as a whole. Furthermore, the diagnosis of defeat offered by the Yorkists has been seen only as a product of that particular political agenda. In other words, the way they explained defeat is regarded as having been dictated by their wider purpose of criticising the government and justifying their own opposition. I take a different view, and assume that propaganda relies for its success on manipulating recognisable aspects to clerks of Scotland 'and the lyvelode, landis and possessions of the lordis, gentils and nobles therof to divers Scottes and Frenchemen [...] thobeisunce of our said reaulme, and of our subgiettes therof to be asmuche as she may undre the don-dnacion and power of the same Scottes and Frenshemen'; Kekewich et al (eds.), John Vale's Book, pp. 136, 148.


27 Michael Jones has, however, argued that the fall of Normandy, and specifically Somerset's conduct in Normandy, was the cause of the animosity between York and Somerset in the early 1450s; M.K. Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', EHR 104 (1984): 285-307.
of experience, in this case both the concerns of the political community about what had
happened in France and their existing perceptions of why military defeat occurred.

The association between the proliferation of military texts and the political
context of the third quarter of the fifteenth century has also received little attention
because of the way in which literary scholars and historians have treated these texts and,
in particular, these translations. 28 Previous studies of these texts have been based upon
the model of a stable, author-centred text, a model that does not allow the text to
undergo transformation either in the hands of its scribes or of its readers. For example,
scholars have referred to the wide range of owners of *De re militari* throughout the
Middle Ages, but they have used this simply as evidence of its popularity. 29 They have
failed to recognise that potential meanings of the text could have been affected both by
individual readers and the historical contexts in which they read. Moreover, scholars
tend to homogenise the reception of *De re militari* across period and language, conflating,
for example, a French translation read in 1370 with an English translation read in
1450. 30 The fact that new texts which explicitly addressed military defeat were produced
in the third quarter of the fifteenth century has not been sufficiently recognised. In
other words, because these translations have not been regarded as creative works, and

---

28 For a discussion of literary scholars' lack of interest in translations see L. von Flotow,
'Translation in the Politics of Culture', in R. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, L. von Flotow and D. Russell
29 C.T. Allmand, *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War c. 1300-1450* (Cambridge,
1989), p. 158; G.A. Lester (ed.), *The Earliest Middle English Translation of Vegetius' De re militari*
30 Charles Briggs, for example, refers to Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes* and the 1408 prose
translation as straight-forward copies of *De re militari*, rather than as translations and rewritings;
C.F. Briggs, *Giles of Rome's De regimine principum: Reading and Writing Politics at Court and University, c.
1275-1525* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 45. Christopher Allmand's recent work on Vegetius has,
however, touched upon the ways that translators rewrote *De re militari*; C.T. Allmand, 'Fifteenth-
Century Versions of Vegetius' *De re militari*', in M. Strickland (ed.), *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare*
(Stamford, 1998), pp. 30-45; 'The *De re militari* of Vegetius in the Middle Ages and the
Renaissance', in C. Saunders, F. Le Saux and N. Thomas (eds.), *Writing War: Medieval Literary
because those who read and produced them have been assigned passive roles in the
creation of meaning, it appears that there was little literary or intellectual response to the
experience of defeat.\textsuperscript{31}

This approach to the production of texts and translations is problematic on
three accounts. First, these texts circulated in manuscripts which were produced by
scribes. Texts in manuscripts ought to be seen as unique works in themselves rather
than as direct copies that have the same stability as that assigned to print. The producers
of each manuscript prepared and altered its texts in different ways: by translating the
original dialects into their own, by rubricating in order to highlight or emphasise words
or passages, and by updating the texts' language and references.\textsuperscript{32} Recent work has also
stressed the impact of what have been termed 'codicological aesthetics' upon the
reception of a text. The way a text was presented, its decoration and script for example,
affected the way it would have been interpreted by its readers.\textsuperscript{33} Moreover, translations
did not 'transfer meaning unchanged from one language to another' but were
themselves 'readings' of texts.\textsuperscript{34} Translators updated and recontextualised their source
texts for their intended audiences. Finally, as the annotations in manuscripts indicate, an

\textsuperscript{31} Norbrook has found a similar situation in Renaissance England. He argues that although no
republican treatises were produced during the period, texts such as Lucan's \textit{Pharsalia} were read
in ways which reinforced republican ideology; D. Norbrook, 'Lucan, Thomas May, and the
Creation of a Republican Literary Culture', in K. Sharpe and P. Lake (eds.), \textit{Culture and Politics in

\textsuperscript{32} Extensive work has been done upon the way in which scribes acted like authors. See, for
example, C.D. Benson, 'Another Fine Manuscript Mess: Authors, Editors and Readers of \textit{Piers
15-28; J. Boffey, 'Short Texts in Manuscript Anthologies: The Minor Poems of John Lydgate in
Two Fifteenth-Century Collections', in S.G. Nichols and S. Wenzel (eds.), \textit{The Whole Book: Cultural
Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany} (Michigan, 1996), pp. 69-82; K. Kerby-Fulton and
Plowman} (Minneapolis, 1999).

\textsuperscript{33} R. Hanna III, 'Producing Manuscripts and Editions', in A.J. Minnis and C. Brewer (eds.), \textit{Crisis
and Controversy in Middle English Textual Criticism} (Cambridge, 1992), p. 129.

\textsuperscript{34} R. Evans et al, 'The Notion of Vernacular Theory', in J. Wogan-Browne et al (eds.), \textit{The Idea of
the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280-1520} (Exeter, 1999), p. 317.
individual text could be read in a variety of ways and those readings could vary over time and were dependent as much on the reader as on the author or translator.

Instead of homogenising the reception of a text, this thesis will employ a 'transactional model of reading', which 'assumes that a single text may give rise to a plurality of possible responses', which are culturally specific.\(^3^5\) This methodology rests upon the acceptance that whatever the intentions of the original author of a text that text's meaning can be made by its reader. As Sharpe comments: 'readers bring their experiences (not least of other texts) to any reading. Reading indeed becomes a process in which we translate into our own words, symbols and mental contexts the marks and signs on the page'.\(^3^6\) In this sense, all reading is an act of translation. If the production and reception of manuscripts and translations are treated as creative processes, then new texts which offered explanations for military defeat were produced in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. Moreover, these texts were rewritten and recontextualised by their scribes and translators, and annotated by their readers, to accord with the English experience of defeat and civil war.

Translation change, scribal rewriting and annotations were not politically or ideologically neutral acts. They were designed 'to influence the performance of the text in the public sphere, written, that is, as political acts and ideas'.\(^3^7\) As a result, they must be viewed alongside other political events, such as the publication of a Yorkist manifesto, a speech given to parliament or the Loveday award of 1458, if we are to fully understand the culture of politics. Reading itself is, of course, a political act, which could

\(^3^6\) K. Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, 2000), p. 34. See also his interesting discussion of the concerns of many Renaissance writers over the very ability of readers to make their own meanings; Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, pp. 42-44.
\(^3^7\) Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p. 66.
serve to consolidate or justify beliefs or positions. Moreover, military texts could be used in public contexts to legitimise and authorise political actions. For example, the duke of Norfolk, in his petition against the duke of Somerset dating from 1453, argued that in cases where a town had been surrendered without siege, the captains who had been in charge 'han be deede and beheded, and her godes lost'. To substantiate his argument he added that 'alle these thyngs may be founden in the lawes wryten, and also yn the boke cleped L'arbre de bataille', referring to Honoré Bouvet's text. Norfolk used a text on warfare as the authority for the political action he was proposing against Somerset. By so doing, he clearly expected his audience to recognise, respect, and invest this text with authority: in other words, to ascribe the same cultural value to the text that he did. Unfortunately, we rarely have such explicit examples of how a text could operate in the public sphere or of how it could be manipulated or used for a direct political purpose. Nonetheless, texts formed part of that common pool of political discourse to which politicians made reference and which, as historians have recently argued, influenced their actions.

This thesis has three interrelated aims. First, I shall explore the range of ways in which a group of texts on warfare translated from Latin and French were read in the fifteenth century, and demonstrate that these texts were interpreted, altered and rewritten to accord with contemporaries' experience of defeat and civil war. Secondly, I shall demonstrate that the study of the reception of military texts provides evidence of

how contemporaries thought about war and chivalry in a context of defeat abroad and war at home. Thirdly, I shall argue that, through the production, dissemination and reception of these texts, there was a significant process of diagnosis of the reasons for military defeat taking place in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. 

In order to achieve this, the second chapter develops the argument that these military texts, in translation and in manuscript, were new works, which were updated and recontextualised by their translators, scribes and owners. It argues that rather than treating translation changes as mistranslations or as corruptions of the original work, they should be regarded as creative and potentially meaningful acts: the creativity shown by translators means that we must reconsider the assumption that those who read translations did so purely because they were unable to read the work in its original language. It considers the impact that the manuscript context may have had upon the way the texts were read: this will demonstrate the different ways in which a text could be read over time by different audiences. Finally, the chapter concludes with a consideration of the way these texts were annotated by their readers and argues that the evidence afforded by annotation practices demonstrates that readers made links between their texts and the contexts in which they lived. The chapter as a whole makes the case for three types of reader: the translator as reader, the scribe as reader and the owner as reader, and argues that this source of evidence provides vital insights into the way in

41 Research undertaken on other periods has demonstrated that the experience of defeat often initiates a cultural process in which the factors leading to defeat are explored, scrutinised and evaluated. See, for example, R. Koselleck, 'Erfahrungswandel und Methodenwechsel: Eine historisch-anthropologische Skizze', in C. Meier and J. Rüsen (eds.), Historische Methode (Munich, 1988), pp. 13-61; W. Schivelbusch, The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery, trans. J. Chase (London, 2003). In the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian war, for example, narratives were produced which filled 'a vacuum of meaning in explaining the defeat'; B. Taithe, 'Rhetoric, Propaganda and Memory: Framing the Franco-Prussian War', in B. Taithe and T. Thornton (eds.), Propaganda: Political Rhetoric and Identity 1300-2000 (Stroud, 1999), p. 205.
which individual readers responded both to their texts and to their experiences of the third quarter of the fifteenth century.

The third chapter assesses the evidence for ownership of these manuscripts and positions the manuscripts in which these texts survive in relation to their owners. It makes some suggestions about the types of agenda these owners may have brought to their reading, explores the various discourse communities which formed around these texts and discusses some of the contexts that gave rise to their reading. How were these texts transmitted and how did pre-existing networks facilitate the exchange of books and ideas? It argues that the evidence for ownership of these manuscripts suggests that a wide range of the political community were interested in reading about war.

The fourth chapter considers both the ways in which readers of these texts diagnosed military defeat and the way that their readings interacted with, and were shaped by, other concerns and discourses of the third quarter of the fifteenth century. It argues that readers of military texts explained defeat as being the result of poor counsel, lack of unity and financial mismanagement, whilst also explaining defeat in a more complex way: translation change and readers' annotation drew attention to the 'demilitarisation of society'.

The final chapter offers an analysis of the role that the end of the war with France played in contemporaries' interpretations of civil unrest. It argues that although modern historians have marginalised the impact of the end of the war in France upon the subsequent civil wars, it was central to the way in which some fifteenth-century readers explained them. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the other ways in
which civil war was explained by these texts and argues that translators rewrote their source texts to accord with their own experiences.
Chapter Two

The Production and Reception of English Military Texts

'Every society rewrites its past, every reader rewrites its texts, and, if they have any continuing life at all, at some point every printer redesigns them'.

This chapter will describe the texts, and the manuscripts in which they survive, that are the focus of this thesis. Its aim is also to rehabilitate previously undervalued areas of literary production, such as translation and adaptation. It seeks to demonstrate the benefits of explicating scribal and translational change as deliberate and creative acts and of using readers' writings as evidence for the reception of a work. It will make the case for three types of reader: the translator as reader, the scribe as reader and the owner as reader. It will argue that this source of evidence provides vital insights into the way in which individual readers responded to their texts and so provides new evidence of how military texts were appropriated, re-inscribed and updated to fit the context of the third quarter of the fifteenth century.

2.1 The Sources

The translations of De re militari

De re militari, a Latin treatise on warfare, was written between A.D. 383-450 by Flavius Vegetius Renatus, a Christian living in the Western Roman Empire, who served either the emperor Theodosius I (379-395) or Valentinian III (425-455). This treatise was based upon the advice given by writers such as Cato, Cornelius Celsus and Frontinus and was divided into four books, which dealt with military education and discipline, the parts of the Roman army, tactics, siege warfare and naval strategy. It circulated extensively in Latin and French versions: 243 manuscript versions survive in Latin, forty-six in French, seventeen in English and eighteen in other vernaculars. Shrader calculates that 148 manuscripts survive from the fifteenth century alone. In the fourteenth century, De re militari was circulating in England in the original Latin and in

---

2 In the rest of this thesis, the 1408 version will be referred to as the prose translation and the 1460 version as the verse translation.


4 Numerous writers drew on De re militari: parts of it were incorporated into treatises such as the Polcraticus of John of Salisbury, Speculum maius of Vincent of Beauvais and De regimine principum of Giles of Rome, which all circulated in England; John of Salisbury, Polcraticus, the Statesman’s Book, ed. M.F. Markland (New York, 1979); Vincent of Beauvais, Preface au Speculum maius de Vincent de Beauvais, ed. S. Lusignan (Paris, 1979); Giles of Rome, De regimine principum, ed. S.P. Molenaer (New York, 1899). Adam Loutfut, Kintyr Pursuivant, summarised the contents of Books I and III in Scottish prose in c. 1494. Loutfut’s version survives uniquely in BL, MS Harley 6149; L.A.J.R. Houwen (ed.), The Dei&. r of Armorie: a Heral&c Treatise and Bestiag, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1994).


6 Shrader calculates that there are ninety-six copies surviving from the fourteenth century and only twenty-one dating from after 1500; C.R. Shrader, ‘A Handlist of Extant Manuscripts containing the De re militari of Flavius Vegetius Renatus’, Scriptorium 33 (1979): 280-305.
two French translations: one made by Jean de Meun, dating from 1284, and another by Jean de Vignay, dating from c.1320.7

In the early fifteenth century *De re militari* was translated into English prose. According to the colophons in eight of the manuscripts, this translation was completed on the vigil of All Hallows (31 October) 1408, for Thomas, Lord Berkeley.8 Thomas was a Lancastrian who had been in the service of Richard II and then served Henry IV in the wars against the Welsh.9 He also patronised John Trevisa, who translated Higden’s *Polychronicon* (1385-7), Bartolomaeus Anglicus’ *De proprietatis rerum* and Giles of Rome’s *De regimine principum* (1399-1402).10 The identity of the translator of *De re militari* is, however, not known, as the only evidence is in the form of a rebus in the colophon of three manuscripts.11 John Trevisa (who died in 1402), John Walton, canon of Oseney, who certainly translated Boethius’s *De consolatione philosophiae* for Elizabeth Berkeley-Beauchamp, the daughter of Thomas Berkeley, in 1410, and ‘magister William Clifton’ have all been suggested as possibilities, although no argument has proved conclusive.12

Although this English prose translation was closely based on the Latin original, the translator also updated and altered some of the material and made it as relevant as
possible to the early fifteenth century. He referred to the text as a ‘tretys of knighthod and of cheualry'; soldiers became knights and Roman nobles became princes, dukes, earls and barons whilst military practice became ‘pe feld of exercise, tournementis & dedis of armes'. He also added a passage about the use of guns in the recent wars against the Welsh. He ended the work expressing the hope that it would be: ‘to grete disport & daliaunce of lordez and alle pe worpi werrioures pat ben apassed by wey of age al labour & trauaillyng, and to greet informacioun & lernynge of 3onge lordez & knyghtes pat ben lusty and louep to here & see & to vse dedes of armes & chyualrie'.

In the late 1450s, De re militari was translated again into English – this time into verse. This verse translation, known as Knyghtbode and Bataile, is a free rime royal translation of De re militari which was probably presented to Henry VI on 1 March 1460. This date is suggested by the references to the king’s entry into London on 1 March on lines 5-24 and to the attainder of the Yorkists, which took place in 1459, on lines 30-2. Presumably, it was written before the king’s capture at Northampton in July 1460, as this rather central event is not mentioned. Moreover, the poem’s patron, John, Lord Beaumont, died in that battle. Although this translation was made in a context of military defeat in France and increasing unrest at home, it reflects a sense of optimism.

13 For example, ‘oure peple of Rome’ and ‘y do yow to wytinge'; Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book I, chapters 1 and 2, pp. 48, 49.
17 It has been suggested that the arrival into London actually represents the ‘Loveday’ between Henry VI and the Yorkist lords which took place on 25 March 1458; R. Dyboski, and Z.M. Arend (eds.), Knyghtbode and Bataile, EETS, original series 201 (1935), p. xvi-xviii. As several scholars have noted, this date does not make sense given the references to the attainder of the Yorkists and the fact that the poet describes the scene as having taken place on St. David’s Day, the calends or 1 March (i Martis/ Mauortis!); Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghtbode and Bataile, ll. 1-8; J. Watts, Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship (Cambridge, 1996), p. 354, n. 389 and D. Wakelin, ‘The Occasion, Author and Readers of Knyghtbode and Bataile’, forthcoming in Medium Aevum (2004). I am grateful to Dr Wakelin for sending me a copy of this prior to publication.
following the Lancastrian victory at Ludford in 1459, a sense that ‘Now proseperaunce and peax perpetual shal growe, and why? For here is unitas’. Knyghthode and Bataile is a poem rooted in the context of the late 1450s and as such reflects the concerns and arguments found in other Lancastrian polemical texts such as William Waynflete’s sermon ‘Gracia vobis et pax multiplicetur’ given to parliament in 1459 and the contemporary, anonymous, tract the Somnium Vigilantis.

The impression that the poem reflects Lancastrian ideology of the late 1450s is also supported by the evidence for the authorship and patronage of the text. Although the identity of the author is not altogether clear, he probably belonged to Margaret of Anjou’s household, which also included the poet George Ashby, Sir John Fortescue and the author of the Somnium Vigilantis. In the proem and epilogue, the poet described himself as a ‘person of Caleys’. Daniel Wakelin has recently suggested that one John Neele, rector of St. Mary’s, Calais was responsible for the translation.

---

20 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, 1. 33; U. 2981-90; G.L. Harriss, ‘The Struggle for Calais: An Aspect of the Rivalry between Lancaster and York’, EHR 75 (1960): 30-53. It used to be thought that this translator was also responsible for the translation of Palladius’s third-century treatise De re rustica, known as On Husbondrie, undertaken between 1439-1444 for Humphrey, duke of Gloucester. This was because the format of the verse translation is very similar to that of On Husbondrie. MacCracken suggested that Robert Parker, who became parson of St. Nicholas’s Calais in 1450, was responsible for both translations. Yet, as Wakelin has recently argued, the two poems are not so similar and may have been produced by different people; H.N. MacCracken, ‘Vegetius in English: Notes on the Early Translations’, in N. Robinson, W.A. Neilson and E.S. Sheldon (eds.), Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge (Boston, 1913), pp. 398-400; Wakelin, ‘The Occasion, Author and Readers of Knyghthode and Bataile’.
21 The Somnium Vigilantis is generally thought to have been a product of Margaret of Anjou’s household; M.L. Kekewich, ‘The Attainer of the Yorkists in 1459: Two Contemporary Accounts’, Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 55 (1982): 30.
22 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, 1. 33; ll. 2981-90; G.L. Harriss, ‘The Struggle for Calais: An Aspect of the Rivalry between Lancaster and York’, EHR 75 (1960): 30-53. It used to be thought that this translator was also responsible for the translation of Palladius’s third-century treatise De re rustica, known as On Husbondrie, undertaken between 1439-1444 for Humphrey, duke of Gloucester. This was because the format of the verse translation is very similar to that of On Husbondrie. MacCracken suggested that Robert Parker, who became parson of St. Nicholas’s Calais in 1450, was responsible for both translations. Yet, as Wakelin has recently argued, the two poems are not so similar and may have been produced by different people; H.N. MacCracken, ‘Vegetius in English: Notes on the Early Translations’, in N. Robinson, W.A. Neilson and E.S. Sheldon (eds.), Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge (Boston, 1913), pp. 398-400; Wakelin, ‘The Occasion, Author and Readers of Knyghthode and Bataile’.
23 John Neele was granted a safe-conduct to travel to Guines in April 1456 and a licence to hold two benefices early in 1460. He also received a benefice on Guernsey in June 1460. Wakelin wonders whether these were rewards for the poem; D. Wakelin, ‘Vernacular Humanism in England, c.1440-1485’ (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2002), p. 127. Neele certainly had literary interests. He gave forty-two volumes to Magdalen College at Oxford; J.M. Fletcher, ‘A
chaplain to the chancellor of England, William Waynflete.24 Waynflete gave the opening sermon to the 1459 parliament in which York and his supporters were attainted and the fact that there are, as just mentioned, parallels between this sermon and the verse translation strengthens the argument for Neele's authorship. Moreover, the poem's patron is named as John, Lord Beaumont, in the opening lines of the poem: Beaumont was the steward of Margaret of Anjou's household and one of her most loyal supporters.25 The verse translation seems then to have been produced in an environment closely associated with Margaret of Anjou and with the production of other Lancastrian texts.

The argument for Neele's authorship is convincing, but possibly the translator's self-construction as a religious figure has been taken too literally. Presenting himself as a religious figure both authorised the advice the poem contained and his right to offer the advice. For example, in the proem, the poem's patron, Lord Beaumont, tells the author that he will read the text 'as o psaultier', which suggests that he will consult the text regularly as he would a Book of Hours.26 The use of the term 'psaultier' also legitimises the translation and implies that the reform suggested by the poem is akin to the religious salvation offered in a psalter. Similarly, the translator presented much of his argument against the Yorkists within a religious framework, conflating, for example, the Yorkists with heretics and the figure of Judas.27 The use of this religious framework can be interpreted as further evidence of the translator's religious profession, but it might also be interpreted as an authorising strategy.

26 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, l. 57.
27 See, for example, Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 1671-77.
More explicitly than the other translations considered here, the verse translator used his translation as a vehicle with which to diagnose the problems faced by the country at the height of the civil war. The translator referred to his poem as a translation, but adapted and expanded his Latin material in order to make it more relevant to an English audience and in order to promote the Lancastrian cause. To enable the translation to be read as a comment on the current political situation, the author utilised a variety of techniques. He added new material to his translation, such as passages which referred to the defeat of the Yorkists at Ludford and to their subsequent attainder, and he frequently referred to Henry VI and to the Yorkist lords under the guise of their badges. In other cases, he explained to his audience why the material found in De re militari was relevant to the 1450s. For example, the translator altered Vegetius’s discussion of truces to refer to the civil war: ‘And best be war, when that thin aduersary/ Wil swere grete, ye be the Sacrament,/ And vse that, ye and by seint Mary,/ And al that is vndir fim-iament:/ Belive nat his othe, his false entent/ Is this: thi trewe entent for to begile’. He then argued that ‘The pref herof nys passed but a whde’. Thus, he related Vegetius’s abstract discussion of truces to the contemporary situation. It is as if the translator utilised the authority and prestige of Vegetius as an author, and the legitimacy and audience that such a translation could bring, so that he could offer his own critique of the Yorkists. At the same time, the genre of military manual acted as a kind of wrapper for what was in effect a propagandist piece of writing.

28 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, ll. 978-1026; 2908-9. This seems to presuppose a politically literate or initiated audience. For other poems of the period which also did this see T. Wright (ed.), Political Poems and Songs relating to English History (London, 1859), 2: 221-3.
29 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, ll. 1160-1169.
Table 1 - Extant manuscripts of the two translations of *De re militari*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prose translation</th>
<th>Verse translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233</td>
<td>c. 1408-17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291</td>
<td>c. 1445</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMC, MS Lat. 30</td>
<td>c. 1450</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL, MS Add. 8706</td>
<td>c. 1450</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PML, MS M 775</td>
<td>c. 1450-61</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, MS Sloane 2027</td>
<td>c. 1461-74</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC, MS 243</td>
<td>c. 1460-70</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45</td>
<td>c. 1460-70</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, MS Cotton Titus A XXIII</td>
<td>c. 1464-72</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, MS Lansdowne 285</td>
<td>c. 1468</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, MS Add. 14408</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, MS Add. 4713</td>
<td>c. 1480</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, MS Royal 18 A. XII</td>
<td>1483-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The translations of French military texts

Translators did not only turn to antiquity when selecting their texts. They also chose texts emanating from the Valois court, which had originally been written in response to French military reversal in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, such as those by Christine de Pizan. Pizan wrote her Livre du corps de poltie between November 1404 and 23 November 1407. Her sources included Giles of Rome, Aristotle's Ethics, Politics, Metaphysics and Rhetoric, Cicero's De officiis and De senectute, Boethius's De consolatione philosophiae, Valerius Maximus's Facta et dicta memorabilia and, of course, Vegetius's De re militari.

Pizan's Livre du corps de poltie was translated into English in c. 1470 and is extant in only one manuscript: CUL, MS Kk. 1.5. The translation is heavily influenced by French vocabulary, sentence structure and phrasing. This translator often retained French words and then added a synonym: for example, 'bolde and avaunt', 'induce and stere', 'mordrers and occisions'. He also tended to maintain the noun plus adjective word order of the French, as in 'lettir closed', 'man mortall'.

There is no firm evidence as to the identity of the translator, although most scholars have accepted Bornstein's suggestion of Anthony Woodville without question. However, the identification of Woodville as translator is by no means certain.

---

31 She probably used Henri de Gauchy's French translation of De regimine principum, Le livre du gouvernement des rois (c. 1286), although she was also familiar with the original Latin.
32 Bornstein offers a detailed account of the style of the translator; D. Bornstein (ed.), The Middle English Translation of Christine de Pisan's Livre du corps de poltie ed. from the MS CUL kk1.5 (Heidelberg, 1977), pp. 26-30.
33 Bornstein (ed.), Middle English Translation of Livre du corps, p. 28.
Bornstein's argument rests upon the fact that Woodville translated another of Christine's works, her *Morale Prouerbes*, and expressed admiration for her work in the epilogue to this translation. Bornstein also argued that similar translational features are exhibited between Woodville's other translations and the translation of the *Livre du corps*, such as a fondness for doublets and a syntactic complexity (hardly uncommon traits among fifteenth-century translators). Finally, she concluded that if he was the translator then we have a reason why a copy of the translation came into the possession of the Haute family. Richard Haute, the probable owner of CUL MS Kk. 1.5, was Anthony Woodville's cousin and one of the executors of his will. Clearly, this evidence is not conclusive, especially given the fact that Woodville usually acknowledged his role as translator, as he did in the prologue to the *Dictes or Sayengis of the Philosophres* and in the epilogue to the *Morale Prouerbes*. There is no such attribution in this translation.

In the early 1470s, two Middle English translations were also made of Alain Chartier's *Quadrilogue Invectif* (1422). The first translation is extant in one manuscript and will be referred to as the U translation. There is no evidence as to who made this translation. The second translation, which will be referred to as the R translation, presumably circulated more widely as it is extant in four manuscripts. This translator may also have translated Chartier's *Traité de l'Esperance* (1427), which always appears alongside this translation in manuscripts, and one of Chartier's Latin compositions.

---

34 Several of Woodville's translations were printed by Caxton: *Dictes or Sayengis of the Philosophres* (1477, the first dated printed book produced in England), *The Morale Prouerbes of Christyne* (1478) and the *Corbyale* (1479).
35 Bornstein (ed.), *Middle English Translation of Livre du corps*, pp. 31-36.
37 These have been edited by Margaret Blayney; M. Blayney (ed.), *Fifteenth-Century English Translations of Alain Chartier's Le Traité de l'Esperance and Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, 2 vols, EETS, original series 270, 281 (1974, 1980).
38 OUC, MS 85.
39 LPL, MS Arc.L.40.2/E.42; Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338; CSJC, MS 76 D.I.; NL, MS f.36, Ry 20. It is impossible to tell which is the earliest manuscript. NL, MS f.36, Ry 20 is clearly the latest manuscript, but the hands of the other three suggest a date in the early 1470s.
Dialogus familiaris amici et sodalis (1425/6). Blayney suggests that Sir John Fortescue was the translator of these three texts. The evidence she cites for her identification is that Thomas Smith attributed the translation of the Traité de l'Esperance contained in BL, MS Cotton Vitellius E.X to Fortescue in his catalogue of the Cotton Library made before the fire which damaged the collection. Blayney draws attention to the fact that the manuscript came into the possession of Robert Cotton, a good friend of the famous sixteenth-century Sir John Fortescue and a direct descendant of the fifteenth-century Fortescue. It is known that the former Fortescue gave Cotton at least another manuscript, so it is possible, she argues, that Cotton obtained BL, MS Cotton Vitellius E.X from him. She then argues that the fifteenth-century Fortescue would have had the opportunity to study Chartier's works on his various journeys to France. But she herself suggests that the actual style of the translation makes it unlikely that Fortescue was the translator.

Of the two translations of the Quadrilogue Invectif, the U translation appears to be the most decontextualised. The U translator omitted all reference to France, thus removing the text from the context of its original composition. For example, France became 'the Land', Chartier's 'Qu'est devenue la constance et loyauti du peuple françois' became 'where is bycome the constaunt trouth of the peele'. Yet the translator did not replace references to France with England (unlike the translator of the

---

40 The English translation of Chartier's Dialogus familiaris amici et sodalis has been edited by Blayney; M. Blayney (ed.), A Familiar Dialogue Between the Friend and the Fellow: A Translation of Alain Chartier's Dialogus familiaris amici et sodalis, EETS, original series 295 (1989).


43 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilque Invectif, 2: 29-30. Although some of the changes made by the R translator to his source text reflect some of the arguments employed by Fortescue; see, for example, below pp. 51-3 and chapter four, p. 174.

Livre du corps de police, for example) as might be expected, but left the referent ambiguous. For example, Chartier’s ‘Haa, hommes françois’ was translated as ‘Ellas men out of regle’: rather than specify a particular race of men, the translator felt free to embellish and recreate Chartier’s expression – what Chartier meant, to the U translator, was ‘rebellious men’ not specifically French or English men. Yet the U translator produced a much more literal translation than the R translator in terms of both language and construction: he followed the French word order and also used French words which he then explained by the addition of a synonym.

The R translator, on the other hand, chose vocabulary more familiar to an English audience, as is illustrated by a comparison of the two translations. For example, the R translator used ‘willis’ for the U translator’s ‘voluntes’; ‘hope’, for U’s ‘esperaunce’; ‘thraldom’, for U’s ‘seruitute’; ‘rule’, for U’s ‘regle’; ‘frendom’, for U’s ‘fraunchise’; ‘power’, for U’s ‘puissance’ and ‘cowardnes’, for U’s ‘lachenesse’. The R translator also exercised considerable independence from the French source text and added freely for explanation or emphasis. For example, the French ‘Et qu’est discipline de chevalerie si non’ became in the R translation ‘Now I aske a question: what is knightly discipline? Nothing ellis but.’

The R translator also addressed the reader directly through the use of the first person singular and plural: ‘I wote wele’, ‘me thinkith’, ‘I counsell the’, ‘I cannat see but we must’. The use of ‘we’ can perhaps be seen as the translator’s attempt to engage the

---

45 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 171; Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invectif, p. 23.
46 For example, the French ‘desertion’ became ‘desercion and destruccion’; ‘deprime’ became ‘deprimed and vnderlaied’ and ‘souldees’ became ‘saude and wages”; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 149, 165, 201.
47 See, for example, Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 166/7, 182/3.
reader through verbal association. Berkhofer has argued that the use of the first person plural is 'an attempt at author-reader complicity, through the linguistic construction of a text, an acknowledgement of the social contract underlying the genre'. Moreover, and most appropriately, the use of 'we' implies 'some link between the implied historian or narrator and the historical actors in the discourse in order to establish the author's right to narrate their history'.

In the absence of direct statements from the translators, it is difficult to know what they were hoping to achieve by translating these texts. This problem is compounded by the lack of firm evidence concerning their identities. The translators did not discuss their role as translators or even refer to their texts as translations. Thus they retained Chartier and Pizan's prologue to their respective texts, albeit translated, to create the impression of an unmediated text. For example, the rubric for OUC, MS 85 reads: 'The prologue of the tretye folowing entitled and called the quadrilogue of Aleyn Charietere secretarie somtyme to the kynge of Fraunce'. Presumably, the translators retained Chartier's name because they wanted to utilise his authority. In this way also, the texts received by readers appeared to be direct, unmediated representations of Chartier and Pizan's works, which seemed to erase the role of the translator as custodian over the 'meaning' of the text.

Moreover, the extant manuscripts contain no mention of a patron. As Carol Meale has argued in relation to Malory's Morte Darthur, it seems strange that if there was a patron, he or she was not identified. She argues that 'information about a patron, who

---

50 The opening paragraph of Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338 reads: 'To the ryght high and excellent mageste of princes, to the full honorable magnificence of nobles [...] Aleyn Chartir, humble secretorye to oure Soueragne Lorde'; Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338, fol. 1r.
51 OUC, MS 85, fol. 1r.
by definition, has to be in a position of some superiority to the author' would have provided the work with 'a pedigree guaranteeing respectability and, perhaps, even fashionableness'. 52 However, Meale also suggests that we should not always think in terms of patronage, as a writer did not have to have a patron in order to write. 53 The fact that no patron was mentioned by these translators might indeed suggest that they themselves instigated the translations, although presumably even if the translations were not commissioned as such, the translators felt that there would be a market for their works: a potential, if not actual, patron.

Table 2 - Extant manuscripts of the translations of Pizan and Chartier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>The translation of Pizan's Livre du corps</th>
<th>The U translation of Chartier's Quadrilogue Invectif</th>
<th>The R translation of Chartier's Quadrilogue Invectif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUL, MS Kk. 1.5</td>
<td>c. 1470</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUC, MS 85</td>
<td>c. 1470</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPL, MS Arc.L.40.2/E.42</td>
<td>c. 1470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338</td>
<td>c. 1470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJSC, MS 76 D.I.</td>
<td>c. 1470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL, MS f.36, Ry 20</td>
<td>c. 1480-1490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 Indeed, Meale sees the retention of the colophon in the copy of the prose translation of *De re militari* contained in BL, MS Lansdowne 285 as symptomatic of this trend; C. Meale, 'Manuscripts, Readers and Patrons in Fifteenth-century England: Sir Thomas Malory and Arthurian Romance', in R. Barber (ed.), *Arthurian Literature IV* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 110.

53 Meale, 'Manuscripts, Readers and Patrons', p. 112.
These translators altered their texts so that they could be read, not only as military texts or as texts rooted in a French context, but also as texts which addressed a broader set of English issues. As previously mentioned, the U translator of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* omitted all reference to France, thus removing the text from the context of its original composition. The translator of the *Livre du corps de police* also replaced some references to France with England, which would have enabled the audience to relate the text more easily to contemporary English events. The R translator of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* retained references to France but frequently used phrases such as 'at this howr' and 'now at this tyme', which would have achieved a similar effect. In other cases, translators changed parts of their source texts so that they referred to a wider context. The prose translator of *De re militari*, for example, altered Vegetius's discussion of rebellion in the context of the military host so that it applied to the realm as a whole. Vegetius had argued that 'Numquam enim ad contumaciam pari consensu multitudo prorumpit sed incitatur a paucis, qui vitionum scelerumque impunitatem sperant peccare cum plurimis'. The prose translator of *De re militari* argued, however, that 'it is no3t comynliche yseie that a comynalte reyseth eny grucchinge or eny greet wordes maken ayenst hir souerayne bot by steringe of a fewe proude men' (my italics). He applied the advice to the realm as a whole – in his model it was a 'comynalte' rising against its sovereign. Moreover, a leader must administer justice to anyone who causes dissension in the host for 'bette it is that they be punisshed and chastised as the law asks than all the host is contrarious and rebel to here souverains'
(my italics). These alterations allowed the advice contained in *De re militari* to be applied to a wider context and encouraged its readers to relate its arguments to their own times.

**William Worcester's Boke of Noblesse**

The final text in the corpus I have surveyed is William Worcester's *Boke of Noblesse*. Although the treatise was dedicated to Edward IV and dated to 1475, Worcester was working from an earlier draft, composed in the early 1450s, in the period immediately following the expulsion of the English from France. Unfortunately, the presentation copy of this text is no longer extant. There is only one surviving copy, which might be termed Worcester's 'working' copy. It contains extensive annotations and corrections in Worcester's hand. This manuscript was written at some point after 1461, revised during Henry VI's second reign, and then revised again before its presentation to Edward IV.

Worcester was both a collector and a compiler of books and he had a wide range of interests. He was particularly interested in the writings of Cicero. Worcester owned seven notebooks into which he copied extracts from works which interested

---

59 'Here endyth thys epistle unde correccion the xv day of june the yeere of crist miiiiixxv and of the noble regne of kyng Edward the iii the xv'; [William Worcester], *The Boke of Noblesse*, ed. J.G. Nichols (London, 1860), p. 85.
61 This is suggested by the corrections to the title of the treatise in the manuscript. It originally referred to Edward IV, this reference was then crossed out and 'Henry VI' was written over it. Then 'Henry VI' was crossed out and replaced with 'Edward IV'.
him. His annotations or ownership notes have also been identified in a further thirteen manuscripts. He owned CUL, MS Add. 7870 which contains an anonymous French translation of John of Wales' *Brevioguim de virtutibus antiquorum principum et philosophorum* (fols. 5r-30v); Jean Courtetcuisse's French translation with commentary of *Des quatre vertus cardinaux* ascribed to Seneca (fols. 32r-71v) and an unidentified French text (fols. 72r-75r). Worcester dated the first section of this manuscript to 1450. His marginalia has also recently been identified in a copy of Chaucer's *Boece*. Worcester made a compilation called the *Acta domini Johannis Fastolf* now lost. He also annotated London, College of Arms, MS 9, an unpublished chronicle in French covering the period from the capture of Harfleur in 1415 to the raising of the siege of Orléans in May 1429, which had been written for Fastolf in 1459. It was composed by Peter Basset, an Englishman who had served in France, Christopher Hanson, a German who had served Thomas Beaufort, duke of Exeter, and Luke Nantron, a native of Picardy and one of Fastolf's clerks. The chronicle was produced at Worcester's instigation and he clearly influenced its content. Worcester also collected documents concerning estimated revenues from the English possessions in France, various wages, receipts and expenses, ordinances, inventories, and several reports by Fastolf into a notebook. This notebook, LPL, MS 506, was probably intended to accompany the *Boke of Noblesse*.

---

63 A full list of manuscripts is given in D. Wakelin, 'William Worcester Writes a History of his Reading', forthcoming in *New Medieval Literatures* (2004). I am grateful to Dr Wakelin for providing me with a copy of this prior to publication.

64 Wakelin, 'William Worcester'.

65 It ends with the note: 'cest trevis est corrigre par moy Guillem Worcestre dit Botener le moys de jullle lan grace 1450' on fol. 30v. This translation has never been edited.


Worcester was clearly familiar with both Christine de Pizan’s *Faits d’armes et de chevalerie* and Chartier’s *Quadrilogue Invectif* as he used these texts for sections of the *Boke of Noblesse*. He had extracts from the *Quadrilogue Invectif* copied into one of his notebooks, BL, MS Royal 13 C.I. Worcester also referred to the works of Vegetius, Livy, Josephus and Bartolomaeus Anglicus in the *Boke of Noblesse*. Fastolf owned French translations of all of these works.

The purpose of the *Boke of Noblesse* was to encourage and promote a new campaign in France, but Worcester also sought to explain and assess the English defeat and to offer models of reform for the future conduct of the war. He attributed defeat to England’s ‘synne and wrecchidnes’ and within this broad framework he identified the particular faults of the country which had caused divine disapproval. These faults were lack of prudence and governance ‘and havyng no consideracion to the comon wele, but rathir to magnifie and enriche oure silfe by singuler covetise’. Worcester’s understanding of the problems the English had faced in France was influenced by the experience of his employer, Sir John Fastolf, famous veteran of the French wars, and by his own experience of living in France. Worcester therefore offered his advice as an author whose authority rested both in his personal experience and relationship with the

---

68 It has the title on fol. 143r: ‘Incipit compilatio et extractus actuum armorum gentis Romanorum inter Iulium Cesarem et Pompeium et alorem, secundum Lucanum et Suetonium historiographos, scriptus per W. Wyrcestre mensibus Novembris et Decembris anno Christi 1453, extractus libri Iohannis Fastolf militis habitantis Parisius’ and on fol. 136r: ‘Extrait du quadrilogue maistre alan Charetier secretaire du Roy Charles le vj roy de ffraunce’ written in Worcester’s hand.

69 These are listed in OMC Archives, MS Fastolf Papers 43, fol. 10r. These authors appear in [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, pp. 2, 21, 26, 29, 51, 53, 55, 83; Wakelin, ‘Vernacular Humanism’, p. 168.

70 [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 51.

men involved in the war as well as in his extensive knowledge and use of Roman, military examples. This meant that his advice transcended that of the self-interested petition on behalf of soldiers and that of the learned clerk who had no first-hand experience of the situation and practices he was advocating.

Why was Worcester the only writer to directly address the reasons behind England's defeat? Why were people translating military texts rather than offering their own compositions? The conditions which, it has been argued, promoted the creation of such texts in France, 'the misfortune of the country, menaces from abroad, pressing dangers', were certainly in existence in England in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. Yet, as Taylor remarks, England simply did not produce polemical texts in the way that France did.

One reason why people preferred to translate the works of Latin and French authors, rather than to write their own treatises, might lie in the political context itself. The 1450s and 1460s witnessed increasing government anxiety about seditious language and rebellion. For example, in his newsletter of January 1454, John Stodeley remarked that 'The Duke of Somerset hath espies goyng in every Lordes hous of this land; whiche reporte unto hym all that their kun see or here touchyng the seid Duke. And therfore make gode wacche and beware of suche espies'. Both the authors of the Chronicle of Rebellion in Lincolnshire and the Arrival of Edward IV discussed the imposition

73 As Taylor argues, 'royal clerks like Adam Murimuth, John le Palmer and Thomas Hoccleve were clearly interested in writing and book collecting, but such men apparently did not see the need to develop defences of the rights of the English crown'; C.D. Taylor, War, Propaganda and Diplomacy in Fifteenth-Century France and England', in C.T. Allmand (ed.), War, Government and Power in Late Medieval France (Liverpool, 2000), p. 86.
of measures to control seditious language.\textsuperscript{75} Gross has suggested that the government became increasingly worried about the circulation of Lancastrian texts, such as Fortescue's pamphlets, and that this anxiety was responsible for the arrests and executions which took place in the mid-1460s.\textsuperscript{76} Moreover, he suggests that the problems faced by writers such as Fortescue, George Ashby and John Morton may have deterred other political commentators from composing their own works.\textsuperscript{77}

Perhaps in this environment, translation was seen as a means of commenting upon the political context and of criticizing the government without being held directly accountable. Potter suggests that translation may have been the preferred literary medium for Royalist writers during the English Civil War of the seventeenth century because it was relatively 'safe'.\textsuperscript{78} Patterson has also argued that censorship encouraged the production of translations of classical texts in early modern England. According to Patterson, texts drawn from history functioned as analogies to the English situation and did not always attract censorship and punishment.\textsuperscript{79} Might, then, the prolific production of translations, which takes place in the third quarter of the fifteenth century, also be explained in this way? This suggestion is indirectly supported by the fact that the later translators did not acknowledge their role as translators or even refer to their texts as translations. Thus they retained Chartier and Pizan's prologues, albeit translated, to create the impression of unmediated texts. As I have already argued, in this way, the texts received by readers appeared to be direct representations of Chartier and Pizan's

\textsuperscript{77} Gross, \textit{The Dissolution of Lancastrian Kingship}, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{79} A. Patterson, \textit{Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England} (Madison, 1984), pp. 46, 57.
works, which seemed to erase the role of the translator as custodian over the 'meaning' of the text and, one assumes, their responsibility over its contents.

However, these texts were so appropriate to the English situation, even without the recontextualisation which will be discussed below, that writers may have felt it was more valuable to make them available in English than to compose their own texts. The French and Latin texts were addressing very similar problems to those faced by England in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. Milner, for example, regards the production of *De re militari* as a response to experiences such as the battle of Adrianople. He argues that *De re militari* was designed to revive low morale, to correct the abuses Vegetius saw in the Roman army and was 'informed by the need to carry on the fight with the barbarians, both within and without the system, by land and by sea'.

Central themes of Vegetius's work were also particularly appropriate to the fifteenth century. For example, Vegetius emphasised the importance of military discipline and warned against the problems created by soldiers who were undisciplined and motivated by the prospect of pillage. This aspect of Vegetius's treatise was commented on throughout the Middle Ages by authors as diverse as John of Salisbury, Pizan and Chartier, but in England it seems to become more pronounced in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. This issue of military discipline was particularly pertinent in the context of the loss of the Anglo-French lands, but also had a closer and more immediate relevance due to the presence of undisciplined soldiers during the Wars of the Roses. The continuing or, indeed, renewed, relevance of this issue is suggested in several ways: in c. 1450 Worcester glossed the passage in his copy of a French

---

82 See, for example, Reeve (ed.), *Vegetius: Epitoma rei militarii*, book I, chapter 1.
83 See my discussion of this issue in chapter four, pp. 163-176.
translation of John of Wales’s *Breuiquium* which argued that the Romans conquered the world through their military discipline and he also bracketed the section of text to which he was referring and wrote in the margin ‘Vegetius de disciplinam Romanorum’. The chronicler, John Whethamstede, explicitly linked the importance of Vegetian discipline to his account of the Wars of the Roses composed at some point before 1465. He cited Vegetius and argued that: ‘docta exercitateque paucitas solet plerumque de inerti inermique multitudine vincere’.

Likewise, French authors of the first quarter of the fifteenth century were dealing with similar problems to those faced by Englishmen half a century later: military reversal, civil unrest and popular rebellion. From 1405 France was on the verge of civil war, which eventually broke out after the murder of the Duke of Orléans by followers of the Duke of Burgundy on 23 November 1407. In Pizan’s letter to the duke of Berry, *La lamentacion sur les maux de la France*, dated 25 August 1410, she argued that civil war would result in famine, pillage, popular unrest and English intervention. Chartier’s *Quadrilogue Invectif*, composed in 1422, was also responding to a series of French reversals: the catastrophic defeat of the French at Agincourt in 1415, the rapid conquest of Normandy by the English, and the Treaty of Troyes of 1420 which saw the heir to the French throne dispossessed in favour of an Englishman. The *Quadrilogue Invectif* offered a diagnosis of the country’s problems and attempted to unite France against the English. Clearly writers ‘felt a need to rally the morale of the French armies, then in a

84 CUL, MS Add. 7870, fol. 12v.
regrettable state of stagnation'. Both Pizan and Chartier were also concerned by popular rebellion. Pizan stressed the importance of loyalty in the third book of the *Livre du corps de police* and emphasised the effects that popular rebellion could have upon the realm.

Moreover, France not only had endured civil war, military reversal and external manipulation, but had also come through those experiences victorious. The English translators of these military texts were seeking to explain how a nation could be defeated and then rise again, as France had done, and these texts were part of that experience, perhaps even part of how Englishmen explained the recovery of France. These texts and translations legitimised the argument that it was possible, indeed desirable, to learn from those who had conquered you. The prose translation of *De re militari*, for example, argued that: ‘Metellius under the emperoyr Albyn, kawght and vndiryoked the grete oost of Affryk the whiche he taughte and lerned so wel the olde ordenaunces of werres that they were bolde to take hem prisoners of the whiche they had takyn before’. The scribe of OUC, MS 85, the only extant copy of the U translation of the *Quadrilogue Invecfý*, may have been engaging with this discourse when he wrote in red in the middle of a sentence ‘Nota bene processum’ before the instruction ‘lerne to knowe your infelicite by the happy fortunes of your enmyes’. In effect, it was an injunction to learn from the success of your enemies.

The growing fashion for French culture in England during this period might also explain why English translations were made of French texts. A range of manuscripts produced in the third quarter of the fifteenth century, such as OUC, MS 85, fol. 8v.

---

90 OUC, MS 85, fol. 8v.
85, was made in England and contains Middle English translations of French texts, but the hand and the decoration give the impression of a French book. CSJC, MS H.5, a copy of Stephen Scrope’s translation of Pizan’s Épître d’Othéa la déesse à Hector, was written by the French-trained scribe, Ricardus Franciscus, and was probably illuminated by William Abell.\textsuperscript{91} It has pink ruling and illuminated border decoration in a French style though it was produced in an English workshop as is clear from the note on the flyleaf: ‘vi payentis ii. c. champis vi. iii. c. paragraffis. v’. Indeed, the prolific output of Ricardus Franciscus, whose hand has so far been identified in thirteen manuscripts dating from the third quarter of the fifteenth century, suggests that the ability to imitate French batarde was a desirable quality in a scribe, alongside the vogue for Flemish and French styles of illumination.\textsuperscript{92} The number of manuscripts which were brought back from France by men involved in the English occupation of France is also indicative of this trend.\textsuperscript{93} Soldiers such as Sir William Porter and Sir Thomas Hoo brought back Books of Hours from France and Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, owned a copy of l’enseignement de vraie noblesse, illuminated in Bruges by the artist Guillaume Vrelant and finished, according to its explicit, on 4 September 1464.\textsuperscript{94}

Although this fashion was presumably an aspect of why French texts were translated, translation should be seen not only as an expression of value for another culture’s texts but also as an act of cultural appropriation.\textsuperscript{95} These translators utilised the

\textsuperscript{92} For more on this scribe, see chapter 3, p. 138.
\textsuperscript{93} For copies of Giles of Rome’s De regimine principum which were brought back from France see C.F. Briggs, Giles of Rome’s De regimine principum: Reading and Writing Politics at Court and University, c. 1275-1525 (Cambridge, 1999), p. 66.
authority of the French experience, but they also modified it and took their own control of it. As I have already emphasised, translators rewrote and recontextualised their source texts: as Jones has suggested 'Translation might involve much more than simply transferring one textual unit from learned language to vernacular'. In this sense, those who translated French or Latin texts were, in effect, creating new texts. It is to this aspect I shall now turn.

2.2 The translator as reader

The translations under consideration here can be divided into those which have been recognised as rewritings (the verse translation of *De re militari* and the *Boke of Noblesse*) and those which have been treated as literal and, as a result, flawed translations (the translations of Pizan and Chartier). This section will break down these notions by demonstrating that all translation was a form of rewriting and that all writing involved acts of translation.

Take, for example, William Worcester's *Boke of Noblesse*. He used Chartier's *Quadrilogue Inventif* and Christine de Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes et de chevalerie*, alongside a range of other materials, to develop his treatise which argued in favour of a renewed campaign in France, yet the text is generally treated as an original composition. This is in spite of the fact that Worcester himself acknowledged his sources and often borrowed the rhetorical strategies of his French authors. One of his notebooks contains excerpts from Chartier's work which reappear, in various guises, throughout his treatise. Worcester selected and altered the material from his French sources (his reading of which can be traced as a result of the extensive marginal notes he made in his books) and as such he 'translated', both literally and conceptually, his material into a new form. The verse translation of *De re militari* has also been referred to as a paraphrase, as opposed to a literal translation, of *De re militari*. This was, in effect, a 'new' text and is a

---

97 See, for example, Wakelin, 'The Occasion, Author and Readers of *Knyghbode and Bataile* and Allmand and Keen, 'History and the Literature of War'. Both articles recognise that these texts were rewritings rather than flawed misrepresentations. The translations of Pizan and Chartier have received very little scholarly attention, but both editors of the translations interpret translational changes as 'mistranslations' rather than as potentially creative acts.

98 The title is written in Worcester's hand on fol. 136r: 'Extrait du quadrilogue maistre alan Charetier secretaire du Roy Charles le vj roy de fraunce'. References are given in the margins to the pages of the book from which the extracts are taken. Unfortunately, this book has never been identified.

99 Examples of this process can be seen in chapter four, for example, p. 219.
A good example of the grey area that exists between translations and substantial rewritings. The translator referred to his poem as a translation, but adapted and expanded his Latin material in order to promote the Lancastrian cause.

Conversely, the translations of the Quadrilogue Invectif and the Livre du corps de police appear to be literal translations. These translators did not discuss their role as translators or even refer to their texts as translations. They also retained Chartier and Pizan’s prologue to their respective texts, albeit translated, to create the impression of an unmediated text. Yet these translators rewrote and altered their source texts and, as a result, the differences between the French and English versions provide us with evidence of how one piece of work could be re-inscribed by its reader/translator in the 1470s. Although the immediate appeal of these works for the translators (and possibly for their market) may have lain in the similarities between the French and English situations, these translators did recontextualise their texts so that they were more appropriate for an English audience and to the English situation. Although this was not achieved with the radicalism or thoroughness of other translations of the period, such as the verse translation of De re militari, it is nonetheless important not to dismiss outright these works as ‘literal’ and therefore unproblematic renditions of the Quadrilogue Invectif and the Livre du corps de police.

Although there have been some recent developments, medievalists still tend to treat translations such as these as essentially non-creative practices. They conventionally analyse translations using a model of degeneration which regards the translation as a corruption or debasement of the original work, which is to be preferred at all times.

---

100 Jasin, in her study of Wellcome MS 225, has demonstrated that the manuscript’s compiler adapted the Latin text so that it was more appropriate for an English audience; J.M. Jasin, ‘The Compiler’s Awareness of the Audience in Medieval Medical Prose: The Example of Wellcome MS 225’, The Journal of English and Germanic Philology 92 (1993): 509-22.
This model of translation is informed by the premise that translations should be reproductions of their source texts; equivalent in terms of style, form, language and 'meaning'. Previous research on the translations of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* and the *Livre du corps de police* has, therefore, been dominated by how 'good' or 'bad' the translations were from the perspective of correspondence to the source-text. As a result, variations in the translations have generally been ascribed to 'mistranslation' or incompetence on the part of the translators. For example, Blayney, the EETS editor of the translations of the *Quadrilogue Invectif*, argued that although the U translator 'frequently mistranslated passages, his command of French on the whole was better than R's [...] R's tendency to substitute his own sense when he did not understand the French might be illustrated from almost every page' of his translation. A little later she argued that the R translation was more successful as a piece of English prose, which was 'straightforward, clear and vivid'. Yet she treated the R's translator's achievement in this respect almost as an accidental by-product of his linguistic ignorance.

Is it not worth considering that the R translator provided different readings of the French, not because of ignorance, but because he was more concerned that it made sense to his audience? The 'mistranslated' passages may differ from those in their source texts, but on the whole they are coherent, and so it seems unlikely that the changes were the product of accident or the result of an insufficient grasp of the language. Moreover,

---

101 This approach to the analysis of translations is, as Kittel has argued, both subjective and ahistorical. It is subjective because 'it reduces the meaning of a literary text to the translation critic's personal conception of it, and ahistorical, because generally the postulate of equivalent (or adequate) translation fails to take into account the cognitive aims and conditions prevailing in different places and cultural epochs'; H. Kittel, 'Inclusions and Exclusions: The "Göttingen Approach" to Translation Studies and Inter-Literary History', in K. Mueller-Vollmer and M. Imricher (eds.), *Translating Literatures, Translating Cultures: New Vistas and Approaches in Literary Studies* (Stanford, 1998), p. 4.


103 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, 2: 46.
even if a change made by a translator was the product of linguistic ignorance, this does not erase the ideological significance of the variant for the reader.

Unfortunately, the exemplars from which the translations were made have not been identified so caution must be exercised. A change made by the translator may actually have been present in the manuscript from which he made his translation. Fortunately, the recent editor of the Livre du corps de policie has thoroughly listed extant variations between manuscripts containing the French text and has therefore made the task of identifying whether a change was already present in the exemplar or made by the translator much easier.\textsuperscript{104} This is far from the case with Droz’s edition of the Quadrilogue Invectif. She used the text extant in Bibliothèque Nationale, MS fr. 126, which she then corrected in fourteen places from Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Fr. 1124. As Blayney notes ‘the text is not a critical one and has serious shortcomings in readings, which are passed off without comment by the editor’.\textsuperscript{105} Blayney, in her edition of the two translations the Quadrilogue Invectif, lists most variations and concludes that she could not find a manuscript that supported all of the variant readings exhibited in the translations, which does suggest that some changes were made independently by the translators.\textsuperscript{106} I have checked the readings in five manuscripts containing the French text, as well as Droz’s edition of Bibliothèque Nationale, MS fr. 126, to be as certain as possible that the changes were made by the translators and not present in the exemplar from which they made their translation.\textsuperscript{107} Of course, there is another possibility: that the changes were made by the scribes of individual manuscripts and as we do not have an ‘authorial’, translator’s copy of any of these translations, this must remain a possibility.

\textsuperscript{105} Blayney (ed.), \textit{English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif}, 2: 72.
\textsuperscript{106} Although of course the exemplars may no longer survive.
\textsuperscript{107} These manuscripts are BL, MSS Harley 4402; Add. 15300; Cotton Julius E.V; Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 421 and Manchester, Chetham’s Library, MS A.6.91.
I shall treat translation changes as creative, potentially meaningful and, in some cases, deliberate acts, rather than as mistakes or oversights. I shall argue that such changes can be profitably explicated without recourse to mistranslation but with reference to the conceptual frameworks of the translators and those of their implied audiences. I shall therefore demonstrate the benefits of an approach which treats translations, not as failed reproductions of texts in other languages, but as ‘readings’ of texts. This approach recognises that translators updated and recontextualised their source texts for their intended audiences. The re-inscription, translation and adaptation of these works reflect the issues and concerns of the intended audience and, perhaps more importantly, their ways of shaping their political, cultural and social experience. The evidence afforded by translation therefore provides a vital insight into the way in which individual readers responded to their texts and as such these translations provide new evidence of how texts were appropriated, re-inscribed and updated to fit the context of the third quarter of the fifteenth century.

In order to demonstrate the benefits of this methodology, I shall look at some of the changes made by translators and offer alternative readings of passages which traditionally might be disregarded as poorly translated or mistranslated. I shall argue that in most cases, the translators of these works were recontextualising and updating their texts so that they were more appropriate for an English audience and to the English situation.

In the late fifteenth century, there were, of course, notions of equivalence: Caxton in his *Epilogue* to Woodville’s translation of the *Dicts or Sayings* (1st edition, 18 November 1477) stated that ‘I have put me in devoir to oversee this hys sayd book and
beholden as nyghe as I coude howe it accordeth wyth th'original, beyng in Frensh' (my italics).\textsuperscript{108} Notions of equivalence are also expressed in Caxton's \textit{Epilogue to Boethius} (c. 1478): according to Caxton, Chaucer had 'translated this sayd werke oute of Latyn as neygh as is possible to be understande' (my italics).\textsuperscript{109} However, to translate 'accurately' might not necessarily mean 'correspondence' to a source text in terms of linguistic accuracy, but might involve acts of rewriting.\textsuperscript{110} So 'word for word' translation is not the only way in which a translation might be deemed accurate by a translator or, more problematically, by its reader.

For example, a comparison of the different ways the U and R translators responded to the same passage from the \textit{Quadrilogue Invectif} demonstrates that literal translations do not always convey the meaning of the source text and that it is inappropriate to judge the success of a translation exclusively in terms of its linguistic accuracy in relation to its source text. In the \textit{Quadrilogue Invectif}, Chartier argued that the nobles had degenerated so that there was no difference between their morals or wills and those of other men: 'les nobles hommes y prennent si peu garde que a peu se laissant ja les plusceurs couller en ordonnance des autres, sans difference de meurs ne de voulentez'.\textsuperscript{111} Whereas the U translator followed the French literally by translating 'les nobles hommes' as the 'noble men', the R translator translated it as the 'nobles and worshipfull men'.\textsuperscript{112} A traditional approach to this addition of the translator's would

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[110] For example, translators who substitute 'England' for 'France' are still in accordance with the original because they want to elicit a particular response (the same as that of the original) from the audience, but also know that they need to alter the referent in order to achieve this.
\item[111] Chartier, \textit{Le Quadrilogue Invectif}, p. 60.
\item[112] The U translator wrote 'And more it greeuith me that the noble men take so litle kepe therto that they suffer thaimself to slide in ordainance of othir men withoute difference of condicions or volunites'. The R translator wrote: 'Yet ther is a thing that gruggeth me more thanne this that I haue rehercid, for I se hough the nobles and worshipfull men take so litill hede to themself that is no difference of rewle and condicion bytwen them and the mysgouerned folkis, nothir in their
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
have explicated it as either a mistranslation or as an example of the preference for doublets among fifteenth-century authors. Yet, by doing this, the translator was actually negotiating a difference in meaning between French and English notions of nobility. For Chartier, writing for a French audience, the term 'nobles' referred to the whole of the second estate. The U translator used the same terminology and so provided a literal translation, but in an English context for an English audience it had a different, narrower connotation, meaning only the higher echelons of the second estate (the lords) and not the knights, esquires, gentlemen and gentry and therefore would have meant something different to Chartier. The R translator negotiated this difficulty by broadening the passage's applicability to include 'wourshipfull men' as well as those who were strictly 'noble'. He may not have provided a literal translation, but it conveyed more accurately Chartier's meaning.

Translators also rewrote their texts so that they communicated more effectively the 'meaning' of the original. This is demonstrated by the way translators rewrote the story of the women of Rome who cut off their hair in order to provide sinews for hand and crossbows and as a result saved their city. This story was used by Vegetius, by the prose and verse translators, by Chartier and the two translators and by Pizan in her Livre willis nor in feere of their soueraines' (my italics); Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inventif*, 1: 236/237. No equivalent to 'wourshipfull' is given in any of the French manuscripts.

113 No judicial status of noblesse developed in England like that in France, which distinguished the petty noble from the commoner; M.H. Keen, *Origins of the English Gentleman: Heraldry, Chivalry and Gentility in Medieval England*, c. 1300-c.1400 (Stroud, 2002), p. 121.

114 The R translator did this on other occasions as well: Chartier said that because the common people dressed like their superiors you could not longer tell between 'ung noble homme' and 'ung ouvrier mecanique', translated by the U translator as 'a noble man' and a 'werkman or iourneyman'. The R translator, however, argued that you could not tell between a 'wourshipfull man' and a 'craftis man'; Chartier, *Le Quadrilogue Inventif*, p 41; Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inventif*, 1: 203/202.
The prose translation followed the ‘meaning’ of the original Latin and so used the example to make the point that: ‘Leuer thei had to lyue with here husbandes yn ffredam wyth her hedes a lytyll whyle defacyd than long tyme vndyr theyre enmyes thraldom and seruyce yn bondage with bryghte bewte and ffeyrnes’.

For the translators of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* this story illustrated that ‘no particuler thinge, were it translators of the Quadrillogue Invectif this story illustrated that ‘no particuler thinge, were it

neuyr so precious, was nat spared nor recelled’ for the common good.

Not surprisingly, authors and translators found this story quite difficult and had to alter it in order to emphasise that the women cutting off their hair was actually a sacrifice. Chartier and the U translator of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* felt that it was necessary to stress just how important the hair was to the women: ‘the whiche heeris fro the day of thaire natuuite they had keped and spared and curiously laboured’. The R translator changed the example: he may have misunderstood the French, but the effect was that he emphasised the extent to which the women were prepared to degrade themselves for the common good of their city: the women

made kytt of the feyr heir of their hedis and toke it vnto the workemen to make newe cordis in sokeryng of the comon wele, and consentid also to yeve away their best kerchevis and their best array and take themself to boistous garmentis and

---


labored with their hondis as thei had be powr people for the comon profyght of their cite. ¹¹⁹

The verse translator of De re militari used the example twice. On the second occasion, he emphasised what the alternative was for the women: 'Theim leuer was to haue her goode husbandis/ With honeste, & with their hedis bare,/ Then dishonest be led to straunge londys,/ Dispareged, her mariage forfare'. He then stated: 'O, mony oon of goode wyvys are,/ That charge more vertue and honestee/ Then worldly good or bodily beautee'. ¹²⁰ By extending the metaphor to include 'worldly good' as well as beauty he emphasised that the model did not only apply to the women's hair but also to their wealth and implied that the sacrifice needed in England was one of wealth. ¹²¹

Some of the changes made by these translators can also be interpreted in terms of audience acceptability. ¹²² For example, whereas the U translator removed references to France in his translation, the R translator not only retained them but also, on some occasions, added them to his text. For example, the French argued that the king of England was the ancient adversary to 'ceste seigneurie': the R translator wrote, however, that he was 'auncient aduersarye to the lordship and houe of Fraunce' (my italics). ¹²³ He therefore negotiated any difficulties an English audience might have had in understanding the passage and thereby showed an awareness that he was writing for an English audience.

¹¹⁹ Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 186.
¹²⁰ It is first mentioned on ll. 2340-42; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, ll. 2959-2965.
¹²¹ I discuss the possible significance of this alteration in more detail in chapter four, p. 185.
¹²² Djordjević has recently stressed that medieval translators were perhaps more concerned with achieving audience acceptability than adequacy to the original; I. Djordjević, 'Mapping Medieval Translation', in J. Weiss, J. Fellows and M. Dickson (eds.), Medieval Insular Romance: Translation and Innovation (Cambridge, 2000), p. 10.
¹²³ Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invectif, p. 4; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 140.
Explicating translation change without recourse to mistranslation also allows us to consider the different conceptual frameworks readers brought to bear upon their texts. For example, the R and U translators of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* responded in different ways to their source texts. The U translator followed Chartier and stated that men gave liberally when Rome was impoverished because ‘nothinge was to theim soo deere as that they dispoosed to prescrue the seigneurie and publique well of thaire citee’. The R translator, on the other hand, stated that:

whanne thei sawe their cite vngamyschid of richesse and the comon tresbour was fallid, every man wold liberally yeue of his own, bothe of iuellis and othir goodis, for the socour of the comon wele and this wold thei bye aye ageyne the tyme of prosperite with propir goodis, for ther was nothing so ioyfull vnto them as the restoryng of their lordeship and the comon wele of their cite’ (my italics). The R translator thus heightened the image by using ‘joyful’ instead of ‘dear’ and ‘restoring’ instead of ‘preserving’. In R's example, the common weal had already been destroyed because of lack of money and thus it could only be restored with the restoration of the ‘comon tresour’.

The R translator also altered another passage so that it made a similar point. The French manuscripts all read: ‘et qui se veult enrichir avecques ung prince necessiteux et accroistre trop grandement sa substance et son estat des biens de cellui qui peu en a pour la sienne sauver monstre par sa privee affection que son couraige est indigne de service publique’.

The U translator translated this as: ‘and whoso will enriche himself with a nedy prince and encreece to gretely his substaunce and estate of his goodes that hath but litle, be shewyth by his prive affection that his corage is indigne of publique servise’ (my

---

126 Chartier, *Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, p. 52.
The R translator, however, argued that: 'whoso wolle entende to enriche himself vndir a prince that stondith in necessite and hath but litill sheweth that his prive affection and his corage endinith nat that the comon wele shuld prosper' (my italics). Blayney explained this change by suggesting that the R translator either used an inferior French manuscript, of which she found no evidence, or badly misunderstood the passage and cited it as an example of the R translator's poor command of French. But in effect the R translator was making a different point to that of Chartier and the U translator. Chartier and the U translator were arguing that a servant who enriched himself under a prince was unworthy ('indigne') of public service, whereas the R translator was arguing instead that it showed that the servant did not want the common weal to prosper. The R translator's argument rests upon the premise that it was only when a sovereign was financially secure that the common weal could be satisfied. In effect, the common weal depended upon a king's wealth and, as a result, anyone who tried to take away that wealth jeopardised the common weal.

These changes seem to have been informed by the contemporary discourse surrounding the importance of a sovereign's financial security and its relationship to the common weal of the realm. For example, Warwick's articles on his way from Calais to Ludlow, 1459, argued that 'no lande cristened may longe endure in prosperite wherof the prince is so robbed of his livelode'. The author of the English Chronicle, writing before 1471, argued that 'the reame of Englonde was out of alle good gouernaunce'

127 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 223.
128 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 222. An early reader of the Rawlinson manuscript, possibly a member of the Heydon family, annotated this passage; Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338, fol. 26r.
because Henry VI 'owed more then he was worthe'.\textsuperscript{131} In his \textit{Governance of England}, probably written at some point between 1471 and 1475, Fortescue consistently made the point that 'no realm may prosper, nor be worshipful, under a poor king'.\textsuperscript{132} The first article of Robin of Redesdale's manifesto of 1469 argued that, by only being interested in their 'singer lucor', the counsellors of Edward II, Richard II and Henry VI 'toke no respecte ne consideracion to the weele of the seid prince, ne to the commone weele of this lande'.\textsuperscript{133} If the R translator's changes are immediately dismissed as mistranslations, the significance of what he is saying, and the perspective from, and context in, which he was writing, is missed altogether.

Studying translations as creative practices not only provides evidence of how 'active readers' engaged with their texts, but also means that the extent to which those who were reading the translations felt that they were reading 'new' texts can be better appreciated. Because many traditional studies are informed by the premise that translations should be equivalent to their source texts in terms of style, form, language and 'meaning', medieval translators are frequently seen as 'failing' to reproduce their source text and as a result 'failing' their audience. This, in part, stems from the flawed assumption that readers actually wanted the texts in French or Latin, but had to 'settle' for English translations, because they were either unable to read the language or did not have access to French or Latin copies.\textsuperscript{134} Recognising that translators deliberately altered their source texts suggests a different model of text production, one that does not figure

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{131} J.S. Davies (ed.), \textit{English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI}, Camden Society, old series 64 (1856), p. 79.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Kekewich et al (eds.), \textit{John Vales Book}, p. 213.
\item \textsuperscript{134} Of course Caxton said on occasion that was why he was translating the text: in the prologue to \textit{Charles the Great} (1 Dec 1485) he stated that his purpose was 'to th'ende that th'ystories, actes and lyves may be had in our maternal tongue lyke as they be in Latyn or in Frensshe, for the moost quantyte of the people understonde not Latyn ne Frensshe here in this noble royame of England'; Blake (ed.), \textit{Caxton's Own Prose}, p. 67.
\end{itemize}
English as a second-rate alternative to French or Latin. Rather, it allows these translations to be seen as performing a hitherto unrecognised function in fifteenth-century England – filling not only a linguistic gap in the market, but also a cultural one. It suggests that readers may have wanted English translations precisely because they were not literal and that they expected the translators to be engaged in a process of adaptation and reinscription which would make the text more culturally relevant and would give them more freedom to construct and analyse their own world with all of its problems. Moreover, if the argument that the act of translation was an act of creativity and of ‘authorship’ is accepted, the fact that writers did not offer their own, ‘original’ compositions is, to some extent, explained.

The observation that vernacular translations were not solely the preserve of those unable to read French and Latin is borne out by work done in other areas of medieval translation. The research undertaken in the field of medical writing, in particular, has drawn similar conclusions. Peter Jones has found that ‘the vernacularisation of medical texts cannot be simply identified with popularisation in the sense of targeting a particular non-Latin reading community’ – in other words, the texts were not translated solely to enable non-Latin literate people to read them.

135 In a sense, we have perhaps taken too literally, or misunderstood, the claims of medieval translators that they were ‘reducing’ their texts from French or Latin into English. In his prologue to Blanchardine and Eglantine (c. 1489), Caxton stated that ‘I have reduced this sayd boke out of Frenshe into our Englyshe’. The verb to ‘reduce’ is particularly prominent in the prologue to Charles the Great (1 December 1485) – it is used three times in the first sixteen lines; Blake (ed.), Caxton’s Own Prose, p. 58. In a recent article Kuskin has argued that Caxton used the term ‘reducyng’ not only to mean conversion or diminishment. In the case of translation in particular, he argues that ‘reduction’ represents ‘less a wholesale change of language than a transformation which returns or draws out some latent quality of the text’; W. Kuskin, ‘Reading Caxton: Transformations in Capital, Authority, Print, and Persona in the Late Fifteenth Century’, New Medieval Literatures 3 (Oxford, 1999), pp. 181-2.

Jones has likewise shown that the production of translations of medical texts was not always a result of the demands of those 'whose literacy was primarily or solely English, but was also instigated by the more highly educated sections of the population, who must have chosen to use English for reasons other than an inability to read Latin'. She goes on to suggest that the survival of translations of medical works which were made for university fellows indicates that translations were not only made for those with a poor command of Latin. For example, Thomas Westhaugh, a doctor of canon law and fellow of Pembroke College, wrote a copy of a translation of Gilbertus Anglicus for John Sperhawke, who was also a Pembroke fellow and a doctor of canon law. Sperhawke's ownership of a medical book in English cannot be seen as a result of his inability to read Latin as in order to understand Latin legal texts he must have had a high level of Latin literacy. Recognising that other motives may have been at work allows the appeal of translations to involve more than the linguistic issue alone and forces a consideration of a range of other factors.

Indeed, readers' interest in the translations of military texts should not be explained solely in terms of physical access and cannot be explained purely in terms of linguistic ignorance. The physical evidence of the manuscripts actually refutes the argument that their owners were unable to read Latin or French. For example, BL, MS Lansdowne 285, presumed to be the 'Grete Boke' of Sir John Paston II, contains a copy of the prose translation of De re militari and items in French and Latin, whilst although BL, MS Add. 14408 owned by Nicholas Seyntlo of Sutton in Somerset, sheriff of Somerset and Devon, contains vernacular translations of texts, he chose to write his ex-

138 This manuscript is Glasgow University Library, MS Hunter 509/V.8.12.
139 Jones, 'Vernacular Literacy', p. 102.
libris in French. BL, MS Add. 4713, another copy of the prose translation, contains excerpts in Latin from Godardus, monk of Malmesbury and Valerius written in an early reader's hand at the end of the prose translation. Richard Whetehill, the probable owner of the U translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif, was so proficient at French that he translated a letter from English into French for Louis XI. Thomas Rotherham, an owner of the prose translation, also owned a range of Latin texts. Moreover, the texts themselves are multilingual: copies of the English translation of Chartier's The Familiar Dialogue, which are found alongside the R translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif, are scribally glossed in Latin whilst all three of the extant manuscripts of the verse translation of De re militari have Latin marginalia.

Much work has stressed that texts written in Latin and French were more prestigious than those written in English. In a recent article, Pearsall argued that 'French remains as a permanent backcloth to English as the language of a superior culture'. He also discussed how the scribe John Shirley, in Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.3.20, which contains his own translations of French works, used French titles and rubrics in order to add 'a sort of cosmopolitan glamour and prestige to the items he was copying'. In another recent collection of essays, Bowers argued that the French aristocrats associated with the English court after the Treaty of Brétigny 'infused the bilingual English court with an even more powerful and deeply pervasive sense of

---

140 It is written in black in a contemporary hand: ‘C'est liure appertient nycolas de saint lo cheualier'; BL, MS Add. 14408, fol. 73r.
141 BL, MS Add. 4713, fol. 93r.
143 A full list of Rotherham's books can be found in J.C.T. Oates, Cambridge University Library: A History: from the Beginnings to the Copyright Act of Queen Anne (Cambridge, 1986), p. 70.
French cultural prestige’. Although Latin and French texts were clearly considered more prestigious in some instances, caution must be exercised: it is too easy to attribute every difference between the circulation of Latin, French and English texts with recourse to this model. For example, a recent article by McCarthy argues that ‘the scarcity of Arthurian romances in English is no doubt due in part to the fact that for many generations the English aristocracy, who were fond of romances, spoke French’ and that this explains ‘why the first romances in English tended to be less aristocratic and sophisticated than their French equivalents and why their authors seem less interested in courtliness than in military success and action’. He goes on to argue that vernacular romance writers were writing for ‘at most the provincial minor nobility who were more for action and adventure than for aristocratic refinements’ (my italics). It is not the place here to attack this specific argument, but it seems dangerous to uncritically map English as low status and to consistently see literary production in the vernacular as only appealing to those who could not read French.

Indeed, the usual assumptions which are made surrounding the relationship between social status and Latin or French literacy are not borne out by the physical evidence of manuscripts containing the prose translation of De re militari. Echard argues that in manuscripts containing Gower’s Confessio Amantis, there is a tendency for ‘the more modest manuscripts to curtail, omit or translate the Latin programme’. She concludes that this suggests that the readers of these less expensive manuscripts did not need or desire the Latin. In the less expensive volumes containing the prose translation, the contrary is the case: BL, MS Sloane 2027 and Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc.

416 consistently omit the English translation of the Latin heading with which each chapter begins.

Perhaps what we are witnessing is the development of an English discourse about war: audiences wanted to read about these things in English and develop their own vernacular idiom in order to do so. Morgan has argued that 'the English-language proclamations, and letters missive under the king's signet announcing the progress of his [Henry V's] enterprise in France, are among the most formative exercises which over the following generation brought into being an English idiom of public life'.

Moreover, English became the official language of central administration between 1420 and 1460. Fisher, looking at petitions, showed that whereas before 1400 only two petitions were written in English, between 1431-40, 132 were in English; between 1441-1450 there were 135, and the period 1451-1455 produced 126 petitions in English.

Pearsall has also argued that in terms of the status of vernacular literary production:

> great advances were made in the first forty years of the fifteenth century in the systematic production of authoritative looking manuscripts of the major English poets that match those in Latin and French in handsomeness and regularity and were dignified with the kind of apparatus of presentation that had hitherto been reserved for Latin and French texts.

Possibly, the commissioner or producer of OUC, MS 85 was attempting to achieve a similar effect: the manuscript was written by a French trained scribe and the hand,

---


well as the decoration, give the impression, as Kathleen Scott has argued, of a Continental book. 152

The deliberate 'Englishness' of mid-fifteenth century literary production has been commented on in relation to genealogical rolls produced in Yorkist England. Hughes has recently suggested that the reign of Edward IV encouraged 'a new type of genealogy distanced from the French antecedents by being written in Latin and English'. 153 The most stimulating work in this respect has been done on Malory's *Morte Darthur*. For example, Vinaver has demonstrated that Malory reworked the syntax of his French sources and has argued that this must have been a conscious decision by Malory. 154 Smith has likewise found that Malory's style 'owes much more to the native than to the French fashion of prose' and he urges us to recognise that Malory made a choice between available styles. 155 He argues that 'as a translator and adaptor, Malory chose comparatively few features of style from his largely French sources' and did not, unlike other contemporary translators, retain the word order of the original at all costs, and thereby avoided 'stencil-copying'. According to Smith, 'Even a usage which may be derived from the French, the progressive lengthening of verbal units characteristic of French oratorical style, has been naturalized'. 156 Basically, Smith demonstrates that Malory replaced the French syntax of his sources with structures characteristic of the English tradition. 157 He concludes that Malory's 'choice of the English prose tradition is an assertion of Englishness which should be recognized as something positive rather than negative.

156 Smith, 'Language and Style in Malory', p. 101.
157 Smith, 'Language and Style in Malory', p. 103.
than as an absence of conscious decision'. Moreover, Smith argues that, 'in his choice of a native form of expression, Malory was asserting in a deeply conservative fashion the value of these ideological concerns at a time of social ferment, worrying both to himself and to his class'.

Perhaps this increasing preference for English models explains the lack of popularity of the two translations in my corpus that were closer to the French originals in terms of style: the U translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif and the translation of the Livre du corps de policie. These two translations did not proliferate, although we cannot, of course, be sure that there were not other copies now missing. There is indirect evidence for the suggestion that these two texts were too 'French' to appeal to the literary market: the other text with which the U translation was paired, 'These iij consideracions beth right necesarye to the good gouernaunce of a prince', appears in two later manuscripts, but in these copies the scribes altered or omitted words and forms which had 'a too distinctly French flavour'. In one of the manuscripts, Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS English 530, the scribe's emendations resulted in text which was significantly different from that contained in OUC, MS 85. So here we have evidence of a shift away from English prose which owed a lot to French syntax, language and style and this shift may explain the unpopularity of the U translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif and the translation of the Livre du corps de policie. The corollary is, of course, that the R translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif, which, as we have seen, utilised more familiar vocabulary and was a 'free' translation, seems to have secured a market very quickly.

158 Smith, 'Language and Style in Malory', p. 105.
159 Smith, 'Language and Style in Malory', p. 113.
160 J.P. Genet, Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages, Camden Society, 4th series 18 (London, 1977), p. 179. These manuscripts are Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.5.6 and Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS English 530.
161 Genet, Four English Political Tracts, p. 179.
Copies of these texts in French and Latin were, of course, still being produced in England in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. It is difficult to assign provenance to manuscripts containing Latin and French texts, particularly in a period in which it became fashionable for scribes to emulate French script. Decoration is one way in which a manuscript's provenance can be ascertained, but this is still problematic as it is not unknown for a manuscript to have been written in England and then illuminated on the Continent. Moreover, there was a constant flow of manuscripts from the Continent to England. However, I have not identified one English-produced manuscript of *De re militari* in either French or Latin which dates from after the middle of the fifteenth century. Thomas Thwaytes, a Calais official, owned a Flemish-produced copy of Jean de Vignay's French translation of *De re militari* produced between 1470 and 1480. Several earlier copies were in circulation: Oxford, Balliol College, MS 146 A was owned and annotated by Thomas Gascoigne, chancellor of Oxford.

162 For example Ricardus Franciscus discussed in the following chapter, p. 138 or the 'Hooked g' scribe.
163 One of the workshops which worked on Margaret of Anjou's anthology, BL, MS Royal 15 E.VI, was located in Canterbury, the other was in Rouen. The one in Canterbury apparently provided drafts and the one in Rouen copied and illustrated the texts assembled by Talbot; A. de Mandach, *L'Anthologie chevaleresque de Marguerite d'Anjou (Royal E VI) et les officines Saint-Augustin de Canterbury, Jean Wauguelin de Mons, et David Aubert de Hesdin*, in J. Subrenat (ed.), *Vie Congrès International de la Société Renouve', Actes (Aix-en-Provence, 1974)*, pp. 318-22, 331-35.
164 We should not only think in terms of transmission from France to England. BL, MS Harley 4431, an anthology of Christine de Pizan's works, was produced in France, owned in England, and then owned by Louis de Bruges. This manuscript was made for Isabella of Bavaria, the queen of Charles VI. John, duke of Bedford acquired the manuscript through his purchase of the French royal library when he became regent of France in 1425. It was then owned by his second wife, Jacquetta of Luxembourg. After Bedford's death in 1435, Jacquetta married Sir Richard Woodville. Her signature, alongside that of her son, Anthony Rivers, appears on the cover of the manuscript. Anthony used this manuscript to translate the *Morale Proverbes*. He later gave it to Louis de Bruges, who also signed the manuscript; Bornstein (ed.), *Middle English Translation of Livre du corps*, p. 32.
165 I have consulted all the fifteenth-century copies of Vegetius now located in England with the exceptions of Blickling Hall (Co. Norfolk), Library of the Marquess of Lothian, MS 6849 (excerpts of Vegetius in Latin) and Eton College Library, MS 131.
166 This is now BL, MS Royal 17 E.V. Thwaytes was an official in Calais from 1468. His will refers to his books, but does not list them individually; A.F. Sutton and L. Visser-Fuchs, 'Choosing a Book in Late Fifteenth-century England and Burgundy', in C. Barron and N. Saul (eds.), *England and the Low Countries in the Late Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1995), p. 82.
As well as these copies, several fourteenth-century manuscripts were being 'actively' read in the fifteenth century. By this I mean that either the annotations date from the fifteenth century or that a fifteenth-century owner can be identified because he or she signed the book. It is essential that the availability of earlier copies of these texts is considered if the audience and demand for these texts in the fifteenth century is to be fully appreciated. Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 149 was owned by one 'William Bryde' in the fifteenth century; Thomas Abendon owned Bodl. Lib, MS Auct f.3.2; Bodl. Lib, MS Auct. f. infra 1.2 was owned by Thomas Erle, abbot of Reading Abbey between 1409-1430, whilst BL, MS Royal 20 B.I was annotated by an anonymous reader in the mid to late fifteenth century. Significantly, this annotating reader wrote an abstract of the text in English at the end of the manuscript. A second shorter summary at the front of the

167 This contains a Latin copy of Vegetius' De re military; Secreta secretorum; extracts from Pliny's Historia naturalis; John of Paris' De potestate regia et papalis; Giles of Rome's De regimine principum; and extracts from Aristotle's Politics. The manuscript contains a copy of a letter, dated 1446 from Wolfard Koer, physician to Thomas Gascoigne; Briggs, Giles of Rome, p. 165.

168 Shirley's monogram with a crown beneath his motto and name 'ma ioyc Shirley' appear on the flyleaf. Fol. iv has the note 'Mercy Jhesu Caudray. This boke calde Viegece made of knithode translated out of latin in to frenshe by bat excellent Poete maister iohan de Meuene at binstance of bat noble prince be Eorhe of Eve'. For Shirley's books see M. Connolley, John Shirley: Book Production and The Noble Household in Fifteenth-Century England (Aldershot, 1998).

169 It has the endnote: 'cest liure est a moy Homfrey duc de Gloucestre du don Moss. Robert Roos cheualier mon cousin'. It also contains the note 'Strangways. J.' written in textura on fol. 36v.

170 This is listed in an inventory of goods at Caister Castle; OMC Archives, MS Fastolf Papers 43, fol. 10r.

171 Harris has commented that scholars tend to neglect the role of earlier manuscripts in the book provision of the later Middle Ages; Harris, 'Patrons, Buyers and Owners', p. 172.

172 This abstract explains, for example, that in 'the first boke be contenyd xxvij chapertes þt tellith how ordre of knight hode began and how þe Romans be knighthode and fete of armes
manuscript states that the book 'telleyth how [order] of knight hood Began'. The hand appears fairly regular and professional, which might suggest that this manuscript was adapted and updated for the second-hand book trade.

Only one surviving copy of the Quadrilogue Invectif was definitely owned in England. BL, MS Cotton Julius E.V was, judging by the illumination and pen flourishing, an English production, probably dating from after 1470, but it contains no marks of ownership. Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 421, BL, MSS Add. 15300 and Harley 4402 were certainly French-produced manuscripts but they may have been in England in the fifteenth century, though as yet I have found no evidence for this. Pizan's Livre du corps de policie, on the other hand, does not seem to have circulated in England. Although it survives in nine copies, none of these can be linked to an English audience. BL, MS Harley 4410 ended up in England, but there is no evidence that it was in England in the fifteenth century. It is written in a French hand with French illumination and decoration and it contains no marks of ownership. Indeed, the only fifteenth-century annotations mark complimentary passages concerning Charles V of France from which it might be concluded that the owner was French.

It does then appear that people were choosing to own these texts in English. I have sought to demonstrate that this trend should not be seen exclusively as arising from an inability to read Latin and French but that other factors may have played a role, such as the creativity of translators and intrinsic merit of the work in the vernacular. The

---

173 BL, MS Royal 20 B.I, fol. iv(a).
174 BL, MS Cotton Julius E.V contains the Quadrilogue Invectif (fols. 1r-28v); Dialogus familiaris amici et sodalís (fols. 30r-39v) and Traité de l'Espérence (fols. 40r-107v).
preference for English might also be seen as an assertion of Englishness, as evidence of a desire to read about these issues in English and to participate in the formation of a written English discourse about war. It might also suggest that there was already an oral discourse surrounding the conduct of war in existence and that these texts represent its transference into a written context. Moreover, as will be demonstrated in the next chapter, this desire involved a range of gentry society. The audience for these translations comprised knights, sheriffs, lawyers and professional soldiers and as such we can see the way in which different communities coped with the experience of defeat and civil war by adopting and adapting French and Latin texts.
2.3 Codicological evidence

Recent work has stressed the impact of what have been termed 'codicological aesthetics' upon the reception of a text.\textsuperscript{175} Kerby-Fulton has argued that 'those who prepared manuscripts wielded a great deal of power; they could silently affect every aspect of textual reception and with a consistency and vision that created not only new readings but also new texts'.\textsuperscript{176} Westphal argues that manuscript producers not only selected the texts to be included in a volume but also chose the script or type of binding they used. Thus, she concludes that 'the physical makeup, composition, and history of a manuscript are not independent variables, but deeply interrelated aspects of how medieval literature was produced and enjoyed'.\textsuperscript{177} Aspects of a manuscript's aesthetics, such as its script, layout and composition, contextualised the texts it contained in certain ways and this means that the effect of the manuscript context on the way these texts were read and interpreted must also be considered.

In most cases, it is impossible to know whether the extant manuscript reflects the desires of its commissioners or those of its producers. This is a particular problem with the period under discussion here. Some scholars have argued that the organisation of the book trade was changing in the third quarter of the fifteenth century: decisions about, for example, a book's form, were increasingly made by book producers rather

\textsuperscript{175} Three recent collections of essays illustrate the impact that interest in 'codicological aesthetics' has had on literary and manuscript studies; S.G. Nichols and S. Wenzel (eds.), The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany (Michigan, 1996); D. Pearsall (ed.), New Directions in Later Medieval Manuscript Studies (York, 2000); A.J. Minnis (ed.), Middle English Poetry Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of Derek Pearsall (York, 2001).


\textsuperscript{177} S. Westphal, Textual Poetics of German Manuscripts 1300-1500 (Columbia, 1993), p. 218.
than commissioners. The cases where we can be sure that the manuscript commissioner exercised considerable power in choosing the contents and format of the manuscript will be discussed separately below. Although the individual circumstances of each manuscript's composition have to be taken into account, most scholars working on fifteenth-century book production agree that the majority of manuscripts were special orders, designed and produced for a specific patron. Mooney argues that 'there is little evidence for single-scribe 'manufacture' of manuscript books for commercial sale in the fifteenth century either before or after the introduction of print'. However, a few popular texts, such as the prose *Brut* or Nicholas Love's *Mirror*, may have been produced commercially.

Is there any evidence for the commercial or speculative production of the manuscripts in my corpus? Mooney and Matheson list the factors that need to be in existence before such a case can be made. They argue that there needs to be evidence of 'a standard exemplar kept readily accessible for repeated copying, evidence of the supervision of scribal copying and of repeated collaboration between two or more scribes and/or artists'. With regard to the first item in Mooney and Matheson's list, there is no evidence which points to the existence of a standard exemplar for these

178 Harris, 'Patrons, Buyers and Owners', p. 183.
180 L. Mooney, 'Written for Whom?: Some Late Medieval Scribes and their Patrons'; unpublished paper given at the 'Writing for Whom?' conference held at the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York, 8 June 2002.
181 Kate Harris suggests that from the middle of the fifteenth century scribes were willing to invest in speculative production - she cites Lancastrian and Yorkist genealogical rolls, Books of Hours and other texts such as the *Troy Book, Confessio Amantis, Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers* as examples; Harris, 'Patrons, Buyers And Owners', pp. 183, 198. In a recent article, Mooney and Matheson argue that the Beryn scribe appears to have worked in a scriptorium in London; L. Mooney and L.M. Matheson, 'The Beryn Scribe and his Texts: Evidence for Multiple-Copy Production of Manuscripts in Fifteenth-Century England', *The Library*, 7th series 4 (2003): 347-370.
military texts. There are, however, signs of the second item in their list, evidence of correction, which might suggest some form of supervision of scribal copying. There is also evidence of repeated collaboration between scribes and artists in the production of these manuscripts. Doyle and Parkes argue that this third type of evidence does not necessarily imply commercial production, but might be the result of a stationer or author repeatedly using the same scribe. In the case of these manuscripts, it seems likely that the producers of the manuscripts formed informal networks of recommendation, rather than that they worked together in a workshop environment.

There is, then, little evidence to suggest that these manuscripts were produced speculatively. Only one text was copied more than once by the same scribe: the hand of the scribe of Lydgate and Burgh's Secrets of Philosophers contained in PML, MS M 775 is the same as that of Philadelphia Free Library, MS Lewis T.15/488, which is a single leaf of the same text. There is, however, evidence for the repeated employment of one scribe by a patron. Ricardus Franciscus, for example, was employed by the Fastolf household on at least two occasions. He was also employed by John Smert, Garter King of Arms, on two occasions. Another scribe produced at least two manuscripts for Thomas, Lord Berkeley, and the Westminster scribe, William Ebesham, wrote two manuscripts for the Paston family and also copied documents for them. Nicholas

183 OMC, MS Lat. 30 - see chapter three, p. 107.
184 See chapter three, p. 138.
186 I am grateful to Professor Mooney for this information.
187 He wrote Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 570 for Fastolf and parts of CUL, MS Add. 7870 for Worcester.
188 These are Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 764 and Nancy, Archives Départementales de Meurthe et Moselle, MS H. 80.
189 Berkeley's manuscripts are Bodl. Lib, MSS Bodley 953 and Digby 233; Paston's are Harvard University Medical Library, MS Countway 19 and BL, MS Lansdowne 285. A letter from John Paston to Margaret Paston, dated on internal evidence to October 1469, mentions Ebesham as
Seyntlo employed the same scribe to write both his copy of the prose translation of De re militari, extant in BL, MS Add. 14408, and a herbal, extant in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 572.\(^{190}\)

The fact that there is no evidence to suggest that these texts were produced on speculation has several implications for this study. Meale has identified two copies of the *Libelle of Englyshe Polyge*, a poem written in the 1430s urging the protection of the narrow seas and Calais, which were certainly made from the same exemplar and were written by the same scribe: BL, MSS Cotton Vitellius E.X and Add. 40673. She argues that this evidence suggests that ‘the demand for the work was evidently deemed to be sufficient for an exemplar to be kept in stock’.\(^{191}\) The proliferation and mode of production of genealogical rolls during the reign of Henry VI also permit similar conclusions. Several of these rolls were written by the same scribe and illuminated by the same artist. Allan has concluded from this evidence that pedigrees were produced on speculation rather than for individual patrons.\(^{192}\) It is clear that producers felt confident that there was a market for these texts and so were prepared to invest in the speculative production of genealogies.

---

190 Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 572 contains medical recipes on fols. 1r-34r, followed by *Agnus castus* on fols. 35r-63v. Apart from additions on fol. 34v and in the margins, this manuscript is written in the same hand as that of BL, MS Add. 14408 with similar red and black flourished initials. Both manuscripts were written on the same paper from the same stock as suggested by the presence of the same watermark in each manuscript (similar to Briquet 13006); C.M. Briquet, *Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire historique des Marques du Papier*, 4 vols (Amsterdam, 1966).


in this period can be seen, not only as a response to the political situation: the 'uncertainties engendered by the rivalry of Henry VI, Richard, duke of York and Edward IV',¹⁹³ but also as evidence that producers reacted and were aware of the need for these texts. In other words, the fact that these texts were commercially produced suggests that both producers and owners were part of a discourse community around the issues of dynastic continuity and the dynastic claims of the Lancastrians and Yorkists.

That this did not occur with the texts I am examining implies that producers did not have confidence in the existence of such a market. However, it also suggests that the production of these texts was a personalised transaction, which took place between patron and producer and relied to some degree upon personal ties and networks. Moreover, the fact that these books must be seen as special orders means that each copy was unique and patron-specific. The manuscript's script, level of decoration or mise en page were presumably chosen by the manuscript's commissioner.¹⁹⁴ It therefore follows that the extant manuscript reflects the commissioner's taste and provides an insight into how individuals perceived the texts it contained.

In this next section, I shall make some general points about the codicological aesthetics of these manuscripts and suggest, on the basis of this evidence, some of the ways in which readers read, or were encouraged to read, these texts. I shall contrast the codicological evidence presented by my corpus of manuscripts with that provided by a consideration of the contexts and formats in which French and Latin copies of these texts circulated. This comparison will provide evidence of whether these translations

---

¹⁹⁴ Hanna, 'Producing Manuscripts and Editions', p. 117.
were differentiated visually from the original texts and so allow an assessment of the extent to which producers and owners felt that the translations were, as has been argued, 'new' texts.

**Scribal rewriting**

Just as traditional approaches tend to treat translations as non-creative practices and conventionally utilise a model of degeneration which regards the original work as corrupted and debased by its translators, variation between manuscripts is often also explicated with recourse to this model: the original work is seen as corrupted by scribes in their act of copying. However, this distinction between author and scribe, where an author creatively composes an original work and a scribe reproduces or corrupts it, is not a particularly useful, and is, indeed, an anachronistic way of treating manuscript variations. As Bryan has suggested, 'medieval expectations for non-sacred texts did not necessarily include expectations of a mechanically fixed text or of a text that could only be altered by a single, original author'.

Manuscript variations should not, then, be interpreted exclusively as the result of scribal error or as degenerations from their originals. Rather, variations between manuscripts should be seen as reflecting the different conceptual frameworks of scribes.

---

195 This approach to manuscript variations is also reflected in many critical editions of texts; see the comments of T.W. Machan in 'Middle English Text Production and Modern Textual Criticism', in A.J. Minnis and C. Brewer (eds.), *Crux and Controversy in Middle English Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 2.

196 Machan, 'Middle English Text Production', p. 3.

197 E. Bryan, *Collaborative Meaning in Medieval Scribal Culture: the Otho Layamon Brut* (Michigan, 1999), p. 17. However, just as there were expectations for accuracy in translation, so too did some readers want their texts to be 'correct'. Worcester wrote the note 'cest tretis est corrige par moy Guillem Worcestre dit Botener le moys de jullle lan grace 1450' at the end of his copy of an anonymous French translation of John of Wales's *Breviloquium* (fols. 5r-30v). He seems to have gone through the copy written for him and checked the scribe's readings against another copy – perhaps the copy owned by Fastolf: Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 570.
or their intended audiences. The differences between manuscripts demonstrate that these texts were perceived differently by their readers and were appropriated and read in a variety of ways.\textsuperscript{198} The scribe was a reader of the text and the extant manuscript is evidence of this reading as well as his own conceptual framework and perceptions of the text he is producing and the audience for whom he is producing it. For example, the scribe of the copy of the \textit{Livre des faits d'armes} contained in the anthology made for Margaret of Anjou (BL, MS Royal 15 E.VI), removed a few anti-English passages from the text, such as the passage in Book I, chapter 5, which discusses the Black Prince putting to death envoys of Charles V in 1369.\textsuperscript{199}

In many ways, studying scribal change poses as many problems as studying translation change. It is rarely the case that the exemplar from which a scribe made his copy can be identified, so it becomes difficult to ascertain at precisely what point in a text's transmission changes were made. However, scribal variation can still tell us about issues such as the perceived genre or status of a work and at least gives some indication of the period in which texts were updated or altered to accord with, for example, historical context.

For example, the scribes of Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45 and BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII, which contain copies of the verse translation, glossed many words in their copies of the text. They not only explained difficult words, but also provided alternative readings or additional information. In some cases, their glosses seem somewhat

\textsuperscript{198} See Norton's unpublished doctoral thesis for the use of this model in relation to Ottoman and Turkish accounts of the sieges of Nagykanizsa; C. Norton, 'Plural Pasts: the Role of Function and Audience in the Creation of Meaning in Ottoman and Turkish Accounts of the Sieges of Nagykanizsa' (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2004).

unnecessary. For example, they glossed ‘horribil’ as ‘horrende’ and ‘myghti men in
armys’ as ‘knyghtis stronge’.

The Cotton Titus scribe also glossed a word in a particularly interesting way: in the following passage, he glossed ‘jugement’ as ‘parlyment’: ‘The grete Trybune is mad by Themperour/ And by patent, and send by
jugement’.

By adding ‘parlyment’ to this line, he updated the reference and located even further the English translation in an English context.

The Cotton Titus scribe also altered the following passage: ‘Commende and
exercise and holde hem inne/ For when thei ha the verrey craft to fight/ Thei wil desire
it wel this for to wynne’. He altered the last line to ‘welthis for to wynne’.

This fundamentally altered the translator’s and Vegetius’s point that when soldiers are well prepared for war, they will be eager to fight. The Cotton Titus scribe, however, changed it so that their desire to fight was also implicitly a result of the wealth and booty they would acquire. The scribe of NL, MS f.36, Ry 20, a copy of the R translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif, who was probably a monk in a Lincoln monastery, altered the passage in which the ‘Knight’ defends himself from the accusations of the ‘People’.

Rather than following the extant manuscripts in which the ‘Knight’ defends himself from accusations of ‘grette sleuthe’ (lascheté), in the Newberry manuscript, the Knight defends himself from ‘slaughter grete’.

The scribe of Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338 writes of Roman ‘hystories’, whilst all the other extant manuscripts write of ‘Romayn

---

200 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, ll. 409.
201 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, ll. 761-2.
203 On the front pastedown ‘Christoforus Lincolne Monachus’ is written in red in fifteenth-century textualis, the final letter is historiated with face of a monk, this may refer to the scribe or the rubricator. The manuscript seems to have remained in the monastery. Following a summary of Boethius on fol. 207v is the note: ‘J. Clynton prorê scrupt. 148 –’.
204 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 180.
storyes'. This may perhaps be taken as evidence of a different genre classification: the scribe of the Rawlinson manuscript wanted to give more authority to the Roman narratives.

The greatest testimony to the resourcefulness of scribes and their ability to recreate texts is evidenced by the verse translation of De re militari. The scribes of the two later manuscripts, Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45 and BL, Cotton Titus A.XXIII, dating from the late 1460s and early 1470s, replaced Henry VI’s name with that of Edward IV and omitted the explicitly Lancastrian proems which celebrate Henry VI’s entry into London and describe the presentation of the book to Henry VI. The manner in which a text is framed influences the way it will be read. It is from the title and introductory section that audiences form their first impression of the genre and purpose of the work, so by omitting the proem the specific context within which the poem was composed was also removed. Its lessons transcended a specific occasion and this reinvention of the poem by its scribes allowed the text to be more than a response to a particular historical situation.

These two scribes also altered the poem in more subtle ways. The verse translator had argued: "Alhail Caleis! ther wolde I faynest londe/That may not I [...] oo, whi so? for thei distresse/ Alle, or to deye or with her wrong to stonde/ That wil I not, to wynne al Engelonde/ What myght availe, a litil heer to dwelle'. But the Ashmole and Cotton Titus scribes wrote: 'That may not Joo. whiso. for they distresse/ All or to deye or with her werke to stonde/ That dar to right go wynne all Engelonde/ What

205 Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338 fols. 10v, 15r; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilque Invectif, 1: 176; 184.
206 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghtbode and Bataile, ll. 2880, 2982-5.
208 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghtbode and Bataile, ll. 2981-2985.
myght availe, a lite in errour to dwelle'. The Ashmole and Cotton Titus scribes' versions imply that it was the 'right' of the Yorkist lords to 'go wynne all Engelonde' whereas the translator was arguing he would not join the Yorkist lords even if it meant he could 'wynne al Engelonde'. The Cotton Titus manuscript was probably owned by William Hattecliff (d.1480), physician and secretary to Edward IV. The point is that the poem was not only altered and ideologically re-positioned to accord with the change of dynasty, but was also owned by at least one staunch and loyal supporter of that dynasty. The scribes were clearly successful in their marketing strategies.209

Illuminations

Several of the manuscripts containing the prose translation might be thought of as high-status productions. CUL, MS Add. 8706, OMC, MS Lat. 30 and Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291 are written in professional anglicana hands, on good quality vellum and, in the case of OMC, MS Lat. 30, contain border decoration executed to a high standard. However, not one copy of the prose translation of De re militari contains miniatures. This is in contrast to French and Latin copies of the text, which tend to be illuminated.210 This difference in the mode of presentation cannot and should not be explicated with recourse to a dichotomous model which sees Latin and French as having a higher status and therefore able to sustain a pictorial tradition in contrast to those in English. In other words, the absence of miniatures in manuscripts containing the prose translation should not be explained simply in terms of the status of the vernacular. Even when the text is found in what might be called 'high-status' manuscripts, such PML, MS M 775, Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233 and BL, MS Royal 18 A.XII, which was owned by Richard III, it was

209 I discuss the implications of the pattern of transmission of these manuscripts in chapter four, pp. 181-2.
210 BL, MSS Royal 20 B.XI; Royal 20 B.I; Royal 20 B.XV; Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Lat. 56 and CUL, MS Ee 2. 17 were illuminated.
not illuminated. Moreover, the first two manuscripts contain other texts which were
illuminated, but the prose translation was not.

How, then, can it be explained? The way in which a text is framed ‘predisposes
the reader to specific modes of reading and understanding’ which determine the text’s
identity and genre.\textsuperscript{211} The lack of miniatures might then indicate two things: an audience
which does not require visual aids or a desire on the part of the producer to stress the
practical (non-literary/fictional) status of the work. This is indirectly supported by the
evidence of Richard III’s copy of the prose translation, BL, MS Royal 18 A.XII. As
Lester comments: ‘Though a fine manuscript, it is not as lavish as one might expect of a
book owned by a king’.\textsuperscript{212} Neither is it as lavish as some of the other books
commissioned by Richard.\textsuperscript{213} Yet, significantly, it also represents a departure from the
way in which French and Latin versions of \textit{De re militari} were represented.

The opposite process seems to have taken place with the U translation of the
\textit{Quadrilogue Invectif}. As with French and Latin versions of \textit{De re militari}, the extant French
copies of the \textit{Quadrilogue Invectif} associated with England tended to be illuminated.\textsuperscript{214} The
miniature contained in the one extant manuscript containing the U translation is
modelled on those found in French manuscripts and shows France, depicted as a lady,
with her three sons representing the three estates: the Knight leaning on his axe; the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{211} Grazia, \textit{Shakespeare Verbatim}, p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{212} Lester (ed.), \textit{English Translation of \textit{Vegetius}}, p. 19.
\item \textsuperscript{213} Full descriptions of Richard III’s books are given in Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, \textit{Richard III’s
\item \textsuperscript{214} By ‘associated with England’, I mean only those manuscripts which were illuminated or
written in England or those that can be associated with an English owner prior to 1500. BL, MS
Cotton Julius E.V contains a full-page miniature of a king receiving the book from the author
on fol. 1r; BL, MS Add. 15300, which was not an English production, also contains a miniature,
which represents the story of the author being kissed by the Dauphiness, Margaret of Scotland
and there is an unfinished miniature on fol. 73r of Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 421 of the author
asleep and France and the three estates.
\end{itemize}
Clergy carrying a scroll and the People holding a shovel. This manuscript was also written by a French-trained scribe and the hand, as well as the decoration, give the impression, as Kathleen Scott has argued, of a Continental book. This accords with the observations made earlier that the U translator not only seemed to give an unmediated rendition of the Quadrilogue Invectif and did not emphasise that his text was a translation of Chartier's work, but also used French words, which he then explained by the addition of a synonym. The translator and/or producers of this manuscript seem to have consciously designed the appearance of this English translation on French models and in this respect might be seen to have been attempting to give the vernacular rendition the same status as the French by minimising the aesthetic differences between the ways they were represented. Conversely, the producers of the prose translation of De re militari seem to have deliberately displaced or shifted away from the way Latin and French versions of the text had been represented in manuscripts.

Composition

In most cases, it is impossible to ascertain whether the contents of a given manuscript reflect the interests of the commissioner or the availability of exemplars for the scribe. As Hanna has commented, ‘manuscript compilers, when they acquired an exemplar for any desired text, could not be certain that they would gain access to it a second time. Thus, they were constrained to make the fullest imaginable use of any book that came to

215 Compare this with the miniature in Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 421. Not one copy of the R translation contains a miniature, although CSJC, MS 76.D.I was clearly meant to be illuminated at some point as gaps have been left on some of the pages for miniatures.
217 See above, p. 28.
hand, and their planned core selections would come to coexist with other items'. This may account for the pairing of the prose translation of De re militari and Lydgate and Burgh's Secrets of Philosophers in five manuscripts produced between 1450-1474. Lester suggests that the repeated pairing of these two works 'probably reflects the fact that both works were thought of as suited to manuals of edification for gentlemen'. But it may be more complex than this. The frequent pairing of these two texts in manuscripts provides an insight into the conceptual frameworks within which these works were read and used. This pairing suggests that the prose translation was not only read as a text on warfare but also as a text on government. Indeed, the prose translation argued that strong government and successful warfare were inextricably woven: 'There is no thing so stronge ne so worshipful as is the comynalte in whiche is plente of wel tau3te werriours'. This interdependency may also explain why so many treatises on government, such as Christine de Pizan's Livre du corps de policie and Book III of Giles of Rome's De regimine principum (the English translation of which is paired with that of De re militari in Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233), draw on Vegetius.

This is indirectly supported by the manuscript context for the U translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif. It appears with a mid-fifteenth-century English translation of a fourteenth-century French text entitled 'These iij consideracions beth right necesarye to

---

219 BL, MSS Lansdowne 275; Sloane 2027; MS Add. 14408, Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416; PML, MS M 775. John Seynt John was a later owner of CUL, MS Add. 8706 which contains solely a copy of the prose translation. However, he also owned a copy of the Secrets of Philosophers contained in Oxford, Balliol College, MS 329. All of the surviving manuscripts that contain more texts than the prose translation alone include an example of this type of literature.
220 Lester, Sir John Paston's 'Grite Boke', p. 29.
the good gouernaunce of a prince'. The author/translator states that the text is based on *De re militari*, but in actual fact the text does not discuss military matters; rather it uses *De re militari* as a source for the common good and government. Although the author of this text saw nothing incongruous in using Vegetius in this way, he was also aware that readers might have brought different expectations to the text and thus referred those who might expect military information to *De re militari* proper: 'I speke no more of the gouernaunce of a prince in tyme of his werres but yf it be pleasure to haue more pleneure and parfyte knowlege let him beholde and see Vegecius in his treety so soufisauntly made'. One of the French copies of this text contained in Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 1233 also contains another text concerning military matters: namely Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* on fols. 183v-212r. This illustrates how different communities could read a text.

Latin and French versions of *De re militari* associated with England also tended to circulate alongside a mirror for princes: Giles of Rome's *De regimine principum*, which is not surprising, given that Giles used Vegetius for book three of his treatise. Briggs, in his recent study of the reception of *De regimine principum*, argued that this practice was

---

222 OUC, MS 85, fols. 68v-90r. The translation was made in the middle of the fifteenth century of a French tract written in 1347. The translation is extant in two other manuscripts: Trinity College, Cambridge, MS O.5.6, alongside *Sithrake* (fols. 1r-37v), *Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers* (fol. 38r-67v) and Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS English 530 alongside the *Compleynt of Cryst* of William Lychefelde (fols. 1r-4r); *Guy of Warwick* in English (fols. 4v-12v); *The Story of the Kings of Coleyne* (fols. 34r-48r); *The Serpent of Division* (fols. 49r-57v) and an incomplete *Brun* to 1440, with Lydgate's translation for the reign of Richard II (fols. 59r-211v); Genet, *Four English Political Tracts*, pp. 174-6.

223 OUC, MS 85, fol. 63v; Genet, *Four English Political Tracts*, p. 180.

224 OUC, MS 85, fol. 89v; Genet, *Four English Political Tracts*, p. 209. The French reads: 'Par ce que dit je me passe de plus parler des enseignemens du gouvernement au prince en temps de guerre, et qui en vouldra plus savoir, voie le livre de Vegece sur le fait de chevalier et le tiers livre du gouvr. des princes autres parlans de cest matiere'.

225 Five manuscripts associated with England containing *De regimine principum* appear with *De re militari*: Oxford, Balliol College, MS 146a; CUL, MS Ee.2.17; Bodl. Lib, MS Auct. F.3.2; Bodl. Lib, MS Auct. F.3.3; BL, MS Royal 12 B.XXI. Briggs counted seven in total, but this included Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes* (BL, Royal 15 E. VI) as a copy of *De re militari*, which it is not, and the prose translation (Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233); Briggs, *Giles of Rome*, p. 45.
restricted to England, as the pairing is absent in Latin works of Italian origin and is found in only one of the forty-four manuscripts he inspected in French libraries. Yet only one extant copy of the prose translation of *De re militari* was paired with *De regimine principum*; that found in Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233, the earliest extant manuscript of *De re militari*. Why did these two texts not continue to circulate together? It was not as if there was not an English version available: in 1385-7 *De regimine principum* was translated by John Trevisa. Moreover, both translations emanated from the same household under the patronage and, as Ralph Hanna has demonstrated, active promotion of Thomas, Lord Berkeley.

Briggs explains the general lack of interest in Trevisa's translation as being due to Trevisa not producing a decent exemplar, but rather 'an unfinished working version, with obscure, variants, and interpolated passages and probably in a highly abbreviated and current script'. He argues that the extensive corrections written over erasures in Trevisa's translation in Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233 suggest that scribes had difficulty recreating Trevisa's text. It was apparently Digby's scribes and corrector who had to 'reconstruct the text'. However, I still find this a problematic explanation because the scribes of the Digby manuscript reconstructed the text effectively so it does not seem to entirely explain why no other copies were made.

It has also been suggested that Hoccleve's *Regement of Princes*, a translation of *De regimine principum*, *De ludo scaccorum* by James of Cessolis, and the pseudo-Aristotelian *Secreta secretorum*, produced in 1411, would have affected the market for Trevisa's

---

226 Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233.
227 Hanna, 'Sir Thomas Berkeley and his Patronage', p. 910.
228 Briggs, *Giles of Rome*, p. 85; the whole argument runs from pp. 84-90.
This also seems somewhat unsatisfactory because one owner would often own several works from the same genre, sometimes within one volume. It could also be argued that the proliferation of Hoccleve’s text might have stimulated knowledge of, and demand for, other translations of *De regimine principum*. Moreover, in relation to why the prose translation of *De re militari* was not paired with *De regimine principum*, the suggestion that Hoccleve’s translation displaced the market for Trevisa’s translation poses as many questions as it answers. If this was the case, why did the prose translation not circulate alongside Hoccleve’s translation? Indeed, Hoccleve’s translation was sometimes described in manuscripts as being a translation of Giles’s work: Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 40 contains the note ‘Explicit Egidius de regimine principum’ as does Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 735.230

Another explanation might be tentatively suggested. Hoccleve’s translation would have been thoroughly unsuitable as a companion piece to the prose translation because it advances a rather ambivalent attitude towards warfare.231 Were audiences or producers familiar enough with Hoccleve’s translation to realise this and therefore did not want it put alongside the prose translation? This is perhaps unlikely. How then can it be explained? Perhaps, as with illuminations, owners or producers were self-consciously asserting themselves against the way in which *De re militari* used to be read. Whatever the explanation, the fact remains that Lydgate and Burgh’s translation of the *Secreta secretorum* displaced Giles of Rome’s *De regimine principum* as the dominant companion piece to *De re militari*, thus illustrating the way in which one text could be read differently over time.

229 See Briggs, *Giles of Rome*, p. 84.
230 Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 40, fol. 98v; Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 735, fol. 134r.
231 See, for example, Thomas Hoccleve, *The Regiment of Princes*, ed. Charles R. Blyth (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1999), ll. 5321-5439.
The prose translation also appears with another work of Lydgate's - his Siege of Thebes - in Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416. The Siege of Thebes was particularly appropriate in the context of civil war. In the colophons of some manuscripts, including Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416, the title 'Siege' is replaced by 'Destruction'.\(^{232}\) Indeed, the scribal glosses to the copy of the Siege of Thebes (c. 1421-22) contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416 highlight, amongst other things, the destruction of the nobility during civil war. Two of the glosses read "How al the gentyl blood of Grece and Thebes was distroyed on o day' and "The worthy blood of Grece was distroyed at the siege and the cyte frenally brouht to nought'.\(^{233}\)

Several owners of the prose translation of De re militari owned the Siege of Thebes separately. Richard III's signature appears in Longleat House, MS 257, which contains a copy; Sir John Paston II mentions lending Thomas Boyd, the earl of Arran and son of the governor of Scotland, a copy of the Siege of Thebes owned by his sister Anne Paston in a letter from 1472.\(^{234}\) By the mid-fifteenth century, this text was circulating widely, in the types of groups in which the translations considered here circulated. For example, the copy extant in Cambridge, Trinity College MS O.5.2 contains the coats of arms of the Knevet and Thwaites families.\(^{235}\)

The prose translation is also found alongside another popular didactic text in PML, MS M 775: Stephen Scrope's translation of Pizan's Épitre d'Othéa la diesse à Hector.

Stephen Scrope, stepson and ward of Sir John Fastolf, translated Pizan's work into


\(^{233}\) Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416, fols. 244v and 253r.


\(^{235}\) Guddat-Figge, Catalogue of Manuscripts, p. 88.
English apparently at the request of Fastolf at some point between 1440 and 1459. This translation is extant in two other manuscripts. Scrope added a preface to his translation, in which he argued that it was intended for those men who "haue exerciced and occupied by long continuaunce of tyme the grete part of youre dayes in dedys of cheualrie' but who now should turn their thoughts to 'gostly cheuallrie off dedes of armes spirituall'. Although Sir John Paston borrowed most of the material in PML, MS M 775 for his own book, he did not include Scrope's translation of the Épître d'Othéa; instead he chose to own it in a separate codex. Lester argued that Paston chose to exclude it because it was not 'practical enough for what he had in mind'. An alternative suggestion might be that if the translation was purposefully excluded from the book (and this is open to speculation), it was because of its philosophical and moral nature.

Three copies of the prose translation are found alongside heraldic material. BL, MS Lansdowne 285 and PML, MS M 775 contain versions of 'How to organise jousts of peace'; a version of the arms and armour needed for foot combat, regulations

---

236 CSJC, MS H. 5 was dedicated to, and probably owned by, Humphrey Stafford, created Duke of Buckingham on 14 September 1444, who was killed at the battle of Northampton on 10 July 1460. In 1472 the Duke's daughter Anne, widow of Aubrey de Vere and Thomas Cobham, left her sister-in-law, the Countess of Richmond, 'my boke with the pistilles of Othea'; cited in A.I. Doyle, 'A Note on St. John's College, Cambridge, MS H.5', in Stephen Scrope, The Epistle of Othea, ed. C.F. Buhler, EETS, original series 264 (1970), p. 126. The manuscript later came into the possession of the Bremschet family of the Isle of Wight. Emelina Bremschet wrote a Latin prayer on a flyleaf at the beginning of the manuscript and at the end there are nearly two pages of English on the five sorrowes of the Virgin and entries of births in English with name of godparents; dating from the second year of Henry VII's reign to the fifteenth year. Scrope's translation is also extant in Longleat House, MS 253 which contains no marks of ownership. It is extant in at least forty-three manuscripts in French. In terms of its English popularity, Anthony Babyngton translated it again in the late fifteenth century and the printer Robert Wyer translated it in c. 1540; Scrope, The Epistle of Othea, p. xii.

237 Scrope, The Epistle of Othea, p. 121.


239 Lester, Paston's 'Grete Boke', p. 47.

240 For ownership of these texts by heralds see chapter three, pp. 125-6.
for trial by battle, as well as accounts of feats of arms in which the heralds’ role is central. A gathering containing the ‘pee de gre of Chalouns’ was added to the prose translation extant in Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291. Other treatises on knighthood also circulated alongside heraldic material. Ramon Lull’s treatise on knighthood appears in the collection known as ‘Mowbray’s book’ and in that known as ‘Banyster’s French treatise’, London, College of Arms, MS L 12.c, on fols. 35r-60r.242

The verse translation of De re militari, on the other hand, only ever appears on its own and circulated in small pocket book format.243 It is never illuminated and all three copies contain minimal decoration. This accords with the impression sustained by the verse translator that his translation was a practical text. Wakelin has recently argued that the index which accompanies the poem in two of the three manuscripts ‘complements the poet’s conception of his work and its functions by directing us to practical advice’.244

The R translations of the Quadrilogue Inventif appear together with the same translator’s renditions of Chartier’s Traité de l’Esperance and the Dialogus familiaris amici et sodalisc, which perhaps suggests that readers were interested in collecting the works of Chartier and that their selection process was determined by the author of works rather than the content. It is only in the latest manuscript, NL, MS f. 32, Ry 20, that different texts are placed alongside these three translations: namely, Anthony Woodville’s translation of The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers and John Walton’s translation of Boethius’ De consolatione philosophiae. However, these texts were clearly added to the manuscript later: the Chartier translations are written in a separate booklet, by a

242 London, College of Arms, MS M 19 also contains this text in French translation on fols. 25r-55v.
243 CPC, MS 243 measures 241x166mm; Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45 measures 205x135mm and BL, Cotton Titus A.XXIII measures 214x140mm, but this manuscript has been cropped.
244 Wakelin, ‘Vernacular Humanism’, p. 123.
different, earlier hand from that of the other texts, which were probably bound alongside the Chartier texts at the end of the fifteenth century.

The extant manuscripts containing English military texts illustrate some of the contexts in which these texts were read and interpreted and suggest, by extension, that readers approached these texts in a variety of ways. These texts are found in manuscripts containing a range of other English translations, such as a lapidary, an English translation of the *Consilia Isidori*, Scrope's translation of the *Épître d'Othéa*, in manuscripts containing French and Latin texts and in those containing 'original' English texts such as Chaucer's *Parliament of Fowls*. There are, however, patterns, the most significant being the frequent pairing of the prose translation with Lydgate and Burgh's *Secrets of Philosophers*, which suggests that the prose translation was read either as a text on government or that successful governance and success in war were regarded by contemporaries as being interdependent.245

The connections that readers did not make may be as informative as those they did. Whereas several manuscripts containing *Vegedus* in Latin circulated alongside theological tracts and were owned by monastic communities, only one copy of the prose translation is found alongside explicitly religious works.246 Significantly, this copy of the prose translation, Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416, is also the only one which can be

245 This is indirectly supported by the verse translation of *De re militari*. The verse translator used the term 'governing' to refer both to government in its normal sense ('auerus evel gouemaunce', l. 1011) and as a form of self-restraint ('chiualers' should be 'wel gouerned', l. 204). This created an intratextual link between the two contexts in which government is essential. My point is that the government pertaining to an army was transferable (and was transferred by this translator) to the government of the realm.

246 BL, MS Royal 7 C.I, a fourteenth-century Latin copy of *De re militari* which also contains Latin sermons, was owned by Ramsey Abbey; Bodl. Lib, MS Auct. F.3.3 possibly belonged to Reading Abbey and BL, MS Royal 5 E.XXI, a fifteenth-century booklet in a fourteenth-century manuscript containing works ascribed to St. Anselm, came into the hands of Thomas Cranmer.
identified with a religious house. Furthermore, the prose translation was never paired with a romance and was only paired with chronicle material on one occasion in BL, MS Sloane 2027. This manuscript has been singled out as a codex that contains complementary material. Yet the chronicles which form part of the manuscript promote an alternative conception of chivalry, one which celebrates the individual prowess of a knight. This alternative and more traditional model of chivalry found in chronicles and romances might explain why these texts are only found alongside such material in this one instance. Moreover, it is worth noting that the chronicles were a later addition to the manuscript. It originally contained the prose translation (fols. 1r-36v), the Boke of Nurture attributed to John Russell (fols. 37r-52v) and Lydgate and Burgh's Secrets of Philosophers (fols. 53r-92v). Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle (fols. 96v-169v) and the prose Brut continuation (fols. 170r-188r) were added later, which has probably been overlooked by scholars previously because the same scribe wrote both parts of the codex. The texts with which the prose translation was paired are almost always of a practical nature, which suggests that De re militari was valued as a practical, didactic manual.

However, as stated above, it is difficult to know whether or not the composition of the book reflects the commissioner's tastes and interests or the availability of

---

247 It also contains a text on the Ten Commandments (fols. 1r-34v) Peter Idley's Instructions to his Son (fols. 35r-65v) and Cursor Mundi (fols. 66r-181v). On the rear pastedown is the name 'syster Anne colvylle', together with a request for prayers: 'of your charyte pray for sustyr clementia trysburgh'. Anne Colville was a nun at Syon in the early sixteenth century. She also owned BL, MS Harley 993, a copy of Hilton's Scale of Perfection.


249 So, for example, Brutus is described: 'pe prouesse þat brut dede no tunge telle ne may/ Mani was þe gode bodi þat him self slou'; Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle, BL, MS Sloane 2027, fol. 98v.
exemplars for the scribe. In some cases, the construction of the book is suggestive of the degree of choice the manuscript commissioner had exercised. Booklets, for example, allowed a book producer to have stock available without committing resources to the production of complete codices. Furthermore, if a manuscript was constructed using booklets, it suggests that it was tailored specifically for its commissioner: that he or she chose exactly what they wanted from a stock of available booklets; whereas with manuscripts that were not formed using booklets, and do not appear to be specific commissions, it can be difficult to ascertain whether the purchaser wanted all the texts the manuscript contained.

Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416, for example, was constructed in booklet format. The original manuscript contained a text on the Ten Commandments and the Cursor Mundi, but other booklets were added to this core. The codex as a whole exhibits variation in page format and in style of decoration (the booklet containing the prose translation has forty-two lines to a page in contrast to the other prose texts which only have thirty-two lines to a page and is decorated with a grey and red rope design not found elsewhere), independent sets of quire signatures in different parts of the manuscript (the Siege of Thebes and the Secrets of Philosophers which are found on fols. 227r-254v and 255r-287v respectively of the manuscript both have quire signatures beginning with an 'a'); quires formed of varying number of leaves in different parts of the manuscript (ranging from three folios in quire seven to sixteen folios in quire twenty-one); blank leaves at the end of a quire (at the end of the Siege of Thebes for example); variation of paper stocks (the prose translation has a watermark similar to Briquet 2405

---

250 See above, p. 76.
dated to 1463 whilst the other texts are written on paper with a watermark similar to Briquet 2064 dated to Perpignan 1464). These booklets were the work of one scribe and do not appear to have ever circulated in an unbound form as the outer leaves are not rubbed or soiled. The booklets were added very early on, however, as the foliation was done in a medieval hand.

BL, MS Add. 14408 poses some interesting questions concerning whether or not the composition of the book reflects the commissioner’s tastes and interests or the availability of exemplars for the scribe. It is the only manuscript to contain just the first book of the prose translation of *De re militari*. The manuscript is not lacking any quires. It is, of course, possible that the scribe only had access to an exemplar containing the first book. However, the prologue, which details the contents of the whole treatise, is missing and the text ends with a black ‘Explicit’ note. It is unlikely that the scribe would have an exemplar lacking the prologue to the text as well as all the other books, so it must be assumed that he purposefully omitted the prologue, recognising that it was unnecessary to have details of all four books when the manuscript only contained the first book. If this was a deliberate choice then either the scribe or the owner thought that only the first book was relevant. It is tempting to link the point in the commissioner’s career with the fact that only the book concerned with the training and choosing of new knights was included in the manuscript. According to its scribal note, the book was completed in 1473, which was shortly after the manuscript’s commissioner, Nicholas Seyntlo, received his knighthood. One assumes that a text concerned with becoming a knight would have had a particular resonance for him at that time, but of course such an assumption can never be proven.

252 The scribal note reads ‘scriptori merita mater pia reddet maria anno domini millesimo cccl lxxiiij’; BL, MS Add. 14408, fol. 73r. Nicholas Seyntlo was pardoned on 6 July 1471 and the pardon terms him ‘Nicholas Saintlo of Sutton, co-Somerset, knight, late esquire’; CPR, 1467-1477, p. 264.
In other cases, we can be relatively sure that owners shaped the actual composition of the manuscripts they possessed. PML, MS M 775 was almost certainly a special order. Originally, it began with the prose translation of *De re militari* and ended with Scrope's translation of Pizan's *Épître d'Othéa* and contained Lydgate's verses on the coronation of Henry VI and the *Secrets of Philosophers*. Astley then had his own deeds of arms commemorated by incorporating accounts of them into his book and had a new booklet, concerning jousting, bound at the beginning. He then personalised the expanded book by employing an artist to add his crest to one of the jousting knights in the first miniature on fol. 2v, his arms to three folios (fol. 25r, 131r, 274r), and to produce three pictures with his crest, arms or armorial colours. Moreover, the decoration supports the impression that this manuscript was a special order. As Kathleen Scott has argued, apart from the miniatures of the *Épître d'Othéa*, 'most of the pictorial subjects in this manuscript, such as the sea-scape which is not found elsewhere in English books of the period, are rare and undoubtedly reflect the individualistic wishes of a patron'.

The degree of choice a commissioner could exercise in choosing the texts in a manuscript is famously exemplified by John Paston's 'Grete Boke'. The manuscript, BL, MS Lansdowne 285, allows a rare insight into the aesthetic and intellectual decisions a manuscript commissioner might make. Paston's 'Grete Boke' contains many items which are also found in John Astley's manuscript discussed above: it seems that Paston employed the scribe, William Ebesham, to copy out parts of Astley's volume into a

254 The challenge of Piers de Masse to Astley (fol. 275v-6v); the challenge of Philippe de Boyle to Astley (fol. 277v-79r); a version of 'How to organise jousts of peace' (fol. 2v-4v).
255 Tournament foot combat scenes are not common either; Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts*, 2: 291.
similar book of his own. The implication is that what Paston did or did not borrow from Astley's book can tell us about his design for the manuscript as a whole.

Paston incorporated: 'How to organise jousts of peace'; the poem on the coronation of Henry VI; the verses by Lydgate from the 'sootiltees' at the English coronation banquet of Henry VI; the order of service for the coronation in England; the prose translation of De re militari; the arms and armour needed for foot combat; regulations for trial by battle; a version of sailing instructions; Lydgate and Burgh's Secrets of Philosophers; a version of the ceremony for creating the Knights of the Bath; the challenges of Piers de Masse to John Astley and of Philippe de Boyle. However, he did not borrow from Astley's volume: Scrope's translation of Pizan's Épître d'Othéa (or at least he did not want it in his 'Grete Boke' as he owned it as a separate codex), the assize of bread, a Latin calendar; Benedict Burgh's translation of Cato's Parvus and Magnus Cato; Lydgate's poem 'These four things' and his stanza on deceit.

To this collection he added: 'The challenge of an auncestre of therle of Warrewik', an account of the feat of arms performed by Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick (1381-1439) against three French knights in Guines, near Calais, January 1415. The inclusion of the descriptions of the jousts of Richard Beauchamp has the title 'The challenge of an auncestre of therle of Warrewik' — it is therefore explicitly an assertion of Richard Neville's ancestry. John Paston III, the brother of Sir John, first fought under Neville's leadership and both brothers fought for him in the Battle of Barnet (14 April 1471) at which he was killed. The inclusion of this piece invokes the Pastons'
interest in the earl of Neville, but also possibly serves to ally them politically with him. Paston also added the ‘Challenge of Lord Scales to the Bastard of Burgundy’, dated April and May 1465, and an account of that combat which took place in 1467; the ‘Challenge of Louis de Brutaillis to Jehan de Chassa’ (c. 1467), the ‘Challenge of Philippe de Bouton’ (1467); the ‘Challenge to the Pas a l’arbre d’or’ (July 1468); an account of the jousts between John Chalons and Louis de Bueil (5 February 1465) and the challenge to the ‘Pas du perron fée’.

It is also instructive to consider what later fifteenth-century owners chose to add to their manuscripts. A late fifteenth-century owner of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291 added a short tract on how to judge a good horse; an early owner of PML, MS M 775 added medical recipes, astrological material and a text on the oaths of heralds. Later readers also added to BL, MS Lansdowne 285: ‘Le statut de armez de turney per la parlament dengleterre’ was added on a blank space left in the manuscript. It ends with the words ‘quod Sir Jhon Paston.’ Doyle doubts this was written by Paston himself. It is more likely that the ‘quod’ is referring to its being written at the instigation of Paston. Alternatively, ‘quod Paston’ might ‘have been copied from a genuine autograph, from which the words were automatically carried over’. Another scribe added material concerning jousting and tourneys as well as the ordinances of war of Henry V and of Thomas Montague, Earl of Salisbury, and the summons for the surrender of Le Mans in 1425 in a separate quire. Three other scribes added material: a detailed account of the ‘Pas du perron fée’ held by Philippe de Lalaing in Bruges from 28 April to 17 May 1463

259 Lester, Paston’s ‘Grte Boke’, p. 42.
260 The scribe added ‘the challenge of Guillaume de Boursset; ‘proclamation of a tourney in Bruges’; ‘proclamation of jousts at Smithfield’; ‘Ordinance regulating the fees of heralds’ dated 3 September. The ordinances of war were definitely added during Paston’s lifetime: his inventory of books states that the ‘grete boke’ contains ‘statutes off werre’; Davis (ed.), Paston Letters, 1: 516-18.
before Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy; extracts from the *Polychronicon* which describe the rebellion of the Earls of Gloucester and Chester in their successful attack on King Stephen and the 'Epistola Lucii ad Arthurum', taken from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*. The latter only included the text of the letter—Arthur's reply and the narrative of the defeat of the Romans was excluded.

The way in which this manuscript was augmented with material over time demonstrates the danger of assigning fixity to the meaning of any manuscript. It further illustrates the necessity of firmly placing manuscripts within their historical context by employing a model of reading which allows the text to give rise to a variety of responses, which could vary over time and were context specific. Paston's collection represents the interests of those who spent their time performing chivalrous acts: it is testament to the chivalric contacts and the endurance of those contacts between members of the Yorkist court and the knights of France, Burgundy and Aragon. It places the activities of heralds at the forefront. Yet, this impression is altered slightly by those later additions of documents which are the products of the height of English success in Normandy, and seem, by stressing the importance of the prosecution of war not of chivalry, to develop the concerns expressed in the prose translation of *De re militari*. The accounts of the jousts and tournaments are juxtaposed against this alternative history of the fifteenth century: the loss of the French lands, the loss of 'Empire' and the resultant civil war.

Manuscripts such as BL, MS Lansdowne 285 are generally treated as homogeneous collections. Scholars stress the similarity of the subject matter or genre of
the items and impose some sort of rationale or cohesion upon the volume as a whole. Conversely, when scholars find texts whose subject matter does not conform to their generic expectations and seem to be incongruous or to diverge from the codex as a whole, they either gloss over their presence or reduce their impact by terming the collection 'miscellaneous' with its concurrent association of randomness and arbitrariness. Alternatively, the problem items might be termed 'fillers': implicitly only included to fill the physical gaps in the manuscript and not the intellectual ones. So, for example, Lester commenting upon the inclusion of the rutter book in Paston's book states that because 'the subject matter of this item is quite out of keeping with that of the other items [...] it may be that it was copied as a scribal “filler”'. Rather than entertain the idea that a rutter book was perhaps not 'out of keeping' for the reader who caused it to be included, Lester argued that it was added just to fill the physical space on the page.

---

261 See, for example, Lester, Paston's 'Grete Boke', p. 47. Cherewatuk has recently argued that the 'Grete Boke' 'presents in one volume a syncretic vision of knighthood'; K. Cherewatuk, 'Gentyl' audiences and 'Grete Bokes': Chivalric Manuals and the Morte Darthur', in J.P. Carley and F.J. Riddy (eds.), Arthurian Literature XV (1997): 205-16.
263 Lester, Paston's 'Grete Boke', p. 166.
Annotations

Of the twenty manuscripts I have looked at, which contain English translations of military texts, five were extensively annotated in contemporary hands.\textsuperscript{264} Six contain some contemporary annotation.\textsuperscript{265} Five contain scribal annotations which are not part of the texts’ apparatus.\textsuperscript{266} Seven are not annotated at all.\textsuperscript{267} The extant copies of these texts were surrounded by glosses, ‘nota bene’ and pointing hands, and this evidence enables a study of the annotator’s agenda and interpretative practices.\textsuperscript{268} Moreover, as Sharpe has suggested in relation to printed books, margins ‘were always ideological spaces [...] marginal notes could flag, cross-reference, interpret or undermine a passage in the text - at precisely the point the reader first encountered it.’\textsuperscript{269} At a fundamental level, the actual manuscript page might determine the extent to which a given text was appropriated and commented upon; in that there either was, or was not, physical space in which a reader could offer their own interpretation of the text.\textsuperscript{270}

\textsuperscript{264} These are CUL, MS Add. 8706; Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291; PML, MS M 775 and CUL, MS Kk.1.5, which was probably annotated in the early sixteenth century. OMC, MS Lat. 30 contains extensive annotations in a hand contemporary with that of the main scribe. I think that the annotator also made the extensive corrections to the text, discussed in the following chapter, p. 107.

\textsuperscript{265} These are Bodl. Lib, MSS Laud Misc. 416; Ashmole 45; LPL, Arc.L.40.2/E.42, NL, MS f.36, Ry 20 and CSJC, MS 76 D.I. It was probably an early Tudor hand which annotated Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338.

\textsuperscript{266} By this I exclude the three copies of the verse translation which carry scribal marginalia as part of the text. The other manuscripts are OMC, MS Lat. 30, Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, BL, MS Add. 8706, PML, MS M 775 and OUC, MS 85.

\textsuperscript{267} These are BL, MSS Add. 4713; Add. 14408; Sloane 2027; Cotton Titus A.XXIII, MS Royal 18 A.XII and Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233. BL, MS Lansdowne 285 contains only one marginal comment concerning the battle of Cannae.

\textsuperscript{268} For a recent application of this approach see K. Kerby-Fulton and D.L. Despres, Iconography and the Professional Reader: The Politics of Book Production in the Douce Piers Plowman (Minneapolis, 1999).

\textsuperscript{269} K. Sharpe, Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England (New Haven, 2000), p. 50.

\textsuperscript{270} Sharpe, Reading Revolutions, p. 51.
Several copies of these texts contain scribal annotations. Scribal annotations were not simply the product of a scribe's own reading of a text, but were also determined by his perception of the text's audience. Moreover, annotations affected the reception of a text and were 'written to influence the performance of the text in the public sphere, written, that is, as political acts and ideas'. The scribes of OMC, MS Lat. 30, Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, CUL, MS Add. 8706 and PML, MS M 775 annotated some of the Latin terms which are present in the prose translation. As Wakelin has suggested, this 'marginalia drew attention to the original Latin text'.

CUL, MS Add. 8706 shares close affiliations with Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291. Aside from the linguistic similarities of the two manuscripts, the system of 'nota' marks is also identical and presupposes a common ancestor. Yet, the scribe of CUL, MS Add. 8706, unlike that of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, also annotated passages concerning the importance of military strength. This variation suggests that these annotations were intentional, rather than conventional, acts. For example, the scribe annotated the passage that argues that: 'There is no thing so stronge ne so worschipful as is the comynalte in whiche is plente of wel tau3te werriours ffor ther nys neither gaynes of garmentes gold ne siluere ne schinnynge of precious petrey' and a passage about the importance of loyalty. He also annotated the passage which emphasises the importance of archers to the army: 'also Scipio of affrike whenne he was ysende by the Romayns to chastise the numantinus that rebelled a3ein Rome: he trowede not to haue

271 See the comments of Kerby-Fulton and Despres, Iconography and the Professional Reader, p. 71.
272 Sharpe, Reading Revolutions, p. 66.
273 See, for example, the marginal comment 'De domo dedali' in OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 56v; CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 49r.
274 Wakelin, 'Vernacular Humanism', p. 119.
277 CUL, MS, Add. 8706, fols 11v, 24v.
hadde the victorie of hem but in as miche as he hadde putte in euery warde of his oost chosen archeris of pris'.

In some cases, marginalia provides our only link with the reader. BL, MS Add. 4713, a copy of the prose translation, only contains the initials ‘I.M’. This early owner, however, wrote excerpts from Valerius and Godardus at the end of the prose translation. These quotes imply that the reader/writer had made connections between the prose translation and these other authors, and the presence of these notes also of course flagged the reader’s learned credentials. Furthermore, he or she wrote ‘per W. Caxton imprimendum’ (‘to be printed by W. Caxton’). This addition is interesting because the prose translation was not, of course, printed by Caxton: either the annotating reader was under the impression that it would be, or he had confused it with Pizan’s Livre des faits d’armes (parts of which were based on Vegetius), which was printed by Caxton in 1489.

Detailed commentaries, such as those provided by William Worcester, whose marginalia made explicit the links between text and context, obviously reveal the most about how readers interpreted their texts and how those readings related to the specific context in which they read. In his copy of a French translation of John Wales’

278 CUL, MS, Add. 8706, fol. 13r.  
279 BL, MS Add. 4713, fol. 93r.  
280 If this latter scenario was the case, it contributes to a long history of the misrepresentation of Pizan’s work as a translation of Vegetius. Brown has drawn attention to the fact that Antoine Vérand, in his 1488 edition of Pizan’s Livre des faits d’armes, changed the title of Pizan’s work to ‘Art de Chevalerie selon Vegece’ and replaced Pizan’s name with that of Vegetius: ‘purchasers would have thought they were reading a translation of Vegetius instead of a vernacular work by Christine de Pizan’. This may not have been a conscious decision: it has been established that Verard was using a copy of the B group of manuscripts which miss these details. Philippe Le Noir’s 1527 edition was also entitled ‘L’Arbre des batailles Et fleur du chevalerie selon Vegece’. C.J. Brown, ‘The Reconstruction of an Author in Print: Christine de Pizan in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries’, in M. Desmond (ed.), Christine de Pizan and the Categories of Difference (Minneapolis, 1998), p. 215. Even modern scholars have been guilty of this: Briggs treated Pizan’s work as a copy of De re militari; Briggs, Giles of Rome, p. 45.
Breviloquium, for example, Worcester annotated passages which argued that those
defeated often return as the victors, with the marginal comments 'pro Recuperacione
terrae perditii' and 'pour le courage dez anglez'. Worcester also annotated the passage
in his copy of John of Wales which argued that the advancement of base-born men
resulted in the impoverishment of the realm and damaged the common weal. He then
wrote 'nota bene pro Regno Anglie verifacato tempore Regis nunc' next to this
passage. Significantly, this same passage was annotated in Fastolf's copy of the same
text and is the only annotation in the manuscript. Another contemporary reader,
Richard Bole, dated his copy of Sallust's Jugurtha to 20 February 1461 and wrote: 'Quo
anno male pugnatum est per anglos contra anglos iuxta Sanctum Albanum 17 mensis
supradicti'.

Most readers, however, did not explain why they annotated a certain passage,
which presents us with problems. Is it correct to say that when Worcester annotated this
passage: 'que tout Roiaume qui est en soy diuisi et en discencion est en voie de peril et
de desolacion', he was thinking of England's current situation? What we know of
medieval reading practices does suggest that we can be relatively safe in making those
kinds of assumptions. Dagenais has argued that medieval reading practices were
different from contemporary practices and describes a strategy or practice he terms
ethical reading. Texts, rather than being understood as signifying or saying a particular
thing, were seen as engaging the reader in a series of personal ethical choices or

---

281 CUL, MS Add. 7870, fols. 52v-53r. These passages are also discussed in Wakelin, 'Vernacular
Humanism', p. 173.
282 CUL, MS Add. 7870, fol. 23v.
283 Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 570, fol. 18r.
284 'in which year there was awful fighting between the English at St. Albans the 17th of the
170-171.
285 CUL, MS Add. 7870, fol. 7v.
286 J. Dagenais, The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the Libro de Buen Amor
meditations. He asserts that medieval reading practices and expectations were far more interpretative than our own practices and that audiences sought to engage a text rhetorically and to elicit ethical models from texts.²⁹⁷ Readers did not expect to 'reduce texts to a single coherent reading but rather they attempted to construct a system or network of values and ethical positions'.²⁹⁸ Therefore, they related what they read to their own experiences and situations. In a recent study of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester's book ownership, Saygin argues that the authors and readers of advice literature 'concurred in the opinion that the theories propounded by the texts were immediately relevant to the everyday practice of politics'.²⁹⁹

That such reading practices were usual is demonstrated by the exegesis offered by both Worcester and Bole in their marginalia mentioned above and in commentary which is verbalised to the extent of the creation of new book, such as that offered by Malory in the Morte Darthur. For example, Malory connected the civil war which brought about the end of the Round Table to England's experience of civil war, by admonishing 'all Englysshemen' who still followed the 'olde custom and usayges' of being discontented with their king.²⁹⁹

Yet brief annotations do require more interpretative licence: for example why did scribes and readers annotate the following passage?

Alle naciouns and folkes þat nygh ben to þe sonne as þilke þat dwellen in þe south, þey ben wyse and wytty of counsail, for þei drye of hete of þe sonne; but for þey haue but litel blood þey ben no3t stedfast ne bold ne hardy to fy3te, for þei dremen woundes, harmes and hurtes, for þei knowe wel þey haue but litel

²⁹⁷ Dagenais, The Ethics of Reading, p. 62.
²⁹⁹ S. Saygin, Humphrey, duke of Gloucester (1390-1447) and the Italian Humanists (Leiden, 2002), p. 61.
blood. But bilke þat dwellen in þe north, fer fro þe hete of þe sonne, þey ben noȝt so wyse of counsel as þo ben þat dwellen in þe south, but þei ben more habundant ful of blood, and þerfore þey ben more hardy and bolde to fiȝte and to werre, and boldloker dore abide woundes and strokes. 291

The scribe of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291 wrote 'nota bene' next to this passage and then an early reader underlined his marginal comment and drew a pointing hand. 292 The scribe of CUL, MS Add. 8706 wrote 'nota nota nota' next to the same passage and highlighted it visually with a blue paraph mark. 293 The scribe of BL, MS Add. 14408 also wrote 'nota bene' alongside this passage on fol. 50r, as did the scribe of OMC, MS Lat. 30. 294

Perhaps the interest of scribes and readers in this passage reflects the discourse evident in Whethamstede’s chronicle that the civil war, particularly from 1460 onwards, was a war of the north against the south, a view also expressed in the poem on the battle of Towton. 295 That people read this passage of Vegetius in this way is demonstrated by Whethamstede's chronicle written before 1465: Whethamstede used the passage to support the assertions of geographic difference he made in his chronicle. He describes how at the Second Battle of St Albans of 1461, the men from the south showed bravery at the beginning of the battle, but lacked endurance:

291 Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, fols. 6r-6v; Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book 1, chapter 2, p. 50.
292 Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, fols. 6r-6v.
293 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 3r.
294 OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 4r.
Sed quia, secundum Vegetium, ‘De Re Militari’ in omni regione populi illi qui Australes sunt, vel Orientales, propinquius soli nati, minus aliiis habent sanguinis, quia magis per solem desiccati, ideo molliores tenerioresque in se sunt, et ex consequenti ad pugnandum contra hostes coniunx sohliores [...]

Even if we cannot make the claim that readers were consciously relating this passage in the prose translation to the civil wars, the annotations do provide evidence that readers were conscious of the differences between north and south – differences in politics, allegiance and behaviour. This is indirectly supported by Yorkist propaganda, which claimed that men from the north had been given licence to plunder southern wealth.\textsuperscript{297} Clement Paston wrote to his brother, John Paston I, in 1461 that

\begin{quote}
In thys cwntré every man is well wylllyng to goo wyth my lordys here, and I hope God xall helpe hem, fore ýe pepill in ýe northe robbe and styll and ben apoyntyd to pill all thys cwntré, and gyffe a-way menys goodys and lyfflodys in all ýe sowthe cwntré, and that wyll ask a myscheffe.\textsuperscript{298}
\end{quote}

Whethamstede implored Henry VI to make a proclamation against pillage, but instead his army:

\begin{quote}
Erant enim omnes libertati licentiatiique, prout asseruerant, per Reginam et proceres Boreales, ad rapiendum et capiendum quicquid abhici locorum citha Trentam invenire poterant, per viam remunerationis et recompensationis pro laboribus suis.\textsuperscript{299}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{296} ‘But because, according to Vegetius’s “Epitoma rei militaris”, in each country those people who are Southerners or Easterners, being born closer to the sun, have less blood than others, because they are more dried out by the sun; therefore they are softer and more tender in themselves, and as a consequence less fit for fighting against enemies [...] When the Northerners saw this, who all, according to the aforementioned author, because they are more remote than others from the burning of the sun, [and] therefore have more blood, and are more ready, [and] are moreover, even more keen in the shedding of it’; Riley (ed.), \textit{Registrum Abbatiae Johannis Whethamstede}, 1: 390-91.

\textsuperscript{297} Goodman, \textit{Wars of the Roses}, p. 215.


\textsuperscript{299} ‘they were all at liberty and licensed, as they asserted, by the Queen and the Northern lords, to plunder and seize anything they could find anywhere on this side of the Trent, by way of
Significantly, this rhetoric continued into Henry VII’s reign.\textsuperscript{300}

Readers’ annotations in manuscripts, often in the form of ‘nota’ marks or pointing hands, reveal an insight into the agenda a reader brought to the text or the goal to which their reading was directed. For example, the assumption that \textit{De re militari} was used solely as a military handbook is not borne out by the evidence of the manuscripts, although passages concerning practical issues such as victualling were highlighted by readers.\textsuperscript{301} Thomas Rotherham, for example, as well as highlighting passages concerned with the common good, also drew attention to sections about the amount of space that was needed when fighting and passages concerning the use of guns in the war against the Welsh.\textsuperscript{302} Other themes, such as the names for parts of the Roman army and weather prognostications, were also highlighted. Thomas Rotherham and the anonymous reader of OMC, MS Lat. 30 annotated passages concerned with loyalty: ‘ffor be he kny3t or what euere elles he be |pat feithfuliche seruep |he Emperour he seruep God in asmoche as hee feithfulliche lovep him |pat regnep bi goddes ordenaunce’.\textsuperscript{303}

Although such acts of interpretation occurred ‘in the private space between the reader and the page’, they were also ‘situated within a community of interpretive and

---


\textsuperscript{301} For the argument that \textit{De re militari} was used as a practical military handbook in war see, for example, Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, \textit{Richard III’s Books}, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{302} CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 70r, 91r.

\textsuperscript{303} CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 24v; OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 28v; Lester (ed.), \textit{English Translation of Vegetius}, book II, chapter 5, p. 81.
hence political practices. As Slights has argued, no marginal note is politically or ideologically innocent. Much of what follows in this thesis rests upon the premise that annotations were deliberate acts by readers and that the annotator represented a particular discourse community. In other words, his or her annotations were not made in a cultural vacuum, but were both produced by, and representative of, a specific historical context.

This chapter has sought to demonstrate that the texts, translations and manuscripts containing English translations of Latin and French military texts produced during the fifteenth century may be used as alternative sources for exploring the way contemporaries viewed their experiences and for locating the range of models and discourses available to them. Rather than generalising about the appeal of these works, as has been the tendency of scholarship, we should consider instead their cultural specificity, their manuscript context and how changes made to each work or manuscript might profitably be explained with reference to the communities in which they circulated. When generalisations have to be made they should arise from the manuscript evidence. Any text might give rise to multiple interpretations and as such, it is impossible to be definitive. However, a close study of translation change and marginalia provides vital evidence of the way in which individual readers shaped their readings.

These texts contained ideas which were actually common to the genre of the military or chivalric treatise. However, standard arguments or criticisms were transformed by the context within which these texts were received. As Sharpe has


305 W.E. Slight argues that 'Just as there are no politically innocent texts, so too there are no politically neutral marginalia' in "Marginal Notes that Spoile the Text: Scriptural Annotation in the English Renaissance", Huntington Library Quarterly 55 (1992): 258.
argued, 'no conventions or tropes are without a history; and the changing selection, articulation and deployment of them requires closer attention [...] Indeed, the chronology of imitation and appropriation raises important questions'. For example, Vegetius's discussion of discipline acquired a different meaning in the context of the Anglo-French occupation, as did Chartier's discussion of loyalty in the context of the Wars of the Roses. By concentrating on how translators and scribes changed texts and how readers annotated them we can avoid the danger of finding 'unique' correlations between text and context, which are actually intrinsic to the genre of writing and part of that tradition. Such evidence demonstrates that writers and readers engaged with stock 'timeless' criticisms, related them to their own experiences and applied them to their own cultural and political contexts.

Moreover, these authors, translators and readers were 'studying for action', seeking to reform England's 'harde covetous hertes' so that the French lands could be reclaimed and kept and so that there could be an end to civil war. Both Chartier and Worcester emphasised that even after the catastrophic defeat of the Romans at Cannae, the Romans reformed and succeeded in defeating Hannibal. The reader of the English translation of Pizan's *Livre du corps de polioie* annotated the story which described how the Carthaginians broke the peace with Rome, believing that they had the superior military strength, but were actually defeated by the Romans in battle. The scribe of OUC, MS 85, a copy of the U translation of the *Quadrilogue Inveclif*, and the scribe of CSJC, MS 76 D. I, a copy of the R translation, annotated the passage which argued that: 'The enmyes

---

307 The phrase 'studied for action' is used by A. Grafton and L. Jardine in their article "Studied for Action: How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy", *Past and Present* 129 (1990): 30-78. Worcester uses the expression 'harde covetouse hert' in a passage in the *Boke of Nablesse*, p. 84.
308 CUL, MS Kk.1.5, fol. 54v; Bornstein (ed.), *Middle English Translation of Livre du corps*, book II, chapter 13, p. 144.
ben nat made of erthe inmortal nor indeuiable more than ye be. They haue nothir
glaynes nor harneys but ye haue the same, nor they ben nat of so grete nombre but that
ye be as many or more'. An early reader of the prose translation of De re militari,
contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, annotated the passage that argued that those
who in the beginning of a conflict are victorious are often later defeated.

This chapter has demonstrated that these manuscripts, with their scribal
rewritings, marginalia and 'codicological aesthetics', are substantially different both from
the French and Latin versions from which they derive and from each other. Marginalia
suggests that readers were making links between the lessons of Roman history and the
problems faced by England both domestically and externally, whilst the incidence of
rewritings and the proliferation of manuscripts at this point do suggest that this was a
new market. The readers and makers of these manuscripts modernised them through
annotations and rubrics, illuminations depicting medievalised 'contemporary' figures and
scenes, and by imposing heraldic devices. The act of reading vernacular versions also
facilitated the application of the lessons the texts contained because during translation
the texts were updated and made more culturally specific. Translators, producers and
readers thus rendered these texts so that they not only reflected the political
uncertainties and tensions of the period, but would continue to do so for several

309 OUC, MS 85, fol. 10r; CSJC, MS 76 D. I, fol. 7r; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le
Quadrilogue Insectif, 1: 165.
310 'he happe wel nygh and endes of alle batailles is pis þat þilke þat in the byginnynge haue yben
victores & ouercomeres in þe ende þey haue ben ouercome hem self'; Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291,
311 PML, MS M 775, for example, contains 'several illustrations that serve as visual records of an
actual historical moment'. For example, a pen and ink drawing depicts the feats of arms between
Piers de Masse and Sir John Astley. Driver suggests that the building in the illustration is
probably meant to be the Bastille, erected by Charles V in 1369; M.W. Driver, 'Medievalizing the
Classical Past in Pierpont Morgan MS M 876', in A.J. Minnis (ed.), Middle English Poetry Texts and
decades. As the prose translation argued, the lessons the manuscripts contained applied
'not onliche to the world that now ys but also for the worlde that is comyng'.

Chapter Three

Owners, Readers and Makers

The previous chapter argued that the evidence derived from a close study of the ways English military texts were read provides insights into how individual readers responded to the experience of defeat and civil war in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. This chapter will relate the manuscripts in which these texts survive to their owners and make some tentative suggestions about the types of agendas these individuals might have brought to their reading. First, I shall assess the evidence for ownership of these manuscripts, discuss the various communities which formed around these texts, and suggest some of the contexts that gave rise to their reading. I shall then consider both the ways in which these texts were transmitted and the pre-existing networks which facilitated the exchange of books and ideas.

To own a text did not, of course, necessarily mean that it was read or used. Studying the reception of texts is problematic in any case, but particularly so with a text like De re militari. The assumption that most aristocratic libraries contained a copy of De re militari in one form or another raises the issue of whether it was wanted solely as a status symbol.¹ Such an attitude is implicit in much of the secondary literature on the text. Lester, for example, states that 'probably nearly every active military man would have owned a copy of Vegetius and few fifteenth-century aristocratic libraries would have been without one'.² This has the effect of foregrounding status as the reason for ownership of the text and displacing other historically specific motives. In other words,

---

simply assuming that people owned Vegetius because it was expected of them means that alternative reasons for why people chose to own the text are not explored. Moreover, it suggests that people wanted to own, and to be seen to own, Vegetius, rather than to read it.

The manuscript evidence, however, suggests that these texts were read by their owners. This is suggested primarily by the readers' annotations discussed in the preceding chapter: most copies of these texts contain annotations which were made in hands that can be dated on palaeographical grounds to the second half of the fifteenth century. Moreover, Thomas Rotherham, the owner of CUL, MS Add. 8706, which contains solely a copy of the prose translation of *De re militari*, explained unusual words, such as 'sowde' (which is explained as 'bagys of goodis') and did so consistently throughout the text. He also wrote the book number at the top of each page, so he could easily locate the part of the treatise from which he was reading.

The manuscript evidence also demonstrates that, from the point of view of production, the intended audience was a 'reading' audience: the producers of the manuscripts clearly thought that the text would be read. High-status manuscripts such as Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291 and OMC, MS Lat. 30 are traditionally assumed to have been 'coffee-table' volumes, owned for reasons of status rather than for reading. Yet, these manuscripts are extremely user-friendly. Aside from their size (26x17cm and 25x16cm respectively), paragraphing is used continually and often in conjunction with

---

3 See the discussion in the previous chapter, p. 93.
4 For example, on fol. 34v.
'nota' marks to draw attention to certain parts of the text and to facilitate navigation within it.5

The 'readability' of OMC, MS Lat. 30 is also attested to for precisely the reasons it has been dismissed by the editor of the prose translation of De re militari. Lester bemoans the fact that this copy of the text was extensively corrected in a near contemporary hand;6 one assumes that this was the hand of the main scribe of the workshop or of someone taking a supervisory role. This correction often 'involved the provision of a plausible alternative to a difficulty in the text'; clearly the scribe was trying to make the text more manageable and, by implication, more readable.7 William Ebesham, the professional scribe of the large heraldic and chivalric miscellany identified as John Paston's 'Grete Boke', also 'internally translated' the texts it contained: he corrected sections and words that may have hindered clear understanding. For example, in the poem on the coronation of Henry VI, Ebesham changed the incoherent 'three dukes were in present' to 'three dukes were in presens'.8 The scribes of two of the manuscripts of the verse translation of De re militari (Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45 and BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII) glossed unusual words. For example, the word 'rutilaunt' was glossed as 'quik and cleer'.9 The evidence does then suggest that producers expected

5 This evidence runs counter to the findings of other research into the 'readability' of deluxe manuscripts. Echard, for example, has recently found that the more deluxe manuscripts containing Gower's Confessio Amantis were also the least reader-friendly; S. Echard, 'Dialogues and Monologues: Manuscript Representations of the Conversation of the Confessio Amantis', in A.J. Minnis (ed.), Middle English Poetry Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of Derek Pearsall (York, 2001), p. 70.
7 Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, p. 40. One of many examples occurs in book IV, chapter 10, which concerns the importance of ensuring a water supply for a town under siege. The other manuscripts state 'þan moste þou kepe thi water fressher & defende hem with schot', whilst OMC, MS Lat. 30 states that one must defend the water 'feccheres' thus making much more sense.
8 For a discussion of internal translation see H.H. Glidden, 'Marot's Roman de la Rose and Evangelical Poetics', in J. Beer and K. Lloyd-Jones (eds.), Translation and the Transmission of Culture between 1300-1600 (Kalamazoo, 1995), pp. 143-174.
9 BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII, fol. 3r.
these manuscripts to be read and that the majority of their owners did, indeed, read them. Therefore, they were not owned merely as status symbols.
3.1 Ownership

Identifying the owners of medieval manuscripts can be problematic. A higher proportion of institutional manuscripts is likely to survive, and bear marks of ownership, because of superior methods of preserving manuscripts and the practice of making inventories. Private, armigerous owners often have their coats of arms depicted in their manuscripts, but manuscripts owned by those lower down the social scale are less easy to identify. Some book ownership can be identified through testamentary evidence, but unfortunately testators did not always mention their books and, if they did, they tended to give them a generic title ('my English books' for example), rather than name each individual volume. However, of the twenty manuscripts in my corpus, excluding Worcester's Book of Noblesse, fifteen can be identified with owners with a reasonable degree of certainty, which means that we can begin to draw some conclusions about the types of audience for these texts.

The earliest extant manuscript is Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233, which contains John Trevisa's translation of Giles of Rome's De regimine principum and the prose translation of De re militari. This manuscript was probably produced for Thomas, Lord Berkeley, the patron of both of the translations the volume contains, at some point between 1408 and his death in 1417. His probable ownership is suggested by the dialect

---

10 Even when titles are named, identifications can be problematic. For example, does the title 'De regimine principum' refer to Giles of Rome's text, Trevisa's translation, Hoccleve's version or one of the many versions of the Secreta secretorum? The problems associated with testamentary evidence are discussed in S.H. Cavanaugh, 'A Study of Books Privately Owned in England, 1300-1450' (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1980), pp. 8-11; K. Harris, 'Patrons, Buyers and Owners: The Evidence for Ownership and the Role of Book Owners in Book Production and the Book Trade', in J. Griffiths and D. Pearsall (eds.), Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475 (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 163-5.

11 The manuscripts with no marks of ownership are OMC, MS Lat. 30 and BL, MS Add. 4713. Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45 contains the name 'William Browne' and CSJC, MS 76.D.I. contains the name Richard Aldborough, but these names are too common to identify the owners. LPL, MS Arc. L.40.2/E.42 has the name 'Peter Idyll', but I am not convinced this is a signature.
of the scribe of Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233, which is southwestern, with features localisable to the region around Berkeley castle.\(^{12}\) A comparison of this manuscript with Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 953, a copy of Richard Rolle's glossed prose English psalter, which can be firmly identified as belonging to Berkeley, is also suggestive: the same artist executed the decorated borders in both manuscripts and the same hand corrected both books.\(^{13}\) Furthermore, the swan badge on fol. 199v may suggest the intended ownership of Thomas Berkeley's daughter, Elizabeth and her husband, Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick.\(^{14}\)

The first owners of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291 may have been the Chalons family of Challonsleigh in Plympton, Devon. The note: 'This book was wrote in the life time of Robert Chalons, son of Robert Chalons, by Joanne Beauchamp... and I take it this Robert dyed 23 H6', is written in a seventeenth-century hand on fol. vi. The manuscript also contains a genealogy of the Chalons family with heraldic illustrations on fols. 1r-3v and contains a reference to 'Robert Chalous knyght that now is' on fol. 3v. Sir Robert Chalons was the son and heir of Robert Chalons and Joan, daughter of John Beauchamp.\(^{15}\) He died in 1445, so the manuscript must have been made at some point shortly before then. Other evidence suggests that this manuscript was made for someone living in the Devonshire region: the scribe of the prose translation has a


\(^{13}\) C. F. Briggs, Giles of Rome's De regimine principum: Reading and Writing Politics at Court and University, c. 1275-1525 (Cambridge, 1999), p. 85.

\(^{14}\) Mary, Lady Hastings and Hungerford, daughter-in-law of William, Lord Hastings, chamberlain of Edward IV certainly owned the manuscript in the late fifteenth century. It contains the note: 'loyalite me ley/ Mary Hastyns Hungreford/ bottreaux mollens and Mulles/ god help me' on fol. 228r. There is also a link between the earliest manuscript of the verse translation and the Hastings family, see below, p. 116.

southwest Midlands dialect and his hand has been identified in other manuscripts which all share West Country provenance.¹⁶

After the Chalons, this book came into the hands of John Smert, who was Garter King of Arms from 28 March 1450 to 1478. According to Lester, ‘an erased inscription on fol. 136r, partially visible under ultraviolet light’, says: ‘Iste liber constat Iohan Smert, alias dictus Garter Regi Armorum’ and ‘Liber Gartier Regis Armorum’ is also written on the initial vellum flyleaf.”¹⁷ The manuscript may have first been in the possession of Smert’s father in law, William Bruges, 1st Garter King of Arms (d. 1449): beneath the defaced shield on fol. 1r are the words ‘W B[?] book’.¹⁸

*CUL, MS Add. 8706* which, judging by the hand, was produced in the mid-fifteenth century, contains solely a copy of the prose translation. It was owned by Thomas Rotherham, who signed the book on numerous occasions (see Plate one).¹⁹

---

¹⁶ The scribe has been identified in BL, MS Egerton 2863 (*Canterbury Tales* owned by Lady Stourton) and BL, MS Harley 45, fols. 1r-168r, a prose *Speculum vitae* owned in the fifteenth century by Dame Margaret Brent. I am grateful to Professor Linne Mooney for this information.


¹⁸ The son of Sir Robert Chalons’, John (d. 1447), killed Louis de Bueil in a joust held before Charles VII at Tours, 5 February 1446, which is recorded in Paston’s ‘Grete Boke’ on fol. 48v. Bruges was Garter King of Arms for this joust and had to certify the gentility of John, which might explain how the manuscript came into his possession; H.S. London, *The Life of William of Bruges, the First Garter King of Arms*, Harleian Society 111/112 (1970), p. 20. The only reference I have found elsewhere to John Chalons is in a land settlement in Hereford dated 4 November 1442; *CPR*, 1441-1446, p. 146. With the death of John, the Chalons lands passed to Sir Robert’s two granddaughters, the children of Katherine St. Aubyn; Roskell, Clark and Rawcliffe, *The House of Commons*, 3: 510.

¹⁹ Rotherham signed fol. 22v in brown ink; ‘Thomas Rotherham boke’ is written on fols. 33r, 35r, 71r, 72r, 102v.
that sise logauns monen be ordeyned of choisen fylkescrose
wel fised and pried in weyres & thay thoughs he borne
in his regownd songe priedere. if thay be sliggetter
used day by day to bodes of ames wost onych in
the mawninge but al so ater noon: thay puiden
be with pyned aitnde wisel etene presse whylke
fylkescrose: the whiche gan gysome the coumbe ned
be a doute. bit no man thor nere though the alde
custym of weyres be changed: the whiche custyme
euer trewe was: bit a sone the wisom is
pone this game may be well answere, bit to you ben
perdy at a mowe neuer: to pur depere a depere al:
thynge that professtere ben for deserc of erne
comnualte: and al su to you longere to pude the nude
pretres of weyres: and to bode aitnde: to the part
that is forfettn: to knowe to sone elwes be he
merk frangynge and harpe or it be appere: bit
sone is sworn: ben chosen to weyre: styrwy
an coyte be orwnes and arrawd: that is it pat
ne may be fulfylde in bode: with appere a despert.
if neyfrede and conenable coptes: ne ben aconert:
demphe. In opponus elgynge tolong he
bet not sman cobyn corpus: of fayr calculus
on it longe to sugyste. he comptyneste
sume a counte and selene. For The Ep.
an inticte so that in logeins ther ben manpe
spoces and appes: that weseth to have preuious
of leeted fylkescrose: that ben frangynge in wiun
brynge of the peple and erfynge of a countes.
wherefore it weseth to ben that ben chesere of

Thomas Rotherham's copy of the prose translation
Rotherham served as chaplain to John Vere, 12th earl of Oxford, who was later executed for treason in February 1462, became Keeper of the Privy Seal from 1467-1474 and royal chancellor from 27 May 1474-1483. In 1480 he became archbishop of York and master of Pembroke College.20

Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416 contains the prose translation in a separate booklet. The final leaf of the booklet (fol. 226v) contains the scribal note: 'Scriptum Rhodo per Johannem Newton die xxv Octobris 1459'. Watson suggests that 'Rhodo' probably refers to Rhodes in either Lancashire or Cheshire.21 John Newton may possibly be the John Neuton, prior of Battle Abbey, who also owned a Brut, although this is by no means certain.22 Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416 certainly came into the possession of a religious house: the inscription 'syster Anne colvylle' can be found on the rear pastedown alongside a request for prayers: 'of your charyte pray for sustyr clementia tryburgh'. Anne Colville was a nun at Syon in the early sixteenth century.23 This is the only copy of the prose translation which can be identified with a religious house, but it is not known who owned it before it came into the possession of Syon abbey.

PML, MS M 775 was acquired by John Astley before 1461. His ownership can be established by the inclusion of two texts concerning his own deeds of arms when he was an esquire, the presence of three pictures with his crest, arms or armorial colours and the addition of his arms to three folios (fols. 25r, 131r, 274r). Two pieces of

23 Colville and Thasebrough are named in a 1518 list of Syon nuns; G.J. Aungier, The History and Antiquities of Syon Monastery, the Parish of Isleworth, and the Chapel of Hounslow (London, 1840), pp. 81-2.
evidence suggest that the manuscript was produced before 1461: his armorial bearings lack the Garter, which he received in 1461, and there are two references to Henry VI (which were later erased) who was deposed in 1461. It could not have been finished before 1449, because it contains the Secrets of Philosophers, whose author, John Lydgate, died in 1449, leaving it unfinished.24

BL, MS Sloane 2027, produced between 1461-1474, is a paper manuscript, which was owned by William Brandon of Knowle in the county of Warwick.25 Little is known about Brandon, but he was probably a descendent of the Nicholas Brandon who received rents resolute from the College of Knowle.26 Carpenter's comprehensive listing of Warwickshire gentry does not include a William Brandon.27 A 'Nicolaus Brawndon' of nearby Sheldon, and his wife 'Elena', were members of the Guild of St. Anne at Knowle in 1485/6.28 Radulescu has recently suggested that the owner of BL, MS Sloane 2027 may have been the William Brandon who was briefly Thomas Malory's gaoler.29 William Brandon of Framlingham (Marshal of King's Bench, recorded in office in 1457, 1458 and 1460) was also connected with the Duke of Norfolk, who dismissed him in

24 PML, MS M 775, fols. 139r-195r. Lydgate had completed only 1491 lines of the Secrets of Philosophers before his death in 1449 or 1450; the remaining 1239 lines are a continuation by Benedict Burgh.
25 The signature 'Wylliam Brandun (also Brandon) of knoll in the counte of waryke' occurs on fol. 96r and with variations on fols. 62r, 94r, 95r, 142r. It used to be thought that this was the Sir William Brandon of Soham of Cambridgeshire who was associated with Duke of Norfolk and involved in the Paston's attempts to regain the manor of Stockton, but if this was the case it seems strange that he signed himself from Knowle. It contains watermarks close to Briquet's no. 9481 (1467 and 1474).
26 W.B. Bickley (ed.), The Register of the Guild of Knowle, the County of Warwick, 1451-1535 (Walsall, 1894), p. xxiii; Meale, 'Patrons, Buyers and Owners', p. 233, n. 88.
1460 for allowing prisoners to 'go about at large'.\textsuperscript{30} However, Radulescu's suggestion, though intriguing, is far from conclusive.

BL, MS Lansdowne 285 can be identified as the 'Grete Boke' mentioned in the Paston letters as belonging to Sir John Paston (d.1479). The 'Grete Boke' is referred to in two bills from William Ebesham to Sir John Paston dating from after June/July 1468, so it was probably begun in 1468.\textsuperscript{31} Close comparison of the contents of BL, MS Lansdowne 285 and Ebesham's descriptions prove that BL, MS Lansdowne 285 is indeed the 'Grete Boke'.\textsuperscript{32}

BL, MS Add. 14408 is another paper manuscript, dated by its scribe to 1473, which was owned by Nicholas Seyntlo, sheriff of Somerset and Devon, whose \textit{ex libris} appears on fol. 73r.\textsuperscript{33}

The final manuscript containing the prose translation identifiable with an owner is that belonging to Richard III: BL, MS Royal 18 AXII, produced in 1483-4 in London, contains Richard's arms on fol. 1r.\textsuperscript{34}


\textsuperscript{33} The \textit{ex libris} is written in black in a contemporary hand: 'C'est liure appartient nycolas de saint lo cheualier'; BL, MS Add. 14408, fol. 73r. His election as sheriff is recorded in H.C. Maxwell-Lyte and M.C.B. Dawes (eds.), \textit{The Register of Bishop Bekynton}, Somerset Record Society 49 (1934), pp. 275-77.

\textsuperscript{34} Its intended use is suggested by the presence of the arms of Richard III, his wife Anne Neville, and the griffin of his son. The border decoration is similar to that found in Harvard Law School, MS 25, dated 5 March 1476, and owned by William Hastings, and other works with a London provenance; Meale, 'Patrons, Buyers and Owners', p. 204.
Only one of the three extant copies of the verse translation of *De re militari* can be firmly identified with an owner.\(^{35}\) **BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII**, which judging by the hand and the watermarks dates from the late 1460s or early 1470s, was probably owned by William Hatteclyff (d. 1480), physician and secretary to Edward IV.\(^{36}\) The scribe wrote ‘Finis libri’ on fol. 56v which was then finished in Greek with ‘quod αποκλήσθη’ written in another hand and it contains the note ‘Constat Edwardo Hatteclyff’ on fol. 57r. Edward Hatteclyff was William’s son. He began attending Winchester College and later New College, Oxford, after 1482 so, as Wakelin suggests, **BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII** may first have belonged to William.\(^{37}\)

**CPC, MS 243**, another copy of the verse translation, may have been owned by the family of William and Ralph Hastings.\(^{38}\) According to Wakelin, Hastings obtained the positions and property of Beaumont’s son in 1461.\(^{39}\) Beaumont was the verse translation’s patron so presumably would have owned a copy. The names ‘glyntham’ and ‘brantynghthorp’ are also written in the manuscript and it contains a warrant dated ‘in the xxiith yere of our [Henry VIII’s?] Reyn’ at Woking.\(^{40}\) The warrant requests servants ‘within my park at wansted’ to deliver to ‘Richard Arture’ a ‘sprinkke of seafun’ from the estate. William, Lord Hastings (c.1430-1483), owned land in Bruntingthorpe, Leicestershire while his brother, Ralph Hastings (d. 1495), owned Wansted Park in Essex.\(^{41}\)

\(^{35}\) Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45 contains the name ‘William Browne’ on fol. 40r.

\(^{36}\) The watermarks in this manuscript are most like Briquet 9181-83, which date from 1464, 1467 and 1472.

\(^{37}\) D. Wakelin, ‘The Occasion, Author and Readers of *Knyghthode and Bataile*’, forthcoming in *Medium Aevum* (2004). I am grateful to Dr Wakelin for sending me a copy of this prior to publication.

\(^{38}\) This identification has been advanced by Dr Wakelin; Wakelin, ‘The Occasion, Author and Readers of *Knyghthode and Bataile*’.


\(^{40}\) CPC, MS 243, fol. 56v.

\(^{41}\) Wakelin, ‘The Occasion, Author and Readers of *Knyghthode and Bataile*’. 
The Whetehill family of Calais may have been the owners of OUC, MS 85, which contains the only extant copy of the U translation of the *Quadrilogue Invectif*. The manuscript contains a badge on fol. 1r showing ‘a man’s arms embowed, clothed, azure, supporting between the hands a wheatsheaf, proper, above a green mound’ with a motto on scroll below. It has been suggested that this manuscript was owned by the Wheatley family of Echingfield, Sussex, or a member of the Garneys family but, given the form of the badge, the Whetehill family seems more likely.

**Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338**, possibly the earliest copy of the R translation of the *Quadrilogue Invectif*, was certainly owned by the Heydon family of Norfolk. The arms of the Heydon family (quarterly, argent and gules, a cross engrailed counterchanged) are painted within the opening initial and the manuscript contains the signatures ‘harry’ in the margin on left-hand side of fol. 34v, ‘elysabe’ on fol. 42r and the bottom of fol. 47r; ‘Anne Heydon’ on fols. 102v, 112r and 111v and ‘Amy’ written on fol. 111v. These signatures are those of Henry Heydon and of his wife Anne and two of his five daughters.

**NL, MS f.36, Ry 20** was probably owned by a Lincolnshire monastery: on the front pastedown ‘Christoforus Lincolne Monachus’ is written in red in fifteenth-century textualis, the final letter is historiated with face of a monk, which may refer to the scribe or the rubricator. The manuscript seems to have remained in the monastery. Following a summary of Boethius on fol. 207v is the note: ‘J. Clynton proré scrpt. 148—’.

CUL, MS Kk.1.5, which contains the only extant copy of the English translation of Pizan's *Livre du corps de police*, was owned by the Haute family, whose literary and cultural interests have been studied by Peter Fleming. The opening initial contains the coat of arms of the Haute and Shelving families, based in Kent. The manuscript is written in a hand of the late fifteenth century and was probably written in the 1470s. There are several candidates for the ownership of this manuscript, of which the most likely is either Sir William Haute (d. 1492), the son of William Haute and Joan, the daughter of Richard Woodville, or Sir Richard Haute (d. 1492), the son of Nicholas Haute. However, it is impossible to know which member of this family commissioned or read this manuscript because, although it contains extensive annotations, it contains no signatures.

The most striking feature about the audience for these texts is the proportion of owners who were men with military experience. Of the sixteen identifiable owners, twelve had experience in either the Hundred Years War or in the campaigns in France and Scotland after the fall of Normandy, either in an active military capacity or diplomatically, experiences which one assumes they brought to bear upon their reading. Thomas, Lord Berkeley, the patron of the prose translation and probable owner of the earliest extant manuscript containing it, Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233, fought in the wars against France, Spain and Scotland in the 1370s and 1380s and was involved in Henry IV's campaigns in Wales against Owen Glendower. Sir John Astley, the owner of

---

46 There were two Richard Hautes in the fifteenth century. Richard the elder (d. 1487) and Richard the younger (d. 1492).
PML, MS M 775, fought in France before 1453. He was mustered, for example, as a mounted man-at-arms to serve in Orleans on 29 January 1429 and Gisors on 20 August 1430. He also served in Bayonne in 1451. He was one of Edward IV's first elected knights of the Garter in 1461 and was appointed the king's standard-bearer in 1461. He was also on Edward IV's expedition in 1462 to the north, made captain of Alnwick in 1463, taken prisoner by the Lancastrians, sent to France and finally ransomed in December 1466. Astley also participated in feats of arms: as an esquire he performed a joust in 1438 in Paris against Piers de Masse whom he killed, and he fought against Philippe de Boyle at Smithfield in 1442. He also counselled Sir Anthony Woodville in his feat of arms in Smithfield in 1467 against the Bastard of Burgundy.

John Smert, an owner of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, who was Garter King of Arms from 28 March 1450 to 1478, was present on the 1475 French campaign and was also active diplomatically. The first owners of this manuscript were probably the Chalons family of Devon. Sir Robert Chalons fought in France in 1415, 1416 and

48 I am grateful to Dr Grummitt for this information derived from documents in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France.
52 CPR 1461-1467, pp. 10, 190, 262.
53 Astley had these acts recorded in PML, MS M 775: the 'challenge of Piers de Masse to Astley' (fols. 275v-6v) and the 'challenge of Philippe de Boyle to Astley' (fols. 277v-79r).
54 We are told this in the account of combat between Woodville and the Bastard of Burgundy in BL, MS Lansdowne 285, fol. 29v.
55 The roll of the leaders shows that Smert was on the 1475 expedition, receiving 4s a day. According to London, he was fundamental in securing the peace between France and England; London, *William of Bruges*, p. 32. His meeting with Louis XI is recorded in Commynes; Philippe de Commynes, *Memoirs: The Reign of Louis XI, 1461-83*, ed. M. Jones (Harmondsworth, 1972), p. 239.
1422. Sir John Paston, another owner of the prose translation, served at sea in 1462 and was the commander of a naval force in October 1468. His brother, John III, went north in the retinue of the Duke of Norfolk in 1462 to fight on the side of the Yorkists. The two Paston brothers, however, fought for the earl of Warwick in the Battle of Barnet, in the earl of Oxford's retinue. John Paston II also tourneyed alongside Anthony Woodville in 1467. All three of the Paston brothers served in the army which Edward IV led into France in 1475.

Richard Whetehill, the probable owner of OUC, MS 85, a copy of the U translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif, was controller of Calais from December 1460 and was made lieutenant of Guines by Warwick in January 1461, a post which he retained under William, Lord Hastings, until his death in February 1478. He was also active diplomatically at the court of Louis XI. Of course, William Hattecliff and Thomas Rotherham were frequently employed on diplomatic missions.

Richard III, as duke of Gloucester, had also been active in the wars in France and Scotland and has been termed a 'leading member of the war party against France'.

---

58 Davis (ed.), Paston Letters, 1: 524.
60 Davis (ed.), Paston Letters, 1: 396, 545, 566, 570.
In 1472, there was a rumour that Richard would take an army across to Normandy. He commanded the largest personal retinue on the 1475 campaign in France and was apparently opposed (if we are to believe Commynes) to the treaty of Picquigny. Richard was made lieutenant-general of the north on 12 May 1480 and in 1482 he led the campaign against Scotland.

Richard Haute, the possible owner of CUL, MS Kk.1.5, was also on the Scottish campaign of 1482 and was knighted by Richard, duke of Gloucester, during the campaign. He fought for Henry VII during the northern progress of Easter 1486 and at the Battle of Stoke in 1487. Sir William Haute was created Knight of the Bath in 1465. Moreover, members of the Haute family had been active in the French wars. Sir William's father and grandfather were mustered in the retinue of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, for Henry V's first expedition to France. His uncle, Nicholas, was mustered in the retinue of Sir Richard Woodville for the expedition to Normandy on 26 March 1441.

Another owner was involved in the practical preparations of coastal defence in his capacity as sheriff. Nicholas Seyntlo, the owner of BL, MS Add. 14408, who served as sheriff of Somerset and Devon in 1456, is named in a commission of 26 March 1450, ‘to array all men at arms and other fencible men, hobelers and archers within Somerset and to take the muster of the same and to cause watch and ward to be kept and ‘bekyns’

---

68 Fleming, The Hautes and their “Circle”, p. 89.
70 However, his father joined John Tyrell's contingent; Roskell, Clark and Rawcliffe, The House of Commons, 1386-1421, 3: 325.
71 PRO, E 101/53/33 m1.
to be set up in the usual places'. He is also named on a similar commission on 6 May 1450, with the additional role to ‘expel the king’s enemies proposing to invade the realm’. Moreover, Nicholas was a kinsman of John Seyndo, who had served in Normandy. John was mustered as a mounted man at arms at Portsdown in July 1417 in the expeditionary army to Normandy and he also, as a member of the king’s household, mustered for the 1430 coronation campaign, as did his kinsman Giles. Giles was also comptroller of Calais from 19 November 1437 until 2 December 1460 (when he was replaced by Richard Wheteshill). Nicholas, then, although he does not appear to have served in France himself, belonged to a family with a tradition of military service in France.

The interest shown by military men in these texts can be connected to their experience of the defeat in France. Some of these men had fought in France prior to the loss of the lands and their reading of these texts can be seen as their way of coming to terms with, and attempting to understand the reasons behind, the defeat. Moreover, their reading of these texts might also be explained as an attempt to reinforce their own identities. Hanna’s assertion that ‘miscellaneous books testify to the highly individualistic canon-creating efforts by individuals variously inserted into discrete and fragmented social positions’ implies a connection between book ownership and the creation or reinforcement of identity. The work of sociologists has demonstrated that

72 CPR, 1446-1452, p. 319.
73 CPR, 1446-1452, p. 381.
75 Deputy Keeper’s Report, 48 (1887), p. 322. Giles fought for the Lancastrians at Towton: he was among those attainted after the Battle of Towton in Edward IV’s first parliament: RP, 5: 480.
identities become more pronounced, are more clearly articulated or made more explicit when under threat. Bex has argued that 'membership of a community may not always be apparent until faced with an outside threat'. Certainly martial and chivalric values were under threat, or perceived to be, during this period. In this respect, the reading of military texts by men who made their living through war and whose identities were expressed through chivalric culture might be regarded as a means of consolidating their own identities in a period of increasing demilitarisation and less opportunity for military service abroad.

Some of these owners were also prominent in their localities. Robert Chalons served as sheriff for Devon on several occasions, on commissions of the peace, and was made M.P. for Devon in 1420. Sir Richard Haute was on the commissions of the peace for Essex, whilst Sir William was sheriff for Kent in 1465, 1474 and 1482, J.P. and a Kentish commissioner. Henry Heydon was on commissions for Norfolk in the 1470s. Sir John Paston II was M.P. for Norfolk in 1467-8 and J.P. in 1469-70.


79 See chapter four.


81 Haute was on commissions of the peace for Essex on 18 November 1473, 13 February 1474, 8 May 1475, 10 November 1475, 19 May 1476 and 28 November 1476 and in Herefordshire on 4 July 1475. For his commissions see CPR, 1467-1477, passim. For Sir William's shrievalties, see List of Sheriffs for England and Wales, Public Record Office, Lists and Indexes 9 (1898): 12. For his commissions see CPR, 1461-67, 1467-1477, 1476-1485, 1485-1495, passim.

82 He was on the commissions of 2 December 1473, 15 February 1474, 18 May 1474, 10 November 1475, 26 May 1476, 30 June 1476 see CPR, 1467-1477, 1476-1485, passim. Wedgewood stated that Henry was M.P. for Yarmouth in 1487 and served as J.P. for Kent and Norfolk; J.C. Wedgewood, History of Parliament: Biographies of the Members of the Common House, 1439-1509 (London, 1936), 2: 451.
Nicholas Seyntlo, the owner of BL, MS Add. 14408, served as sheriff of Somerset and Devon in 1456.  

The books these men owned and the annotations they made in them provide an insight into how they reacted to their situations. None of these men wrote new texts themselves. It might, however, be useful to briefly compare their experiences with those of someone who did - Sir Thomas Malory. As Riddy states, Malory, who was born in c. 1416, did not witness the highpoint of English martial success in France. Instead, he experienced the gradual loss of the French territories and the subsequent civil war. Malory inherited his father's lands in 1433 or 1434 and was knighted at the end of the decade. In 1442 he may have gone to fight in Gascony: his cousin, Sir Philip Chetwynd, was mayor of Bayonne in Gascony and asked for military aid in 1442. Malory certainly seems to know well southwest France. Malory also served on commissions for Warwickshire and became its M.P. in 1445. Moreover, as Riddy argues, 'If Thomas Malory is the same as he who was returned as the representative for Bedwin in 1449, then he was a member of that House of Commons which urged the execution of the duke of Suffolk on the narrowly patriotic grounds that he had betrayed English interests in France'. Malory was part of the army that went north in 1462 to besiege the Lancastrian castles of Alnwick, Bamburgh and Dunstanburgh and interestingly, Malory may well have known Sir John Astley, as they both took part in the Alnwick siege. His

---

83 See n. 33 above.
85 Philip was indented to serve the Captain of Calais, the Earl of Stafford, to be his lieutenant-governor in 1444; Field, The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Malory, p. 86.
86 Field, The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Malory, pp. 86-7; Riddy, Sir Thomas Malory, p. 4.
87 Riddy, Sir Thomas Malory, p. 46.
88 Malory appears on the surviving list of knights who accompanied Edward IV on the campaign; Field, The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Malory, p. 200. Malory's military experience in the north is also implied by his suggestion that Lancelot's castle of Joyous Garde was either Alnwick or Bamburgh; Sir Thomas Malory, Malory: Works, ed. E. Vinaver, 2nd edn (London, 1971), p. 724, ll. 11-12.
experiences were identical to those of these owners and, to some degree, *Le Morte Darthur*, written in 1469-70, is a reaction to these experiences and echoes many of the issues with which the readers of military texts were concerned. Indeed, Riddy argues that:

we can see *Le Morte Darthur* as a post-imperial, or even post-colonial, text, which speaks with the voices of these “noble and dyvers gentylmen” of Malory’s generation, for whom the loss of the French territories in 1453 had been a personal disaster, and who could not accommodate themselves to the diminished view of their country and of their own role and prospects — both financial and social — that that loss brought with it.

These texts also generated interest in heraldic circles. John Smert, an owner of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, a copy of the prose translation, was Garter King of Arms from 28 March 1450 to 1478. Paston’s ‘Grete Boke’ came into the possession of Sir Thomas Wrythe, alias Wriothesly (d. 1534, Garter King of Arms from 1505) who added his coat of arms and the initials ‘Th’ and ‘WR’ to the bottom of fol. 2r. The ‘Grete Boke’ might have come to him through his father, John Wrythe (Garter 1478-1504), who collected heraldic texts. It has been suggested that Wrythe acquired more of Sir John’s books. His signature and coat of arms can be found in BL, C.10.b23, a copy of Caxton’s *The Game and Play of Chess*, a text which John Paston II also owned. At the end of the book, there is a list of the ‘names of the banerettis made at the batell of

---

89 Field states that the *Morte Darthur* is striking for its ‘historical allusiveness’. He does, however, also observe that when it is compared with its sources, the *Morte Darthur* seems to emphasise the way in which noble division can ruin a kingdom; Field, *The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Malory*, p. 173. The parallels between Malory’s text and the issues emphasised by translators and readers will be discussed in the following chapters.


91 BL, MS Lansdowne 285, fol. 2r. He also entered his arms, without initials, in London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 26; Lester, *Sir John Paston’s ‘Grete Boke’*, p. 58. This manuscript contains the Statutes of the Order of the Garter, a tract on the duty of heralds, ‘Eneas de Heraldis’ written in English, amongst other material; W.H. Black, *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts in the Library of the College of Arms* (London, 1829).

92 Davis (ed.), *Paston Letters*, 1: 517 (item 4).
stooke'. John Paston III, who was knighted at the battle of Stoke in 1487, also made a copy of this list. Thomas Wrythe is also the probable owner of BL, MS Add. 29901, written by the Hammond scribe, which contains the service of the lords at the coronation of the kings of England in Latin (fols. 1r-12v); an order of the service at the coronation of a king (fols. 13r-16v), as well as French ordinances ('Ordinacio belli domini Regis Edwardi contra Scotos'); a French treatise concerning the creation of heralds (fols. 40r-47v); texts on the founding of the Orders of the Garter (fols. 47v-55r), and of the Knights of the Bath in French (fols. 55v-59v); a Latin treatise on heraldry usually ascribed to John of Bado Audeo (fols. 60r-79r) and Bartolus of Saxoferrato's treatise on heraldry (fols. 79r-86v). Wrythe also wrote some heraldic texts in BL, MS Add. 45133 and in London, College of Arms, MS M 3. He purchased the latter manuscript, a book of precedents, from the widow of William Ballard, March King of Arms.

Wrythe's interest in the 'Grete Boke' is suggested by his annotation of a passage concerning coats of arms in the prose translation of De re militari. He wrote: 'Note the antiquite of Creastes and the true vse of them next to xiiij 'diuerse signes'. He also altered a sentence of 'The ceremony for the creation of the Knights of the Bath: the statement 'all these gownys and hoodis the principally herauld of armes shal haue for his fee' became 'all these gownys & hoodis the officers armes shal haue for her fee'. In a similar fashion, an early owner of Astley's volume, PML, MS M 775, added, amongst other things, a text on the oaths of heralds on fols. 279v-80r.

96 BL, MS Lansdowne 285, fol. 97r.
97 BL, MS Lansdowne 285, fol. 9r; Lester, Sir John Paston's 'Grete Boke', p. 83.
Other practical military texts generated interest amongst heralds or were read by readers who owned other heraldic material. Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 824, a copy of Pizan’s Livre des faits d’armes, contains a description of arms in English in a late fifteenth-century hand on fol. 140r, from which it might be assumed that the owner was a herald. It is then signed ‘John Starkey’ on fol. 1r in a late sixteenth/early seventeenth-century hand. John Starkey also owned Bodl. Lib MS Ashmole 764, a heraldic manuscript written by the French-trained scribe, Ricardus Franciscus and possibly previously owned by John Smert, Garter King of Arms. This manuscript contains extracts from Honoré Bouvet’s Arbre des batailles and a copy of the ordinance regulating the fees of officers of arms, which is also contained in Sir John Paston’s ‘Grete Boke’. Sir John Paston also owned a book of heraldry (‘a boke wyth armys portrayed in paper’) and Richard III owned heraldic works. Moreover, as was discussed in the previous chapter, three copies of the prose translation are found alongside heraldic material. BL, MS Lansdowne 285 and PML, MS M 775 contain versions of ‘How to organise jousts of peace’; a version of the ‘arms and armour needed for foot combat’; regulations for trial by battle as well as accounts of feats of arms in which the herald’s role is central. Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, a copy of the prose translation, also contains the ‘pee de gre of Chalouns’, which is illustrated by heraldic pennons and escutcheons.

---

98 It contains the note ‘Joh Starkey 1610’ on fol. iva, written in the same hand as that which signed Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 824. Bodl. Lib MS Ashmole 764 also contains the name ‘R Starkey’ next to John’s signature. This might be the Ralph Starkey who owned BL, MS Add. 38337, a roll of arms, known as the Dering Roll. Ralph also owned BL, MS Add. 39851, which he describes as a ‘booke of coppies of euidence [which] was deuised and performed by mee Raphe Starkey, of London, marchante, seconde sonne of John Starkey, of Oltone Pulton, in the countie of Chestore, Esquire, in Anno 1595[-1612].’ Significantly, this collection contains a mandate for the delivery into Chancery of the records in the case of Scrope v Grosvenor.

99 BL, MS Lansdowne 285, fol. 47v.


101 See chapter two, pp. 82-3.
Several of these manuscripts can also be localised to specific regions. Three manuscripts containing the prose translation circulated in the southwest of England.\footnote{These are Bodl. Lib, MSS Digby 233 and Douce 291; BL, MS Add. 14408.} Two manuscripts in my corpus circulated in the southeast.\footnote{CUL, MS Kk.1.5 was owned by the Haute family, based in Kent, and their manuscript seems to have been written by a scribe working in the southeast Midlands; Bornstein (ed.), Middle English Translation of Livre du corpe, p. 33. Although the early ownership of LPL, MS Arc L.40.2/E.42 is not known, the name ‘Ihon Smythe of Sussex’ appears on fol. 53v in a sixteenth-century hand, so it may have circulated in this region earlier.} Three manuscripts circulated or were produced in East Anglia. The Pastons and the Heydons were based in Norfolk. Heydon’s copy of the R translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif, Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338, is also localisable to Norfolk in terms of production. Scott believes that the borders, the style of which ‘supports a regional location’, were produced in the same workshop as Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 55 (Calendar – Diocese of Norwich), which was produced in Norfolk after 1471 and Oxford, Keble College, MS 32 (Walsingham Breviary).\footnote{Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, 2: 352.} The hand of CSJC, MS 76 D.I appears to be that of a government-trained scribe, almost certainly working in London.\footnote{I am grateful to Professor Linne Mooney for looking at this manuscript with me.} The note ‘be et knone to aull men that I Robert Aulbrow as boute of thomas rade off [.......] xxti bag’ is written on fol. 42r: ‘Aulbrow’ may refer to one of the villages of Alburgh, Aldborough or Aldbrough in Norfolk and Yorkshire.\footnote{Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 2: 13.}

Yet there is another context for the circulation and production of these works: Calais. In a recent article, Boffey argues that there was increasing interest amongst a range of readers in Calais in works on government and military matters and she cites the interest in copies of Vegetius as evidence of this.\footnote{J. Boffey, ‘Books and Readers in Calais: Some Notes’, The Ricardian 13 (2003): 67.} William Sonnyng, an alderman of Calais, owned a copy of De regimine principum, translated into French by Henry de
Gauchy as *Le livre du gouvernement des rois et des princes*. Sonnyng has also been connected with Boston, Public Library, MS 1519, an interesting collection of material in French and English, containing, according to Boffey, 'a number of items likely to be close to the heart of anyone with a Calais connection'. It contains: Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* and 'Le loys et coustumes de la ville et eschevinage de Caleis'; notes on Edward III's retinue at the siege of Calais; Lydgate's translation of the *Churl and the Bird* and the *Libel of English policy*. This manuscript seems to 'register a concern with the history and administration of Calais in the larger context of international trade, politics and statecraft and offers some testimony to the range and sophistication of interests which merchants shared with men like Thomas Thwaytes and Lord Hastings'.

Several owners of the manuscripts in my corpus continued to play a role in the Anglo-French occupation in Calais. Richard Whetehill held military posts in Calais, was mayor and escheator of Calais in the early 1450s and merchant of the Staple. The Pastons were also frequently in Calais. CPC, MS 243, a copy of the verse translation, may have been owned by the family of William and Ralph Hastings. Hastings took over from Earl Rivers as lieutenant of Calais on 18 July 1471 and he and his brother Ralph both served in Calais and Guînes. Incidentally, the earliest copy of the prose

---

108 This is PML, MS 222. It has the inscription on fol. 106r 'Cest liurc partient au gylliam Sonnyng/ Alderman de Calleis et a soun fyz'. His careful study of the text is suggested by his interlinear glosses in English and French. For example, 'A peine' is translated as 'vnethe', 'oiseuse' as 'ydelle' and the verb coustre' as 'to sowde'; Boffey, 'Books and Readers', pp. 70-71.
110 According to a note, the manuscript was owned by one William Caston who appears to have given it to William Sonnyng in 1471: 'Iste liber constat Willetmo Caston quy dedit Willelmo Sonnyng Anno mil iiiic lxii'; Boffey, 'Books and Readers', pp. 70-71.
111 Boffey, 'Books and Readers', p. 72.
114 See above, p. 116.
115 Grummitt, 'Lord Hastings, the Calais Garrison', pp. 262-274.
translation is also associated with the Hastings family.\textsuperscript{116} William Hatteclyff, the probable first owner of BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII, was titular keeper of the exchange in Calais.\textsuperscript{117} Furthermore, Wakelin suggests that although we do not know the owner of the third surviving copy of the verse translation, contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45, it is not unreasonable to suggest that this reader might also have been based at Calais, 'given the close biographical links of Hastings and Hatteclyff and the palaeographical and textual connections between all three manuscripts'.\textsuperscript{118} It should also be noted that two manuscripts containing the prose translation of \textit{De re militari} have passages concerning naval warfare annotated.\textsuperscript{119}

Indeed, although the identity of the verse translator of \textit{De re militari} has been the subject of some debate, it is clear that he also had a Calais connection.\textsuperscript{120} In the proem and epilogue, the poet described himself as a 'person of Caleys'.\textsuperscript{121} Moreover, the poem is rooted within the Calais context as is demonstrated by, amongst other things, the changes the translator made to his source text. For example, naval warfare is much more pronounced in the verse translation than in Vegetius's text. Although Vegetius did discuss naval warfare, this material was the subject only of the last book of \textit{De re militari}. The verse translator, however, referred to the importance of battle on 'see

\begin{footnotes}
\item[116] See above, n. 14.
\item[117] \textit{CPR}, 1467-77, p. 323.
\item[118] Wakelin also suggests that the verse translation 'was created and transmitted among a milieu with distinctly humanist tastes'. He discusses the use of \textit{lunae} (round brackets) in the Ashmole and Pembroke manuscripts. Apparently, these are very unusual in fifteenth-century vernacular manuscripts and are traits associated with humanists. Other English humanists, such as John Gunthorpe, were users of \textit{lunae}, as was John Russell. Moreover, Wakelin adds, Gunthorpe and Russell were associates of Hatteclyff and Hastings; D. Wakelin, 'Scholarly Scribes and the Creation of \textit{Knigbtode and Bataile}', forthcoming in \textit{English Manuscript Studies} (2004). I am grateful to Dr Wakelin for sending me a copy of this article prior to publication.
\item[119] CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 101v; Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, fol. 118v.
\item[120] See chapter two, pp. 20-2.
\item[121] Dyboski and Arend (eds.), \textit{Knighhtode and Bataile}, ll. 2981-90.
\end{footnotes}
& lond' throughout the poem. The repetition of this phrase could be attributed to the translator's poetic style, but it also betrays recognition of how important naval warfare was during the civil war or rather how threatened England was by coastal attack. This element in the poem is also a direct result of the purpose of the poem; it is designed to help Henry 'prevalie in knyghtode and bataile', but Henry's battles take place both on land and at sea: 'Thei hem by lond, thei hem by see asseyle:/ The Kyng his Oratoure, God graunt his bone'. Moreover, the translator envisaged the defeat of the Yorkist enemies taking place at sea. It is surely significant that men who spent their time in the only remaining English part of France were reading or writing about how war should be prosecuted and about the benefits of being a militarised society.

---

122 The pairing 'lond and see' is used at least four times in the course of the poem; see Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghtode and Bataile*, ll. 105, 129-30, 172, 1025-6.
123 The verse translator would possibly have endorsed Richmond's plea for a reassessment of the naval aspect to the Wars of the Roses. Richmond draws attention to the repercussions for Henry VI's government of not being able to defend the sea and develop a fleet; C.F. Richmond, 'The Earl of Warwick's Domination of the Channel and the Naval Dimension to the Wars of the Roses, 1456-1460', *Southern History* 20/1 (1998-9): 1-19.
124 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghtode and Bataile*, ll. 86-7.
125 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghtode and Bataile*, ll. 2826-2923.
126 See also Dr Grummitt's interesting suggestion that Calais provided a forum for chivalric deeds in the context of civil war; D. Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison: Warfare and Military Service in England 1436-1558*, forthcoming. I am grateful to Dr Grummitt for sending me a draft of this prior to publication.
3.2 Transmission

These readers had shared experiences, but did they actually know one another? How were these texts transmitted and what role did pre-existing networks play in the exchange of books and ideas? Hanna has argued that the fact that most English books were special orders 'implies that buyers knew the text they wanted in advance and that such foreknowledge must have been the result of social networks, which facilitated physical access to a pre-existing copy of the text'. As Riddy states, 'when the possibility of owning a text depended upon procuring an exemplar for copying, the personal relationships between members of the reading public themselves must to a large extent have formed the routes along which knowledge of particular works travelled'.

This suggestion has been confirmed by work done on book ownership. Understandably, given the nature of the reading matter and the political context, Lollard reading circles relied to a large degree upon personal contact. Aston argues that although heretical material usually circulated in a familial or household context, the acquisition of Lollard reading material could also utilise other forms of personal contact. Harold Love has also argued that in the seventeenth century, manuscript production 'usually rested on a personal agreement between the supplier of the text and the copyist, or copyist and recipient', and so 'there was a strong tendency for patterns of

---

transmission to coincide with pre-existing communities'.

He terms such groups 'scribal communities'.

Other research has shown that texts were exchanged by people who belonged to the same social or geographical group. For example, BL, MS Royal 17 D.VI, which contains Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*, was probably owned by William Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel and his wife Joan Neville, Countess of Salisbury; yet the signatures it contains suggests that it may have also circulated amongst their friends and family. LPL, MS 491, a copy of the *Martyrs of Arthur*, also contains the names of people 'who seem to have formed a kind of informal literary circle amongst the Essex gentry in the early sixteenth century'. What is not clear is whether these cultural contacts were the result of other links or whether shared cultural interests led to these links. Fleming, discussing book owners in Kent, argues that the individuals he identified 'appear to have constituted a cultural circle, either in the sense of a group brought together by shared cultural interests, who then forged other links of a political, business and familial nature, or of a group within which the dissemination of culture was facilitated by existing communities'.

The owners of these military texts also formed wider reading groups. In some ways, Paston's 'Grete Boke' references a network of readers who were interested in the literature of chivalry and war. It includes accounts of the feats of arms of John Chalons, Sir John Astley, both owners of military material, and of the translator Sir Anthony

---

131 Love, *Scribal Publication*, p. 44.  
Woodville. Paston’s inventory further contributes to this impression: it refers to a copy of the ‘Dethc off Arthur’ which he borrowed from ‘myn ostesse at þe George’ and ‘a boke off Troylus whyche William Bra[ndon?] hathe hadde neer x yer and lent it to Da[me?] Wyngfelde’. In a letter dated 1472, he mentions lending Thomas Boyd, the earl of Arran and son of the governor of Scotland, a copy of the Siege of Thebes owned by his sister Anne Paston. John Paston’s nephew, William Paston II, also obtained a copy of the Statutes of War printed by Richard Pynson in 1492 for Thomas Cary, a Berkshire gentleman.

Astley’s book, containing a copy of the prose translation of De re militari, may have circulated around court: the names ‘Thomas fytzhugh’, ‘Bryan Tunstall’ and ‘Thomas Tunstall’ occur on fol. 2r, although these do not appear to be signatures. John Paston certainly had access to Astley’s book. Paston’s ‘Grete Boke’ contains many items which are also found in John Astley’s manuscript. Paston seems to have borrowed Astley’s book and then employed the Westminster scribe, William Ebesham, to copy out parts of it into a similar book of his own. Personal contact or shared social networks must have facilitated Paston’s acquisition of Astley’s manuscript. Paston also had a copy of the summons of the surrender of Le Mans, dated 1425, and the

135 These accounts are on fols. 15r-16r, 18r-22v, 29v-43r, 48r-52r.
137 Davis (ed.), Paston Letters, 1: 575.
138 The letter refers to ‘the boke of the Statute of Warre with the portraiture of the kynges armes and bagys that ye desyred me by your wrytyng to sende you, it is so that Pynson the printer that dwellyth withoute Tempill Barr, and dyd printe theym, hathe delyuered all the bookes that he made for the kyng vnto Ser Thomas Lovell before the kyng departed, whiche were delyuered seym vnto the capitaignes of his hooste’. This letter (found in Northampton, Northamptonshire County Record Office, Fitzwilliam Roll 370[1]) is reproduced in R. Beadle and L. Hellinga, William Paston II and Pynson’s Statutes of War (1492), The Library, 7th series 2 (2001): 108.
139 Meale, ‘Patrons, Buyers and Owners’, p. 237; Meale suggests that Thomas Fitzhugh may have been the fourth son of Thomas Fitzhugh and Alice Neville; Thomas Tunstall may be he of Thurland castle in Lancashire, and Brian Tunstall may be his son who was killed at Flodden in 1513.
ordinances of war of Henry V and those of Thomas Montague, copied into his manuscript. It is perhaps worth remembering that Fastolf was made governor of Le Mans in 1425. As yet, I have not found these texts in Worcester's collections, but given that Worcester frequently referred to the ordinances in his *Boke of Noblesse* and that Fastolf had been governor of Le Mans, it is plausible that Paston acquired the exemplars for these texts from Worcester. We know that Paston and Worcester exchanged books: according to his inventory, Paston lent Worcester a copy of *De amicitia*.

Other owners of military texts exchanged their books. Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, acquired his copy of *De re militari*, CUL, MS Ee.2.17, through Robert Roos, who was his cousin and former ward. He then passed it on to James Strangways, Speaker of the House of Commons in 1461-2. John Shirley passed his copy of *De re militari* on to his friend and executor, Richard Caudray. Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, originally owned by the Chalons family, came into the possession of John Smert, Garter King of Arms, probably through his father-in-law, William Bruges. Bruges, as Garter King of Arms, certified the gentility of John Chalons in 1446, which might explain how the manuscript came into his possession.

---


142 The inventory refers to 'in quayers Tully or Cypio de Ami[,]. leffte wyth William Worcester'; Davis (ed.), *Paston Letters*, 1: 517.

143 It contains the endnote: 'cest liure est a moy Hornsfrey duc de Gloucestre du don Moss. Robert Roos chevalier mon cousin'. It also contains the note 'Strangways J.' written in textura on fol. 36v.

144 Shirley's monogram with crown between his motto and name 'ma ioye Shirley' appears on the flyleaf. Fol. 1v has the note: 'Mercy Jhesu Caudray. This boke calde Viegece made of knighthode translated out of lat in to frenshe by pat excellent Poete maister iohan de Meheune at instance of pat noble prince pe Eorle of Eve'; BL, MS Royal 20 B.XV. For Shirley's books see M. Connelly, *John Shirley: Book Production and the Noble Household in Fifteenth-Century England* (Aldershot, 1998).

Although there is no evidence that other owners exchanged their books, some of them did know one another. Henry Heydon, the owner of the R translation of the *Quadrilogue Inventif*, was an associate of the Pastons. William Paston, the younger brother of Sir John, married Sir Henry’s daughter, Bridget. Richard Whetehill, based in Calais, who owned a copy of the U translation of the *Quadrilogue Inventif*, had links with Thomas Rotherham, an owner of the prose translation of *De re militari*, and William Hatteclyff, an owner of a verse translation. All three of these owners are named in BL, MS 13 B.XI, a collection of state papers relating to negotiations between Edward IV and France and Burgundy between 1461 and 1476. Sometimes they appear on the same commissions, so it might be assumed that they knew one another. Whetehill also knew the Pastons, who were frequently with Lord Hastings during the 1470s, and thus spent much time in Calais. Indeed, John Paston III considered marrying one of Whetehill’s daughters in May 1476. The Pastons also had links with the Haute family. John Paston III, younger brother of Sir John Paston, stated that he was well acquainted with, amongst other people, Haute (perhaps James) in 1462 whilst accompanying Edward IV to the north. John Paston II married Anne Haute, the sister of James, privately in 1469 – by February 1472, their divorce was under way. Sir Thomas Malory may well have known both Sir John Astley and John Paston III, as they all took part in the Alnwick siege.

---

148 Intriguingly, William Ebesham, the scribe of Paston’s copy of the prose translation, leased a tenement in the Sanctuary at Westminster in March 1475 and held it until 1478-9 when it was taken over by William Hatteclyff; Doyle, ‘William Ebesham’, p. 320.
149 Grummitt, ‘Lord Hastings, the Calais Garrison’, p. 266.
150 Richmond, *Endings*, p. 159.
151 Davis (ed.), *Paston Letters*, 1: 524. See also 1: 544 for another reference to James Haute.
152 Davis (ed.), *Paston Letters*, 2: 760, 904, 905.
153 See above, p. 124.
Whether or not these owners exchanged or discussed their books, the reading and ownership of these texts suggests that they shared a set of common interests, values and purposes. It has been argued that ‘Reading groups often form because of a subtext of shared values’. Love has also argued that reading circles formed around courtly figures, such as Essex, Sidney or Ralegh in the seventeenth century. This poses some interesting questions concerning how literary tastes correspond or relate to other interests, affiliations and identities; according to Love, the circulation of manuscripts ‘bonded groups of like-minded individuals into a community, sect or political faction, with the exchange of texts in manuscript serving to nourish a shared set of values and enrich personal allegiances’.

Moreover, those who read these texts were linked simply by their reading and constitute what may be termed a discourse community whose members may, although not necessarily, share interpretive strategies for reading works. Stanley Fish argues that it is the interpretive strategies shared by such communities that produce meaning and he stresses that those strategies are culturally and historically situated. Bex has also argued that ‘individuals either produce, or produce interpretations of, texts according to the norms of the discourse community and the functions which the text is intended to serve within that discourse community’. These interpretations ‘interact and take on (some) of the meanings of the larger social groups of which they [members of the discourse community] are a part’.

---

138 Bex, Variety in Written English, p. 66.
139 Bex, Variety in Written English, p. 67.
Such communities include everyone involved in the production and use of a book. An example of such a network is provided by Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, which ended up in the possession of John Smert. John Smert had close affiliations with the French-trained scribe, Ricardus Franciscus (fl. 1447-c. 1475), who copied at least thirteen works including, suggestively, Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 570, an extremely expensive volume of Christine de Pizan’s Épître de Othea and the Livre des quatre vertus belonging to Sir John Fastolf; CSJC, MS H.5, which contains Scrope’s translation of the Épître d’Othéa and OUC, MS 85, the U translation of Alain Chartier’s Quadrilogue Inventif, which may have been owned by Richard Whetehill. I have also identified this scribe in CUL, MS Add. 7870, a cheaper and more practical copy of Livre des quatre vertus, produced for William Worcester. Ricardus Franciscus also wrote Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 764 for John Smert and Nancy, Archives Départementales de Meurthe et Moselle, MS H. 80 (a copy of the Statutes of the Order of the Garter) dated 1467 and signed ‘R. Franceys ‘s.R’ which may be ‘scriba/sub Rege’ or ‘written/for the King [of Arms].

Franciscus is known to have worked with the same set of illuminators and decorators on several occasions. He worked, for example, with the artist William Abell, who was responsible for the miniatures in both CSJC, MS H.5 and Bodl. Lib, MS

---

160 See above, p. 111.
161 A full list of Franciscus’s manuscripts is given in Appendix D, p. 296.
162 Worcester’s marginalia appears throughout the text.
164 The artist responsible for the miniatures in OUC, MS 85 was probably responsible for the first miniature of the Lydgate’s Fall of Princes in Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation, MS 439/16, also written by Ricardus Franciscus. The border artist of OUC, MS 85 worked on three other manuscripts written by Ricardus Franciscus: BL, MS Harley 4775, an English translation of Jacobus de Voragine’s Golden Legend; PML, MS M 126, Gower’s Confessio Amantis, and Philadelphia, Rosenbach Museum, MS 439/16. The gold two-line initials in this manuscript are probably by the same decorator as those of BL, MS Harley 4775 and Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 764, which were written by Ricardus Franciscus; Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, 2: 319.
Laud Misc. 570 mentioned above. Although we do not know the identity of the first owner of the former manuscript, it might be surmised that one of the patrons of Ricardus Franciscus and William Abell’s work mentioned above, most likely someone in the Fastolf circle given that it was a copy of Scrope’s translation, commissioned this manuscript. The career of Ricardus Franciscus is certainly suggestive. His clients included John Smert, John Fastolf, William Worcester and the Whetehill family. Significantly, he seems to have specialised in producing French and English military texts for a militarised audience.

Franciscus also copied the London Tallow Chandler’s Company, Grant of Arms, dated 1456. Smert was Garter King of Arms at this point and signed the document. This is an intriguing example of how professional relationships may have facilitated access to these texts. As more is recovered about the scribes and producers of these manuscripts, the relationship between social and literary connections will become clearer, though perhaps never conclusive. The reconstruction of such contacts is always surrounded by speculation. Thus, the border hand of OMC, MS Lat. 30, which contains the prose translation of *De re militari*, has been identified as that responsible for the decoration of Astley’s copy of the prose translation. Was Astley recommended the

---

165 He also illuminated the Consolidation Charter for Eton in 1447-48 and Cambridge King’s Charter dated 16 March 1446. For a recent list of the manuscripts illuminated by William Abell see Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts*, 2: 263-66.

166 Ricardus Franciscus dates Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 570 to 1450 on fol. 93r.

167 The Bremschet family owned it towards the end of the century. This family lived in the vicinity of London and mention Alcton Castle, London, Chelsey, Merston and Newchurch in their register of births which was added to the end of the manuscript; see chapter two, n. 236.


169 Scott identifies other examples of this artist, whom she dates to the late 1440s, in Tokyo, Waseda University Library, MS NE 3691 (a copy of Nicholas Love’s *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*); K.L. Scott, ‘The Illustration and Decoration of the Manuscripts of Nicholas Love’s *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*’, in S. Oguro, R. Beadle and M.G. Sargent (eds.), *Nicholas Love at Waseda* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 61-86.
illustrator by the owner of OMC, MS Lat. 30 or is it purely coincidental that two copies of the prose translation, produced in the 1450s, were illustrated by the same artist? It is probably the latter case, but examples of such connections from the point of view of book production continue to occur. They may be coincidental or alternatively a ‘reading public’, that discussed their books and their means of acquiring them, can be envisaged.

The shared interests and concerns of these owners can also be demonstrated by a consideration of the other books they owned. I have already mentioned readers’ interest in heraldic works. Several of these owners also owned romances. Paston’s library held not only BL, MS Lansdowne 285, but also manuscripts containing chivalric romances (the ‘Deth off Arthur’, the ‘Greene Knyght’, ‘Off Guy’). His sister, Anne, owned a copy of Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes*. Paston’s younger brother, Edmund II, owned a copy of Lydgate’s *Troy Book*. The first wife of Richard Haute, the probable owner of CUL, MS Kk.1.5, the only extant copy of the English translation of Pizan’s *Livre du corps*, was Eleanor Roos, who was the niece of Richard Roos, the translator of Chartier’s *Belle dame sans merci*. She inherited BL, MS Royal 14 E.III from her uncle, which contains the *Romance of the Saint Graal* in French prose. Richard III’s books, which have been catalogued by Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, comprised, amongst other things, romances.

170 Paston’s inventory, for example, refers to: ‘A boke had off myn ostesse at þe George [...] off þe Deth off Arthur begynyng at Cassab[…] Warwyk, Kyng Richard Cure delyon, a cronl[…] to Edwarde þe iii, pric – 2. Item, a boke off Troylus whych William Bra[...] hathe hadde neer x yer and lent it to Da[…] Wyngfelde, et jbi ego vidi’; Davis (ed.), *Paston Letters*, 1: 517.
172 Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS Eng. 752. Edmund’s name is written on fol. 170r. John III’s ownership of the *Temple of Glass* is mentioned in a letter from him to John II in which he asks him to send his copy of the ‘Temple off Glasse’; Davis (ed.), *Paston Letters*, 1: 447.
173 On the flyleaf is the note ‘cest liure est a moy Richard Roos chiualer’ (fol. 2v) and on fol. 162r there is the note ‘Thys boke is myne dame Alyanor Haute’. In Richard Roos’ will of 1481/2 he left Eleanor his ‘grete booke called the Saint Grall’; Meale, ‘Manuscripts, Readers and Patrons’, p. 103.
Several of these owners also owned mirrors for princes. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, five manuscripts of the prose translation of *De re militari* also contain copies of Lydgate and Burgh's *Secrets of Philosophers*.\(^{175}\) Paston also bought Caxton's translation of *The Game and Play of Chess*.\(^{176}\) Eleanor Roos owned a copy of BL, MS Royal 17 D.VI, which contains Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*.\(^{177}\) Thomas Rotherham owned a *tabula* to Giles of Rome and Richard III owned a copy of Giles of Rome's *De regimine principum*.\(^{178}\)

However, these readers' interests also ranged more widely. For example, Harvard, University Medical Library, MS Countway 19 seems likely to have been the 'litil boke of fisik' commissioned by John Paston.\(^{179}\) Nicholas Seyntlo, the owner of BL, MS Add. 14408, can also be associated with a herbal, Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 572.\(^{180}\) William Hatteclyff, the probable first owner of BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII, also owned Lincoln Cathedral Library, MS 88, a grammatical miscellany dating from the early fifteenth century and signed 'Willelmo Hatteclyff'.\(^{181}\) Henry Heydon referred to his 'English books' in his will, although unfortunately no other books have been identified.\(^{182}\) Thomas Rotherham's copy of the prose translation, CUL, MS Add.

---

\(^{175}\) See chapter two, p. 77.

\(^{176}\) Davis (ed.), *Paston Letters*, 1: 517 (item 4).

\(^{177}\) Her signature appears on fol. 1r.

\(^{178}\) Rotherham's *tabula* is CUL, MS Ff. 4.38; Richard III's *De regimine principum* is LPL, MS. Arc L.42/L.26.

\(^{179}\) Doyle, *William Ebesham*, p. 299. This manuscript was copied for Paston by William Ebesham.

\(^{180}\) This manuscript, like BL, MS Add. 14408, has fragments of a fourteenth-century copy of *Guy of Warwick* as pastedowns and flyleaves. This manuscript is not dated, and contains no marks of ownership. However, one of the four documents, which were used as reinforcing strips, is a lease for two lives from Nicholas Seyntlo and his wife Agnes; M. Mills and D. Huws (eds.), *Fragments of an Early 14th Century Guy of Warwick* (Oxford, 1974), pp. 1-5.

\(^{181}\) D. Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Middle English Grammatical Manuscripts* (New York, 1979), p. 188.

8706, is but one volume in a large collection of manuscripts and printed books he owned. He owned copies of works by Robert Grossteste, Alexandreis of Gualtenis de Castillione, Pharsalia of Lucan, as well as Vincent of Beauvais’s *Speculum historiale* and many works by Bartolus of Saxoferrato.\(^{183}\) Anne Colville, a later reader of the prose translation of *De re militari* contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416, also owned BL, MS Harley 993, a copy of Walter Hilton’s *Scale of Perfection*.\(^{184}\)

This chapter has emphasised the extent to which these owners had shared experiences. But as their extant books indicate, they had diverse interests and vocations. Thomas Rotherham’s ownership of the prose translation might seem incongruous given his appreciation of texts in their original language and his interest in humanist works. Hattecleff and Rotherham were first and foremost administrators: Hattlecleyff was the king’s physician as well as his secretary. Henry Heydon was a lawyer. This suggests that the subject of war had a wider appeal than is traditionally thought. Moreover, some of these manuscripts had a female readership, which leads one to challenge the assumption that conduct of war texts were not enjoyed by women.\(^{185}\) These texts were owned both

---

\(^{183}\) He owned printed books imported from Germany and Venice. A full list of Rotherham’s books can be found in J.C.T. Oates, *Cambridge University Library: A History: from the Beginnings to the Copyright Act of Queen Anne* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 70.

\(^{184}\) On fol. iir there is the note ‘thys boke is suster anne Colylle’.

\(^{185}\) The swan badge on fol. 199v of Bodl. Lib, MS Digby 233, a copy of the prose translation of *De re militari*, suggests the intended ownership of Thomas Berkeley’s daughter, Elizabeth and her husband Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick. Towards the end of the fifteenth century, it was owned by Mary, Lady Hastings and Hungerford, daughter-in-law of William, Lord Hastings; see above, n. 14. Emelina Bremschet wrote a Latin prayer on the opening leaves of CSJ, MS H.5, a copy of Stephen Scrope’s translation of Christine de Pizan’s *Épitre d'Othéa*, and three women in the Heydon household, Elizabeth, Amy and Anne, signed their names in the margins of Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338; see above, p. 117. Anne Colvyle was a later owner of the prose translation contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416; see above, p. 113. Traditionally, scholars have assumed that Sir John Talbot’s gift of BL, MS Royal 15 E.VI, which contains Honoré Bouvet’s *Arbre des batailles* (fol. 293r); Giles of Rome’s *De regimine principum* (fol. 327r); the statutes of the Order of the Garter in French (fol. 439r) and Christine de Pizan’s *Livre des faits d’armes et de chevalerie* (fol. 405r), to Margaret of Anjou reflected the interests of Talbot, rather than those of Margaret, as the texts were not ‘obvious choices for a young lady turning fifteen, albeit a Queen’; A.J. Pollard, *John Talbot and the War in France, 1427-1453* (London, 1983), p. 123. The evidence of female readership of other military texts may suggest otherwise.
by readers who had a vested interest in the Anglo-French lands, and readers who had never set foot in France; yet this disparate group formed a community of readers who were interested in chivalry and military strategy.

Worcester's interest in war with France, as witnessed by the Boke of Noblesse, is almost always treated as an anomaly; as at best representing a minority of public opinion or, at worst, as representing 'a small group of passé ultra-conservatives'. However, the proliferation of these manuscripts in the third quarter of the fifteenth century registers an interest in war which suggests that Worcester's sentiments were not so unusual, at least among the class he represented. The market for military texts did not comprise 'passé ultra-conservatives', but individuals who recognised that defeat abroad would have far-reaching consequences for the domestic situation. The speech given to parliament in 1472, which argued in favour of a new campaign in France, utilised the ideas and rhetoric employed by Worcester and found in the works of Vegetius, Pizan and Chartier. This rhetoric succeeded in producing the largest army ever to cross to France in the fifteenth century and the money with which to fund it. These sentiments were clearly shared by more than a minority.

---

187 Not one copy of these texts can be identified with an urban owner.
188 See chapter five, pp. 226-246.
Chapter Four

‘In defaute of exercising of armes’: reading military texts and the English diagnosis of defeat

The following two chapters consider how the military texts discussed in chapter two were read and the way that these readings interacted with, and were shaped by, other concerns and discourses of the fifteenth century. Using the evidence derived from a close study of how these texts were annotated by their scribes and readers, and altered by their translators, I explore the different ways that contemporaries thought about war in the context of military defeat abroad and war at home. Other sources are considered alongside the manuscripts, which enables these reinscriptions to be placed within the broader historical and discursive contexts to which their makers belonged. These sources are ‘propagandist’ bills and manifestos, parliamentary speeches, contemporary chronicles, and literary texts such as Malory’s Morte Darthur and Caxton’s early translations. These are sources which we can either be relatively sure readers would have been exposed to at some point in the period or that emanate from the same cultural milieu as the readers.

The first two sections of this chapter demonstrate that readers diagnosed military defeat in a range of ways. Readers emphasised, through translation change and annotation, the themes of counsel and unity, payment of soldiers’ wages, provision for war and the treatment of the non-combatant. I argue that their interest in these issues can be seen as a reaction to the experience of civil war and as a product of the rhetoric which the wars produced, as well as contributing to a wider discourse surrounding the defeat abroad.
The third and fourth sections of the chapter argue that readers identified a lack of interest in war as responsible for military defeat. They also discuss what this evidence suggests about changing notions of knighthood, the function of the soldier in society and the effect of civil war upon chivalric and noble identity.
Although there has been remarkably little interest in how contemporaries explained the defeat in France, the diagnosis offered in parliament between late 1449 and early 1450 has attained a prominent place in accounts of the 1450s. This diagnosis attributed defeat in France to poor, self-interested counsel. As Watts states, parliament 'publicised a particular account of both the recent past and the current predicament [...]. This account - immediately familiar to us - was that Suffolk and other self-interested courtiers had usurped the place of good and noble counsel about the innocent, but passive, king and used it treasonably, to pillage his estate, obtain excessive judicial power and contrive the loss of Normandy'.

This diagnosis of defeat continued to be articulated throughout the 1450s in contexts closely associated with Richard, duke of York. As a result, the argument that defeat in France was the result of poor counsel has been seen as a fundamental tenet of the Yorkist position, particularly because the theme of 'poor counsel' became one of the main ways in which York and his supporters justified and legitimised the later civil war. However, reader and scribal annotations of the translations circulating between c. 1445 and c. 1475 demonstrate that other, not necessarily Yorkist, members of the political community likewise attributed military defeat to poor counsel.

---

2 In his articles to the king dating from 1450, York argued that 'it is a grete pite to thinke on that so gracieux and mighty prince for the singularite of the thristelewe, coveitous and colde kowardise I broughte up of noughte, shold cause thise inconvenientes, lossis and pouertie and dissolacions'. These same traitors 'have caused the losses of his glorious reaume of France'; Kekewich et al (eds.), John Vale's Book, p. 188. One of Cade's manifestos stated that 'France is loste' because of the king's 'fals counsaille'. This was a recirculation of the 1450 manifesto; 'Articles of the commons of Kent at the coming of the Yorkist lords from Calais, 1460', in Kekewich et al (eds.), John Vale's Book, p. 211.
Readers were encouraged by scribes to explain loss of territories and military defeat in general as stemming from poor counsel. Scribal annotations affected the reception of a text and were 'written to influence the performance of the text in the public sphere, written, that is, as political acts and ideas'. The scribes of three copies of the prose translation of De re militari, produced in the late 1440s and early 1450s, wrote 'Nota de concilijis' and 'nota de concilijis private' next to the passage which argued that the leader of an army 'nedeth to be wys and pryue of his counsaile'. The owner of one of the manuscripts, Thomas Rotherham, clearly shared his scribe's interest in the importance of counsel. He annotated the passage which argued that a military leader needed to be 'algate bysy with wys counsaile' if he wanted to secure success on the battlefield. The scribe of the only remaining copy of the U translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif, Richardus Franciscus, wrote 'nota bene' next to the story of King Rehoboam, which argued that because King Rehoboam: 'set apart the counseill of the auncient, sage men and folowing the assottid oppinons of the yonge menne vnwyttely he lost of his seigneurie x kindereddes and an half'. This same passage was annotated by a pointing finger in the copy of the R translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338. The fact that readers annotated similar themes to those

5 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 48v; Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, fol. 59v; OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 56r; G.A. Lester (ed.), The Earliest English Translation of Vegetius' De re militari (Heidelberg, 1988), book III, chapter 6, p. 116.
6 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 58v; Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book III, chapter 9, p. 129.
annotated by the scribes of their manuscripts suggests that both producers and readers participated in a discourse community, which recognised the necessity of good counsel.

Other readers annotated sections stressing the need for good counsel when making military decisions. Early readers of two copies of the R translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif annotated the passage which argued that the defeat of the Romans at the hands of Hannibal and his army at the Battle of Cannae was the result of poor leadership and counsel.9 The reader of BL, MS Cotton Julius E.V, a mid-fifteenth century, English-produced copy of the Quadrilogue Invectif in French, highlighted the passage which argued that 'le sauoir raisonable croist auecques les ans et la longue vie et grans experiences font les certains jugemens, si est la savance quise en ceulx qui plus ont vertu'.10 William Worcester had this passage copied into one of his notebooks.11 A reader of PML, MS M 775, possibly Sir John Astley, annotated with a 'nota bene' the section in his copy of the prose translation of De re militari which argued that if a military leader wanted to secure success in battle he had to 'clepe to hym þe wysest and þe kunnyngest men of werre of all hi oost & wipout eny feynynge or flaterie [or] glosyng, he moot ofte trete and counsaille wip hem'.12 Readers also annotated passages which argued that a leader ought to keep his own counsel and not disclose information concerning the prosecution of war to anyone else. For example, the scribes of two copies of the prose translation annotated the passage on the Minotaur, which argued

---

9 LPL, MS Arc.L40.2/E.42, fol. 20r; NL, MS f.36, Ry 20, fol. 12v; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 192.
10 BL, MS Cotton Julius E.V, fol. 20v. This passage was translated by the R translator as follows: ‘The resonable vnderstonding and knowlege growth with the yeres of longe lyvyng and experience makithe the certayne iugementis and the wisdom sought and found owte in them that haue most seen and lyue longest’; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 212.
11 BL, MS Royal 13 C.I, fol. 136v.
12 Unfortunately, it has not been possible to see the folio numbers on the microfilm of this manuscript, which is in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York; Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book III, chapter 9, p. 126.
that: 'ri3t as this best þe Mynotaur is so priueliche hidde in kinde þat no man him knowip, so schulde þe counsaile of a prince or a duke in tyme of werre ben hyd in þe innermest partye of his wittes, þat is discrecioun, þat no man scholde knowe his hole wit but he himself'.

This stress upon the importance of selecting counsellors wisely and not disclosing information echoes the diagnosis of defeat promulgated in the 1449-1450 parliament and by Cade's rebels. As was mentioned earlier, the loss of the French lands was blamed upon Henry VI's self-interested advisors. Moreover, in article 5 of the parliamentary proceedings against the duke of Suffolk, Henry was told that Suffolk knew 'the privite of youre counseill [...] and the purveaunce of your armees, the defence and kepyng of youre townes [...] and] hath often and many dyvers tymes, falsely and traiterously discovered and opened to hym [Charles VII] the privite, ordenaunce and provision of your seid counseill' and because of this, Charles VII was able to conquer the Lancastrian lands. It cannot be argued that readers annotated sections concerning counsel in order to criticise Henry VI's conduct in relation to France. Nonetheless, it is significant, given the existence of a wider public debate in which defeat was attributed to poor counsel, that readers consistently annotated sections in their texts which stressed the responsibility of a ruler to keep his own counsel and to choose his counsellors wisely. The prevalence of the argument that military defeat or loss of territory was the result of poor counsel may have been the product of the discourse or framework in which complaints or criticisms had to be articulated: focusing criticism on those around the king and attributing defeat to poor counsel enabled the complainant or petitioner,
be it York or Jack Cade, to present himself as a loyal subject, as opposed to a traitor and rebel.\textsuperscript{15}

The relationship between counsel and war was also reinforced by the manuscript context for the circulation of these texts. These texts were frequently paired with mirrors for princes, which stressed the importance of good, impartial counsel. The prose translation of \textit{De re militari}, for example, is found alongside Lydgate and Burgh's \textit{Secrets of Philosophers} in five manuscripts produced between 1450-1474.\textsuperscript{16} The U translation of the \textit{Quadrilogue Invec} was paired with a translation of the \textit{Secreta secretorum} and 'These iij consideracions beth right necesarye to the good gouernaunce of a prince', a mid-fifteenth-century translation of a fourteenth-century French text, which also stressed the importance of counsel in war. The reader of BL, MS Add. 14408, which contains both the prose translation of \textit{De re militari} and a copy of the \textit{Secrets of Philosophers}, annotated stanzas promoting counsel. He wrote 'hede' alongside the stanza which concerns prudent counsel and 'jhesu' alongside stanzas which also stress the need for good counsel.\textsuperscript{17} The copy of \textit{The Siege of Thebes} contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc 416, which also contains a copy of the prose translation, has the marginal gloss: '¶ The counsell of flaterers' next to the passage that reads that the king: 'lefte trouthe and sette his fantasye/ To be governed by fals flaterye'.\textsuperscript{18} The other texts which circulated alongside these translations, and the ways in which they were annotated, reveal, therefore, both a keen interest in counsel during this period and also that success in war

\textsuperscript{15} See the comments of Watts in 'Polemic and Politics', pp. 3-42 and in 'Ideas, Principles and Politics', in A.J. Pollard (ed.), \textit{The Wars of the Roses} (Basingstoke, 1995), pp. 125-6.
\textsuperscript{16} BL, MSS Lansdowne 285, Sloane 2027, Add. 14408; Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416; PML, MS M 775.
\textsuperscript{17} BL, MS Add. 14408, fols. 37r, 39r; John Lydgate and Benedict Burgh, \textit{Lydgate's and Burgh's Secrets of Philosophers ('Governance of Kings and Princes')}, ed. R. Steele, EETS, extra series 66 (1894), ll. 2073-2080, 2171-2184.
\textsuperscript{18} Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416, fol. 237r.
was regarded as dependent upon good counsel. By extension, defeat in war could be explained by poor counsel.

Those more directly affected by the loss of the lands also explained defeat in this way: the petition of the inhabitants of Maine dating from 1452, copied into one of Worcester's notebooks, argued that: 'A cause de la quelle delivrance vous ayez habandonne sy grant nombre du people, voz loyaulx subgies, et icellui mis en lobeissance de voz dis adversaries qui cest grant pitie. La quelle chose vous bien loyallement conceillie et adverty, neussies jamais soufferte avoir est fette'.

Worcester likewise implied that poor counsel was partly responsible for the defeat abroad. He used the example of King Rehoboam to provide a parallel to the English situation. According to Worcester, King Rehoboam 'lost the kingdom of whiche he had the gouvernaunce' through poor counsel. Immediately after this example, Worcester induced 'every governoure' to 'have a verray parfit love to the gouvernaunce of a comon wele by wise and goode counceile and to folow the pathis and weies and examples of the noble senatours of Rome, how they were attending to the commyn profit, setting aside singular availe'. Implicitly, therefore, 'singular availe' caused Rehoboam to lose his kingdom. Worcester also wrote of 'yong counceflours [who] had

19 Translated by Stevenson as: 'In consequence of this deliverance you have abandoned a great number of people, your faithful subjects and placed them under the authority of your said adversaries which is a great pity. If you had been well and faithfully advised and warned in this matter, you would never have suffered it to be done'; LPL, MS 506, fols. 50r-51v printed in J. Stevenson (ed.), Letters and Papers illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry V, Roll Series 22 (1861-4), 2: 599-600.
21 It is interesting to note that Fortescue used the story of Rehoboam in his Governance of England in order to make a different point from that of Chartier and Worcester. He argued that because King Rehoboam over-taxed his subjects, 'the ten parts of the people divided into twelve parts, departed from him, and chose themselves a new king'; John Fortescue, On the Laws and Governance of England, ed. S. Lockwood (Cambridge, 1997), p. 105. This passage is annotated with a 'nota bene nota' in the margin of the copy of the Governance contained in John Vale's book;
wasted and brought to nought their inheritance called patrimonie, and the common profit of their cite destroyed.22

Worcester suggested that wise counsel could have fundamentally altered the course of the French war. This is implied by his use of the example of the war between King Pirrus and the Romans. He argued that the Romans 'ayenst their worship' were about to make peace and alliances with King Pirrus 'to her uttermost dishonoure'.23 The senators, however, followed the advice of Appius, the priest of Minerva, who advised them to start a new campaign against King Pirrus and not 'to become subjet to their auncient adversarie'. The result of this advice was that 'the saide senatours were revived in their courage through the wise exhortations of Appius, and had the victorie of Pirrus'.24 The parallel to the English situation is clear. In Worcester's view, the Lancastrian government had made a series of 'dishonourable' diplomatic concessions to the French, including the cession of Maine, but unlike the senators of Rome, they had not listened to the advice of men such as Humphrey, duke of Gloucester and Sir John Fastolf.25

The implied criticism that Henry VI and his counsellors had rejected the advice of those who had urged a hard line against the French was developed in Worcester's
construction of the French as truce breakers. Worcester argued that part of the reason why the French lands had been lost was because Charles VII had broken the truce with England 'ayenst alle honoure and trouthe of knighthode'. His annotations of the only extant manuscript which contains the Boke of Noblesse emphasised this: 'Treugae pluries infractae' ('Several truces broken') and 'Nota fallacias Francorum in rupcione treugarum, vide et attende bene' ('Note the deceits of the French in breaking the truces: see and take good note'). He also presented a chronological account of the history of diplomatic 'war' between the kings of France and England and then summarised that: 'none of alle thcse trewes hathe ben observed [...] but [they] alway brake the saide trewes when they coude take any avauntage ayenst us, as it shewethe openly, and may be a mirroure for ever to alle cristen princes to mystrust any trewes taking by youre saide adversarie or his allies and subjectis'.

Worcester's chronological account of French betrayal may have been inspired by his reading of Chartier's narrative of English duplicity in his Quadrilogue Inveif. Chartier had argued that:

Sachons premierement qui sont ceulx contre qui vous avez a guerroyer. Et se bien en enquerez, c'est la ligne de Forgestus et de Hangestus, les Saxons, qui comme souldoyers vindrent au secours du roy de la Grant Bretaigne oppressé de dures guerres. Et depuis occupèrent et prindrent le pays pour eulx, quant ilz le sentirent despourveu par guerre de sa bonne chevalerie, et par trai6on, soubz faintise de paix, occirent le sourplus de la noblesce de paiz. C'est la ligne qui debouta et occist son souverain seigneur, roy d'Angleterre, pour usurper tiranniquement sa seigneurie.  

---

26 The French are referred to as truce-breakers in [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, pp. 3, 5, 25-30, 34-39 and 41.  
27 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 25.  
28 BL, MS Royal 18 B.XXII, fol. 16v; 17r.  
29 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 39.  
30 Alain Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Inveif, ed. E. Droz (Paris, 1950), pp. 17-18. This passage was highlighted in BL, MS Cotton Julius E.V, an English-produced copy of the text in French on fol. 8r. Note also the U translator's interesting reinscription of this passage. The French stated that they found the king 'despourveu par guerre de sa bonne chevalerie' whereas the U translator
Worcester's construction of the French as truce-breakers served two purposes: on the one hand, it deflected attention away from other explanations for why the French lands had been lost. Worcester was keen to stress that the French had broken the Truce of Tours before the taking of Fougères by François de Surienne. That it was the French who had initiated these actions was emphasised by the section's rubric which read: 'How the frenshe partie began fierce to offende and brake the trewis' (my italics). The attack on Fougères had devastating consequences for the English: it meant that Brittany was bound to support the French and it provided Charles VII with a legitimate reason to restart the war, which he did on 31 July 1449. Yet, the English were not prepared for the opening of the conflict. Taylor regards the attack on Fougères as an example of the 'confusion and lack of long-term strategic planning which characterized English foreign policy under Henry VI'. Worcester, by stressing that the French had argued that they found him 'dispurueid of knyghthode through fortune' (my italics); Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 163.

31 For example, Worcester's statement that 'before the taking of Fugiers ser Simon Mothier knight, provost of Paris' was taken prisoner and the fortress of Pountlarge was captured; [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 5. The English did not assume responsibility for the attack on Fougères. However they refused to persuade François de Surienne to leave or to compensate the duke of Brittany or the inhabitants of Fougères for the damage caused by the attack; M.H. Keen and M.J. Daniel, 'English Diplomacy and the Sack of Fougères in 1449', History 59 (1974): 376-8.

32 BL, MS Royal 18 B.XXII, fol. 3r.

33 M.K. Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', EHR 104 (1984): 301. York's articles against Somerset dating from 1452 refer to Somerset's role in the attack on Fougères; J. Gairdner (ed.), The Paston Letters 1422-1509 (London, 1904): 1: 104. See also the letter addressed to the inhabitants of Normandy written in July 1449, in which the attack on Fougères was cited as the justification for restarting the war; C.D. Taylor, 'Brittany and the French Crown: the Legacy of the English Attack upon Fougères (1449)', in J. Maddicott and D. Palliser (eds.), The Medieval State. Essays Presented to James Campbell (London, 2000), p. 246. The effect of the alliance between Brittany and France was stressed in the parliamentary proceedings against Suffolk. They argue, referring to the truce of Tours, that Suffolk 'suffred and caused the seid Duke of Britayne to be comprised on the partie of the same Charles, as his subgett, frende and alleie'; RP, 5: 179.

34 Harriss emphasises that when the truce collapsed there was simply not the money to pay for the war; G.L. Harriss, 'Marmaduke Lumley and the Exchequer Crisis of 1446-9', in J.G. Rowe (ed.), Aspects of Late Medieval Government and Society (Toronto, 1986), p. 171.

already broken the truce before the attack on Fougères, was implicitly arguing that French duplicity, not English stupidity, was responsible for the loss of Normandy.

Yet, this construction also implied that the English ought to have known that the French would break the truce and ought to have been prepared for that event. Worcester developed this implied criticism of the Lancastrian government throughout the Boke of Noblesse. Representing those dispossessed by the cession of Maine, he stated that: 'Heh alla! thei did cri[e, and woo be the tyme they saide, that ever we shulde put affiaunce and trust to the frenshe partie [...] in any trewes keping, considering so many folde tymes we have ben deceived myschevid thoroughe such dissimuled trewes'.

He later argued that the defeat in Normandy was partly caused by 'infortune and over grete favoure and trust put to youre adversaries' and by 'overmoche trust and avauntage gyven to your adversaries'. Indeed, the lesson of French duplicity was one that some of those involved in the war with France had already learnt. Worcester's employer, Sir John Fastolf, in his report of September 1435 composed in response to the Treaty of Arras, advised against trusting the French because 'alle treaties [...] were ever sone aftarward brokin [...] when they cowd take or avise thaire avauntage over the kingis men'. Worcester therefore implied that if Henry VI and his councillors had been prudent and listened to the advice of men experienced in the war (like Fastolf), they would not have put so much faith in the truce. This point was reiterated in the preface to the collection of documents that probably accompanied the Boke of Noblesse. Worcester’s son wrote that the purpose of the codex was to show how some for their 'gret wysdom and polesye [were] assigned and deputed to be of the grete councelle of Fraunce'. Moreover, this codex contains a variety of documents composed by Fastolf in which he

36 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 41.
37 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, pp. 25, 30.
advised the government not to trust the French, such as Fastolf’s ‘Articles on the treaty of Arras of 1435’ mentioned above and his instructions to Somerset drawn up in March 1448.40

Even after Fougères there was no consensus among the lords over the direction foreign policy should take.41 Such divisions over policy have been regarded as partly responsible for the English defeat in France by modern historians.42 Contemporaries also seem to have diagnosed defeat in this way or at least to have recognised the relationship between internal unity and success in war. For example, in his Regiment of Princes (1411), Hoccleve argued that ‘Whyles that Romains were in herte al oon/And undyvydid al hool stood, they were/Lorde of al the world; fo was ther noon/Outward, as who seith, mighte hem greeve or dere’.43 Fastolf’s ‘propositions concerning the recovery of Anglo-French possessions’, dating from August 1449, which are contained in one of Worcester’s notebooks, argued that Henry V’s success in France was due to French disunity.44

40 LPL, MS 56, fols. 31r, 40v, 42r, printed in Stevenson (ed.), Letters and Papers, 2: 575, 592, 595.
41 See, for example, the different views expressed in the parliamentary speech of 1449 concerning the defence of Guyenne. The speech is reproduced in A.R. Myers, ‘A Parliamentary Debate of the Mid-Fifteenth Century’, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 22 (1938): 398.
43 Thomas Hoccleve, The Regiment of Princes, ed. C.R. Blyth (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1999), Il. 5237-5240.
44 ‘Item, quantum ad secundum, videlicet de his quae siebant tempore defuncti regis Henrici quinti, considerandum est quod dum ipse rex primo intravit Franciam principes Franciae in magna erant divisione invicem; et sic unus alium expectans, nullam apposuerunt resistentiam, neque in suo primo introitu, neque in prosecuzione inceptorum suorum; et illo modo tandem rex obtinuit civitatem Rothomagum et alia notabilia loca, quod nobis bene debet esse speculum et exemplar, nisi adversariis celeriter resistemus’; Stevenson (ed.), Letters and Papers, 2: 729-730. London, College of Arms, MS 48, fol. 333r. An alternative explanation for Henry V’s success was articulated by John Hardyng. He argued that Henry V’s conquests were the result of: ‘the peace at home, and lawe so well conserved, [which were] were croppe and rote of all his hie conquest’; John Hardyng, The Chronicil of John Hardyng, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1812), p. 388.
Moreover, passages concerning the importance of unity were annotated in three manuscripts containing the prose translation of *De re militari* produced in the years leading up to the loss of the French lands and shortly afterwards. The scribes of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291; CUL, MS Add. 8706 and PML, MS M 775 wrote ‘nota de Unite’ next to the passage that states that in the Roman army:

```
suche acorde of good wille ther was amonge hem [soldiers] that not with standinge that horsemen and footemen kyndely contrarien and discorden in condiciouns and maneres 3it amonge hem was suche acorde that eueryche of hem loued and worschiped othir as broýer and broýer and tbýis acorde of loue helde euere the legioun stronge through pees. 45
```

Clearly in this passage ‘acorde of love’ or, as the scribes noted, ‘unity’ resulted in military strength.

Scribes and readers also annotated the following passage in three manuscripts containing the prose translation: ‘For þere is noun so litil nacioun ne peple in þe worlde þat may be distroyed wip enmyes but þe stryue & debate wip inne hem self ssfor strif and debate in a cominalte is to her enemies an hasty helpinge and to hem self asodein distroiynge’. 46 This passage advanced a diagnosis of military defeat which centred upon lack of unity. According to the passage, it was only through internal division that a realm could be defeated. These passages and annotations tell us something fairly fundamental about the use of these texts in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. The passages

---

45 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 35r; Lester (ed.), *English Translation of Vegetius*, book II, chapter 20, p. 97. The scribe of the copy contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291 also wrote the marginal note ‘nota de vnite’ on fol. 43v. In PML, MS M 775, judging from the microfilm, the scribe only wrote ‘nota’ close to the inside margin, but I assume that an examination of the manuscript would show the rest of the phrase. The Latin reads: ‘Per hanc ergo contextionem in legionibus et omnium cohortium et equitum pediumque servatur una concordia’; M.D. Reeve (ed.), *V egetius: Epitoma rei militaris* (Oxford, 2004), book II, chapter 21, p. 55.

46 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 60r; OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 68v; Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, fol. 72r; Lester (ed.), *English Translation of Vegetius*, book III, chapter 10, p. 131.
offered an explanation for the loss of the Hundred Years War (that internal division had caused the defeat), but also a warning for the future. They emphasised that if Englishmen continued along the path towards civil war, the realm would be particularly vulnerable to French or Scottish invasion, an observation which was, of course, borne out by the following decades.  

Translations produced in the late 1450s and 1460s were more concerned with the effects of disunity. Chartier emphasised the divisions in France by structuring his text as a discussion between the three estates and demonstrating that the 'Le Chevalier' and 'Le Peuple' blamed each other for the country's predicament. The R translator of the Quadrilogue Invectif also operated within this framework. He argued that 'the light feith, the chaungeable and litle trouthe of subiettis to this lordship, thai ben the movynge and the causes of comyngys of our enemes vpon vs, and ellis durst nat thei haue takyn suche hardines'. Chartier and the translators also argued that internal division 'encreisith the strenghe of the aduersaryes'.

This correlation between lack of unity and external attack had an added significance in the context of the Wars of the Roses. Lancastrian sources argued that political disunity might encourage enemies to attack. The verse translator of De re militari utilised this rhetorical strategy in his attempts to discredit the Yorkist lords. He made reference to the argument that Yorkist opposition jeopardised the common weal of the realm by making the realm vulnerable to foreign invasion. This was implicitly referenced

47 For example, the raid on the port of Sandwich, which occurred at the end of August 1457. The fact that readers annotated passages concerning the importance of unity is also significant given the political and discursive context of the late 1450s. It has been argued that the preservation of unity was a central concern for the majority of the nobles; Watts, Henry VI, pp. 77-8, 318-350.
49 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 194.
in the verse translator's vision of England without civil war. According to the verse translator, the consequences of ending internal war would be that 'al the worlde' would be scared to attack England: 'The werre intraneous of al this londe/Is at an ende, here nys no more affray; /Justice is heer peasilbilly to stonde/ And al the worlde shal telle of Engelonde/ And of the kyngis high magnificence,/ And been adred tattempte it with offense'. Implicitly, whilst there was internal war, this was not the case. The translator seemed to be echoing the sentiments expressed in the poem celebrating the Loveday of 25 March 1458 which argued that now there was peace and unity amongst the lords 'Oure enemyes quaken and dreden ful sore'.

The concern that internal division might invite external attack was also emphasised by the verse translator in his version of Vegetius's discussion of the military host. Whereas Vegetius had argued that: 'Periculum enim ab hostibus semper gravissimum sustinet divisus et inordinatus exercitus', the verse translator argued: 'First is to lerne a chiualerys pace/ That is to serue in journey & bataile/ Gret peril is, if they theryn difface/ That seyn; our enemye vil our oste assaile'. The translator's reinscription rested upon the premise that division not only causes weakness, but also actively encourages the enemy to attack. Later on in the poem, the translator added that for this reason it is good to see one's enemy 'out of aray'.

---

50 R. Dyboski, and Z.M. Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, EETS, original series 201 (1935), ll. 2917-2923.
53 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, ll. 320-324. The word 'difface' is used under 'pressure of rhyme' according to the editors. The translator uses this unusual word again in l. 1943. The MED says that 'difface' usually meant 'to disfigure' or 'to transform for the worse'. However, the OED cites 'to destroy' as a meaning of 'deface', which is probably its intended meaning here.
54 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, l. 2816.
Yorkist propaganda, on the other hand, argued that Lancastrian misrule, as opposed to noble disunity, might encourage the Scots or the French to attack.\textsuperscript{55} The verse translator seems to have been countering this argument by implying that there was no legitimate reason to oppose the Lancastrian government. For example, he suggested that now ‘all envie’ (referring to the Yorkists) was ‘exiled’ there would be ‘Tranquillite with peax & no debate’ and that ultimately ‘Grace in this gouernaunce wil multilie’.\textsuperscript{56} By implication, the only thing that had prevented ‘grace’ in Henry's government was Yorkist opposition.\textsuperscript{57} Thus, the author recast recent events in order to imply that England had been a peaceful and unified realm prior to Yorkist intervention. Demonstrations of widespread disillusionment with the Lancastrian regime, such as Cade's Revolt, were conveniently forgotten in the translator's version of the past.\textsuperscript{58} There were no discontented elements in the English political landscape; York's followers did not support him because they genuinely believed in the need for reform, but because they thought ‘mony be ther inne’.\textsuperscript{59} Attributing rebellion to purely financial motives had the effect of delegitimising or displacing other, more problematic, factors.\textsuperscript{60}

The argument that internal division would encourage enemies was not only a rhetorical or propagandist device: internal division, such as that in 1459-61 or 1469-71,
had indeed left England particularly vulnerable to French invasion and external manipulation.\(^61\) This is perhaps why the threat of external attack became a recurrent feature of rhetoric emanating from both Lancastrian and Yorkist sources.\(^62\) The Yorkist poem known as 'The Ballade set on the gates of Canterbury', dating from 1460, argued that "'Omne regnum in se divisum," sayethe dyuyne Scribepture,/' Shall be desolate"; than folowethe translacione/ Into the handes of theyre enemies../ And now ys Englund in lyk reputacione,/ In wey to be conquered'.\(^63\) A lyric known as 'pat pes may stonde', found in the late fifteenth-century Heege MS (National library of Scotland, MS Advocates 19.3.1), argues that if all Englishmen would 'holde to-gedur [...] with ýo right of ynglonde and þe Cron' they would not fear 'no nodur nacions' but could 'defende oure enmyes owt of þis londe'.\(^64\) Warwick's articles on his way from Calais to Ludlow in 1459 argued that Lancastrian misrule, as opposed to noble disunity, might encourage the Scots or the French to attack, an argument which had already been used in the 1455 Act of Resumption.\(^65\) In 1470 he reiterated this argument, only this time it was used against

---


\(^62\) Yorkist propaganda went one step further and argued that the Lancastrians actually invited external enemies to attack England and Calais. For example, in the articles sent to the archbishop of Canterbury, dating from 1460, it was argued that Henry VI had invited England's enemies to attack the realm and Calais; Edward IV's letter and instructions to Thomas Cook, alderman of London, for a benevolence, dated 13 March 1462, stated that Margaret and Henry 'have conspired with oure outwarde ennemyes aswele of Fraunce and Scotland as of other divers countrees, that oure saide outwarde ennemyes in grete numbre shall [...] entro into this oure saide reaume of Englunde to make suche cruell, horrible and mortall werre, depopulacion, robberye and manslaughter ashore before hathe not biene used among cristen people'; J.S. Davies (ed.), *English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI*, Camden Society, old series 64 (1856), pp. 87-8; Kekewich et al (eds.), *John Vale's Book*, p. 136.


\(^64\) Robbins (ed.), *Historical Poems*, pp. 239-42, ll. 66-70. Hardman has recently argued that the Heege manuscript suggests that domestic and social issues were of more concern than international ones. She argues that: 'instead of memories of English victory in France [...] we see a desire for national security based not on aggression abroad but on reconciliation at home'; P. Hardman, 'Compiling the Nation: Fifteenth-Century Miscellany Manuscripts', in H. Cooney (ed.), *Nation, Court and Culture* (Dublin, 2001), p. 67.

\(^65\) Warwick's articles on his way from Calais to Ludlow in 1459 argued that: 'Wee therefore, seying these mishesef so parelous and therto knownen unto our ennemyes oутe of this lande where upon it is demed they take corage tenterprise the subduing and losse of alle the lande';
Edward IV. Both the Somnium Vigilantis and the parliamentary speech given in favour of a new campaign in France in 1475 referred to the concept or assumption that the execution of strict justice might expose the realm to foreign attack. Although clearly designed to achieve different ends, the recurrent use of this argument in different spheres not only suggests a consciousness of the vulnerability of England's position in the aftermath of the Hundred Years War and subsequent civil unrest, but also implies the existence of a common pool of political discourse, which could be used for a variety of purposes and glossed and interpreted in different ways.

Kekewich et al (eds.), John Vale's Book, p. 209. The preamble to the 1455 act of resumption argued that resumption was necessary if 'your adversaries and enemyes shuld falle into the drede wheryn here tofore they have been'; RP, 5: 300; Watts, 'Polemic and Politics', p. 27, n. 103.

66 The letter from Warwick and Clarence to the commons of England, 1470, argued that 'the reaume [is] like to be aliened and gouveered by strange and outewarde nacions yif the seid coveitous persons may reule as thei have doone'; Kekewich et al (eds.), John Vale's Book, p. 219.

Throughout the fifteenth century, the argument that the effective prosecution of war relied upon military discipline and sufficient financial provision was made by French authors such as Christine de Pizan and Alain Chartier, as well as in non-literary sources such as military ordinances. In effect, these sources argued that in order for soldiers to be disciplined, they needed sufficient payment of wages; otherwise they would be forced to pillage the non-combatant population. From a French perspective, this stress upon the importance of discipline and finance was due to the nature of the war in France and the behaviour of groups of French soldiers, such as the Free Companies in the 1360s and ‘skinners’ in the 1440s, who continued to pillage and loot their country even in times of peace. From an English perspective, military discipline was essential because Henry V’s conquest was supposed to be an Anglo/French land settlement. Therefore it was essential that the non-combatant population were treated as subjects, not as enemies: in other words, it was vital that their goods were not pillaged and stolen by those committed to protect them.

In this section I shall argue that English readers, through translation change and annotations, emphasised these issues of military discipline and financial provision for war. I shall then offer an interpretation of why these issues were consistently annotated and emphasised in the third quarter of the fifteenth century and argue that these rewritings formed part of a wider diagnosis of defeat in France.

The concern over wages is demonstrated by the verse translation of *De re militari*. The verse translator paired 'exercise' with 'wages' four times throughout the course of the poem. His source text, *De re militari*, was emphatic that exercise was the most important attribute of military success, but if anything it argued against the necessity of wages being paid and certainly did not explicitly link the importance of exercise with wages. Yet the verse translator chose to emphasise the importance of wages. This emphasis suggests that he recognised that the payment of wages was essential to the successful prosecution of war. The EETS editors explained each occurrence of the term 'wage' as either a mistranslation or the result of metrical necessity, and on one occasion explained the use of 'wage' as a 'meaningless addition'.

Thus, in the first case 'what helpith it, if ignobilitee have exercise in werre and wagys large;/ A traitour or a coward if he be', the editors argued that he had mistranslated 'pluribus stipendiis moretur in castris' as wages, where in fact 'stipendia' means 'years of service'.

They then explained the use of 'wage' in two other cases as mistranslations of 'annona'. They argued this despite the fact that in some cases the translator was clearly familiar with the Latin term 'annona' because he was able to translate it 'correctly' in other parts of the poem. Surely it is more profitable to account for these changes as reflecting a recognition of the twin aspects of good soldiering: that both exercise and wages had to be in place in order for the soldier to be efficient and motivated. If this...

---

70 The use of 'wage' in the following lines 'not oonly in the playn, but also where is/ A mountayn or a clif or streyt passagys/ Thus hadde thei both exercise and wagys' is explicated as a 'meaningless addition'; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knighthode and Bataile*, ll. 603-6.

71 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knighthode and Bataile*, ll. 278-80.

72 'And ouer this al, exercise in armys/ The doctour is to teche and discipline,/ For double wage a wurthi man of armys/ Was wont to take'; 'Sengil ther were of these, and duplicate/ And triplicate, and so to IIII or V/That had wage, vche aftir his estate'; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knighthode and Bataile*, ll. 796-8, 397-9.

73 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knighthode and Bataile*, l. 483. They note that 'annona' was translated 'correctly' on page lvii of their introduction.

74 The translator's emphasis on the importance of wages may have been influenced by his experience of Calais in the late 1450s. Harriss has argued that, to a large degree, the garrison at Calais gave their allegiance to whoever paid their wages. In May 1454, the soldiers of Calais...
was the case, the translator was updating and recontextualising *De re militari* for a fifteenth-century audience, rather than mistranslating and mindlessly adding words for the sake of rhyme.

The individual readers of these texts and the communities to which they belonged seem to have been particularly interested in the issues of discipline, wages and victuals. Sir John Paston II added the ordinances of war of Henry V and those of Thomas Montague, Earl of Salisbury to his *Grete Boke.* These ordinances emphasised the necessity of controlling pillage in a host. His nephew, William Paston II, obtained a copy of the *Statutes of War* printed by Richard Pynson in 1492. Beadle and Hellinga suggest that this text ‘was of interest to people like the Pastons and their associates, such that its appearance in print was something of an event’. Worcester mentioned that he gave a copy of Bedford’s ordinances of war to Edward IV on 29 May 1475. An early sixteenth-century reader of the *Boke of Noblesse* noted that he must get a copy of them. The manuscript that was probably intended to accompany the *Boke of Noblesse*, LPL, MS 506, contains, amongst other things, documents concerning wages, receipts and

raided the wool and provisions which were stored in the port because they had not received their wages. Before the garrison would admit Warwick in April 1456, they insisted that the wages they were due were paid. Harriss explains the lack of loyalty shown by the Calais garrison towards Warwick as being partly due to the non-payment of the garrison’s wages; G.L. Harriss, ‘The Struggle for Calais, an Aspect of the Rivalry Between Lancaster and York’, *EHR* 75 (1960): pp. 30, 36, 45, 48-49; see also D. Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison: Warfare and Military Service in England 1436-1558* (forthcoming).

75 These were written by a different scribe from that responsible for the main body of the manuscript, in a separate quire. The copies contained in Paston’s ‘Grete Boke’ are printed in T. Twiss (ed.), *Monumenta Juridica: The Black Book of the Admiralty*, Rolls Series 55 (1871-6), 1: 459-72. See chapter three, p. 134.
76 R. Beadle and L. Hellinga, ‘William Paston II and Pynson’s *Statutes of War* (1492)’, *The Library*, 7th series 2 (2001): 109. Other fifteenth-century copies of these ordinances can be found in Oxford, St John’s College, MS 57 and Bodl. Lib, MS Arch Selden 27.
77 [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 31.
78 BL, MS Royal 18 B.XXII, fol. 15r.
expenses and military ordinances. Clearly this very practical information was seen as being essential to the successful prosecution of war.

The concern over discipline and provision for war is also evident in readers' marginalia. The scribes of the verse translation contained in Bodl Lib, MS Ashmole 45 and BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII wrote 'Ordo discipline' in the margin of their manuscripts next to the passage which emphasises the importance of military discipline. Readers of both translations of De re militari were particularly attracted to passages which argued that hunger was a greater adversary than a conventional enemy. Passages concerning provision were annotated in four of the five manuscripts containing the prose translation produced between 1445-1460. The scribe of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291 wrote 'nota bene' on fol. 53r: 'ffor ofter is an oost destroied with scarste of vitailles than with fight, and rather with honger than with swerd'. Thomas Rotherham, the owner of CUL, MS Add. 8706, wrote 'nota' next to the passage concerning how 'hunger fighteth harder withynne than enemyes swerde with oute'. He also annotated the passage that argued that those soldiers who carefully used provisions 'weren neuere enfamyned ne in perelle'. The importance of victuals was also stressed by an early reader of OMC, MS Lat. 30 who annotated: 'but 3ens lak of victualle in hasty nede is noun helpe', wrote 'nota' next to the passage that advised one to be prepared

80 The contents are listed in M.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace: The Medieval Manuscripts (Cambridge, 1932).
81 BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII, fol. 4r; Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45, fol. 4r; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghtbode and Bataile, I. 215.
82 These are Bodl, Lib, MSS Douce 291, Laud Misc. 416; CUL, MS Add. 8706; OMC, MS Lat. 30.
83 Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book III, chapter 3, p. 108. This was also annotated by the reader of OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 50r.
84 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 54v. This was also annotated by the owner of Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416 on fol. 205v and by the scribe of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, fol. 73r; Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book III, chapter 9, p. 127.
85 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 84v; Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book IV, chapter 7, p. 164.
'bothe in golde and corn' and annotated the exhortation that every soldier about to fight should be 'yfed with a mesurable meel'. The owner of Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45, a copy of the verse translation, annotated the passage at the beginning of fol. 40r that read: 'for iron smyteth not/ So sore as honger doth, if foode faile./ The colde fyer of indigence is hoote,/ And wood theron goth every man, God woot; For other wepen is ther remedie,/ But on the dart of hongir is to deye' and then again on the page: 'Honger within, and enmytee abowte,/ A warse foo within is then withoute'.

On the one hand, these are fairly conventional statements, so obvious they hardly needed annotating. Yet, within the context of the 1450s, the fact that readers consistently annotated such sections acquires a new significance. These passages constructed a narrative of defeat which blamed lack of provision ('hunger') for military defeat. By annotating such passages, readers participated in a discourse which argued that castles and territories were lost, not necessarily through the agency of the enemy or the rebelliousness of their inhabitants, but simply because there had not been sufficient provision to enable them to have any choice.

As Zwicker has argued in relation to early modern marginalia, although such acts of interpretation occurred 'in the private space between the reader and the page' they were also 'situated within a community of interpretive and hence political practices'. These annotations and translation changes reflected a wider public discourse surrounding the loss of the Anglo-French lands. This discourse constructed an explanation for the defection of the 'Anglo-French' subjects in Normandy, which

---

86 OMC, MS Lat. 30, fols. 50r-v, 70r; Lester (ed.), *English Translation of Vegetius*, book III, chapters 3, 11, pp. 109, 132.
87 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knighthode and Bataile*, ll. 1111-1117, 1130-31.
stressed that they were forced by hunger, pillage and neglect to defect. ‘Anglo-French’ subjects switched allegiance because of the way they were treated by those committed to protect them.

The main advocate for this diagnosis of defeat was William Worcester. In Worcester’s view, the ‘English’ subjects in Normandy switched allegiance to the French because they were ‘ungoodele entretid under tho whiche were comytted to kepe, defende, and maynteyn them’. Indeed, according to Worcester, Charles VII relaunched his attack on Normandy: ‘for pite of his peple so oppressid, hiring theire clamours and cries and their curses’. The persistent abuse and neglect of the ‘English’ subjects living in Normandy caused them to welcome French reconquest. He argued that their rebellion was a result of ‘theire wanhope, havyng no trust of hastie socoure and relief of an armee to come in tyme covenable’. As a result of such neglect ‘youre saide obeissauntis were constreined to flee to youre adverse partie and to leve rathir theire natife contree, orellis to die for famyn and povertee’. These subjects had not defected because they were naturally rebellious, but because they had literally not been given a choice.

Moreover, a passage in the English translation of Christine de Pizan’s Livre du corps de policie suggests that the ill treatment of the non-combatant population by undisciplined soldiers was identified specifically with the way the war in France had

---

89 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 74. Fortescue used this argument in order to incriminate the French king. He argued that the commons were so impoverished through excessive taxation that ‘the French king has no men of his own realm able to defend it, except his nobles who do not bear such impositions [...] for he has no defence of his own except his castles and fortresses’. Fortescue also argued that ‘nothing shall make his [a prince’s] people arise; except lack of goods or lack of justice’; Fortescue, Governance of England, chapter 3, p. 89; chapter 12, p. 110.

90 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 74.

91 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 74.
been prosecuted. The translator retained the reference to France in the passage which discussed the ill-treatment of the civilian population. The translator did not retain the reference to France on all nine occasions that it appeared in his source text, but changed it to 'England' on three occasions. Thus, it seems reasonable to suggest that each retention or alteration made by the translator in this respect was intentional and represents a conscious intellectual decision. The translator argued that:

> it is not to vndirstonde that the men of armes theimselfe sholde defoule and pille the contre like as they doo in Fraunce nowadays wher in othre contreis they durste not do so whiche is a gret myscheif and an ovirwharte ordenaunce that they whiche ben stablisshed and ordeyned for the defence of the people, they hemselfe pille and robbe hem full cruelly.\(^92\)

The translator may, of course, have retained the reference to France in this passage simply to criticise French soldiers and discipline.\(^93\) It may, however, be more profitable to interpret his decision to retain the reference to France in terms of what was appropriate for the intended audience: the conduct of soldiers in France and the suffering of the civilian population were well-known subjects amongst the nobility and probable audience of this text, and formed part of the discourse, judging by the other evidence outlined here, by which they explained the loss of the French lands. By retaining the reference to France and thereby arguing that non-combatants were treated particularly badly in France, the translator may have been offering an explanation for why the Anglo-French subjects in Normandy defected.

Worcester argued that men could not be expected to remain disciplined without regular payment, or to remain loyal when they felt that they had been forgotten.

---

\(^92\) D. Bornstein (ed.), *The Middle English Translation of Christine de Pisan's Livre du corps de pollicie ed. from the MS CUL kk1.5* (Heidelberg, 1977), book I, chapter 9, p. 58.

\(^93\) Although Pizan was also referring to soldiers in the pay of the English in France.
Following Pizan, he argued that 'no cheveteyn can have ne kepe long tyme good men of armes eville paied or long delaied'. This argument echoed that made in military indentures, which frequently specified that soldiers were allowed to leave their posts without incurring any 'blame, charge or impeachment' if their wages were not paid. Worcester argued that lack of payment was responsible for pillage and lack of discipline which in turn explained the loss of the lands. Non-payment of wages meant that the soldier, rather than protecting the civilian population, was forced to oppress it and pillage its goods. For Worcester, lack of provision had a devastating impact upon the maintenance of the lands: not paying men, he added later, 'caused the ducdom of Normandy to be lost'. Without wages the soldier would not be motivated or disciplined. This practical consideration was fundamental to the loyalty and discipline of soldiers. Worcester referred to the events of 1451 in which the army was about to embark to Guyenne, but instead 'taried upon the see coostis in Englande almost a quarter of a yere or theire payment was redie. And the cite of Burdeux lost in the meantime for lak of rescue'. This was a genuine illustration of the relationship between insufficient finance and defeat and would have evoked the memory of the murder of Adam Moleyns, bishop of Chichester, on 9 January 1450: he was murdered at

94 [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, pp. 30-1.
95 For example, when the earl of Warwick indented for the custody of Hammes castle in 1462, he and his retinue were allowed to leave the castle if they were not paid for two months; PRO, E 101/71/9/3. Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, argued in the 1437 parliament that soldiers in the Calais garrison were leaving because there were not sufficient wages or provision. He implored Henry VI not to blame him or the soldiers if Calais was lost as a result; RP, 4: 496-7.
97 [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 30.
Portsmouth by soldiers waiting to cross to France whom he was supposed to be paying.\(^9\)

For Worcester, the expulsion of the English from Normandy was the result of 'deffaute of goode and hasty remedie, thoroughe lak of provision of men of armes, tresour and finaunce of suffisaunt nombre of goodes'.\(^{100}\) Victuals were likewise essential: in order to defend territories practically, garrisons needed reliable and sufficient provision.\(^{101}\) Worcester argued that adequate provision and wages 'myght [have] couraged and enforced [the soldiers] to [...] kepe stille the possession' because they made men 'the more abillere to contynnew and resiste youre ennemies in caas of necessite'.\(^{102}\)

According to Worcester, Fastolf ensured that the castles and towns in his care were well provisioned.\(^{103}\) He described how the duke of Exeter, faced by the Paris rebellion of 1421, went to the fortress of St. Anthoine, which was under Fastolf's command: 'And at hys commyng the chieff questyon he demaunded of the seyd Fastolf [was] how welle he was stored [...] he seyd for half yere and more suffisaunt. And hyt comforted gretly the prince'.\(^{104}\) He illustrated the devastating effects of hunger upon the prosecution of war: 'and so vyttailed Harflue yn grete famyn, that a wreched cowys hede was solde for Vis vijd sterling and the tong for iid and dyed of Englysh soudeours mo than ve yn defaut


\(^{100}\) [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 9; York's articles against Somerset dating from 1452 stress that castles fell because of no provision; J. Gairdner (ed.), *The Paston Letters 1422-1509* (London, 1904): 1: 105, 106.

\(^{101}\) The importance of adequate provision was a continuous theme of Worcester's papers. For example, the letter from the English council at Rouen to Henry VI in 1441, informing him of the state of affairs in France and Normandy, was concerned with lack of provision and the feeling of neglect this engendered; Stevenson (ed.), *Letters and Papers*, 2: 603-7.

\(^{102}\) [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 48.

\(^{103}\) [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 68. This also contributed to Worcester's authority to offer advice because the actions he advocated were apparently used with success by 'myne autor'.

\(^{104}\) [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 69.
of sustenanc[e].\textsuperscript{105} Without careful provision and regular wages for the man-at-arms, courage would fail and territories would be lost. Throughout the \textit{Boke of Noblesse}, the necessity of paying men 'bethout any defaulking [or] abbregging of here wagis' was stressed.\textsuperscript{106} In fact, Worcester stated that this was the most important responsibility of a captain.\textsuperscript{107}

Worcester's diagnosis of defeat also permeates the collection of documents, which was probably intended to accompany the \textit{Boke of Noblesse}, contained in LPL, MS 506. This manuscript is filled with receipts, wages, requests for remuneration or compensation and inventories. It did not comprise items selected arbitrarily, as seems the case on first glance, but items that articulated a particular viewpoint on war and its successful prosecution. But neither does it reflect or construct a politically neutral standpoint: its documents include the petitions from the inhabitants of Maine requesting aid from the Lancastrian government, which was never given to them; requests for compensation from the government by Sir John Fastolf for the wages he had paid his men and for which he had not been reimbursed and for the lands he had lost with the dispossession of Maine; advice given by Fastolf and others which, had it been followed, might have saved the Anglo-French possessions and finally, in minute detail, the terms on which Maine and other territories were ceded to the French – terms which were seen by some as dishonourable and even treasonable.\textsuperscript{108}

Worcester therefore constructed an explanation of defeat which argued that the lands were lost through lack of provision and, in particular, lack of wages. There is

\textsuperscript{105} [Worcester], \textit{Boke of Noblesse}, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{106} [Worcester], \textit{Boke of Noblesse}, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{107} [Worcester], \textit{Boke of Noblesse}, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{108} Stevenson (ed.), \textit{Letters and Papers}, 2: 710-718. The dishonour associated with the surrender of Rouen and other towns has been outlined by Michael Jones; Jones, 'Somerset, York', pp. 303-4.
evidence of a similar explanation for the loss of the French lands being advanced in the early 1450s. A petition to chancery from the soldiers of Caen argued that because they were not paid their wages:

\[\text{they were fain to adventur them upon ye kinge's enemies that some were taken prisoner, some murdered & slain, some sworn enemies for default of payment. And they that had no horse nor harness robbed & pillaged the king's true subjects which hath been one of the causing & loss of the said duchy & conquest.}\]

According to this petition, non-payment of wages meant that soldiers were reluctant to defend the Anglo-French lands, defecting to the French or were forced to live off the land, which in turn resulted in the loss of Normandy.

This diagnosis of defeat might help to explain some of the changes the R translator of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* made to his source text. He also argued that soldiers were forced 'of necessite to live upon the poore people' because their wages were stolen by their captains. Moreover, an alteration made by the R translator suggests that he also attributed the defection of subjects to the fact that soldiers were not paid. He argued that unpaid soldiers could threaten the stability of the country. Whereas Chartier argued that civil disruption was caused by soldiers who were 'mal contens', the R translator translated 'mal contens' as 'eville payde'. He therefore played upon the dual connotations of the word 'payde', which meant both 'pleased' and 'paid' in the modern sense. By using this word the translator not only suggested that their dissatisfaction was synonymous with their lack of payment but also relocated the complaint within the

---

109 PRO, C 1/19/498. See, also, Fastolf's instructions on the attempted relief of Caen, dating from 1450, which mention the importance of ensuring that 'souldeours be trulie paide of here wagis, soo that they have no cause to compleine, robbe, nor pille the kings liege peple there'; Stevenson (ed.), *Letters and Papers*, 2: 595-7 [596].

110 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, 1: 222.

111 Chartier, *Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, p. 46; Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, 1: 212.

This account of the defection of subjects replaced other explanations. For example, the R translator altered his source text in a very significant manner. The U translator followed the French and argued that men of all estates had neglected to defend their lordships because they were 'so vnstedfaste and [of] little feith' ('en plusieurs hommes de tous estas si enferme et petite foy'). This complaint was rooted in the French context as Chartier was referring specifically to the events which had led the Treaty of Troyes in 1420, which saw the heir to the French throne dispossessed in favour of Henry V. The R translator argued, however, that they had neglected their lordship because they had been 'brought so lowe and so enpouerisched'. This radically altered the meaning of the French and shifted the responsibility from the negligent or rebellious subjects to those who were responsible for their impoverishment. The R translator therefore removed the argument from the specific context of the Treaty of Troyes and relocated it within a framework which blamed the treatment of the non-combatant for the loss of lands.

The argument that the French lands had been lost through lack of finance and the mistreatment of the non-combatant reflects a wider public discourse surrounding the defeat in France. This discourse stressed that the lands had been lost through financial mismanagement and lack of justice. For example, the parliament held in 1449-1450, which impeached the duke of Suffolk, argued that the defeat was partly the

113 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inventif*, 1: 214.
114 Similar accusations were made against the duke of Bedford in the late 1420s and early 1430s. In the 1433 parliament, Bedford referred to the rumours surrounding his misconduct in France; RP, 4: 420.
result of Suffolk’s misappropriation of money originally intended for the war. Fastolf’s questions to Somerset, which were drawn up in 1449, argued that as a result of Somerset’s embezzlement of soldiers’ wages:

\[
\text{il a convenu que ilz se soient mis a pillier le pueple et a gaster le pais, et telement qu'il nestoit homme qui se osast trouver par pais qui il feust tue ou destrosse, et les pauvres gens du pais pilliez jour et nuyt, et telement que les aucuns habandonoient le pais pour aller ou party des Francoys, parce qu'il ne vouloit faire justice des homes; parquoy il a convenu que le pais se soit tourne avecques les Francoys.}
\]

In 1452, York accused Somerset of ‘not paiying duely nor contentyng such sourdiours as abode upon the defences’. According to York, Somerset’s misconduct in Normandy caused the defection of subjects: ‘the cuntre for such wrong and faute of justice grucched sore agayn hym and his governaunce and caused the people to arise in theire conseytes and to take grete displeasir; and that was a grete occasion and cause of the losse of youre said Duchie of Normandie’.

This diagnosis of defeat continued to be articulated throughout the third quarter of the fifteenth century. For the author of the English Chronicle, writing between 1461 and 1471, Normandy was lost ‘be the vntrouthe and fals couetize of Edmund duke of

---

116 LPL, MS 506, fol. 43r translated by Stevenson as ‘it became necessary for them [the soldiers] to plunder the people and to waste the country, and this to such an extent that there was no one who dared continue in the country who was not killed or plundered, and the poor country people were pillaged day and night, in such sort that some of them abandoned the country that they might go to the side of the French. As he would do no justice to the inhabitants, it followed that the whole country turned to the French; Stevenson (ed.), Letters and Papers, 2: 721. This is ironic given that Fastolf advocated a scorched earth policy in 1435 after the Treaty of Arras. He advocated ‘brennyng and distruyng alle the lande as thei pas [...] for it is thoughte that the traitours and rebellis must nedis have anothere manere of werre, and more sharpe and more cruelle werre than a naturelle and anoien ennemye’; ‘Fastolf’s Report upon the Management of the War in France upon Conclusion of the Treaty of Arras, September 1435’, printed in Stevenson (ed.), Letters and Papers, 2: 580; LPL, MS 506, fol. 31r.
117 J. Gairdner (ed.), The Paston Letters (London, 1872-1875), 1: 105. These articles, unlike Fastolf’s, do not make explicit why non-payment of wages caused the loss of the lands.
Somerset, being that time lieutenant of Normandie; for he menuzid and abatid the
nombre of the soudiers that were in the garisons and sente thaym in to Englund
unpaid of thair wagez, wherby the strengthe of Normandie was lost. Presumably such
diagnoses served two purposes: they were both 'accurate' accounts of why, according to
certain circles, the French territories had been lost whilst at the same time implicating
the dukes of Suffolk and Somerset.

The argument that the loss of the lands was the result of insufficient finance and
the poor treatment of the civilian population was not, however, the only explanation
given by the English translations. For example, although the translator of Pizan's Livre
du corps discussed the hardships suffered by non-combatants, he did not argue that their
treatment justified their defection. Whilst Pizan had argued that the common people
might defect because of 'crainte ou paour ou par aucune mauvaise voulen6', the
translator argued that soldiers ought to 'bryng ynne the pour comons if they will erre or
fall in evill will of rebellion'. Unlike Pizan, he did not cite the reasons for their
rebellion, but implicitly suggested that they rebelled because of 'evill will' as opposed to
Pizan's model, which stressed the effect of fear upon loyalty.

This translator did not explicitly offer an alternative explanation for the defection
of the Anglo-French subjects, but an explanation was implicit in his translation. He
retained the reference to 'France' in the passage that made the argument that the French

---

119 Davies (ed.), English Chronicle, p. 68.
120 He argued that 'euery good prynce and worchipfull man' should show mercy to their enemies
'but not as lordis and othir men of armes done a nowe a dayes. Whan they conquer londis and
fortressis, citees and othir places […] it semeth as they wer doggis that wer enfamyned for hungir
and withoute any pitee of mordrers and horrible occisions of Cristen people'; Bornstein (ed.),
Middle English Translation of Livre du corps, book I, chapter 15, p. 76.
121 The French states: 'qui par crainte ou paour ou par aucune mauvaise voulen6 se veulent
rebellir et rendre a l'averse partie ou eulx y donner'; Bornstein (ed.), Middle English Translation of
people naturally owed their obedience to the French king, a point which was reiterated throughout the final book of the *Livre du corps*. He argued that the French people were: ‘right well blissed, for syn the tyme that it began firste, whiche cam of the yssue of Troians, it was never gouerned by straunge prynces but of theim that they cam firste of from eyir to eyir’. As a result ‘the people of Fraunce be moste naturall and beste loue their prynce and moste of obeysance’. He then argued that there were no princes ‘so naturall nor so benigne as ther be in Fraunce’.

Why did he retain the reference, rather than altering it to England as he had done in other instances? It may have been an oversight, but it might be more beneficial to regard it as a deliberate choice by the translator. He may, for example, have retained the reference because this information was simply inappropriate to the English context: England had been governed by ‘straunge prynces’ since the Norman Conquest and had seen several changes of dynasty. The fact that the opening speech of Edward IV’s first parliament in November 1461 stressed that Edward was England’s ‘natural’ sovereign implies an analogous construction of Henry VI as ‘unnatural’. Moreover, English subjects were demonstrably not ‘most of obeysance’ to their lord as the previous twenty years had demonstrated. Whether this was an accurate depiction of the relationship


124 RP, 5: 462-3. It is interesting in this respect that both the translators of Chartier’s *Le Quadrilogue Invectif* retained the sentence which, according to the R translation, reads: ‘Thes [the enemies of France] ben of the lyme of him that putt owte and slewghe his soueraigne lord, Kyng of Englund, and tyrauntly vsurpid vpon his lordshippis’; Blayney (ed.) *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, 1: 162/3. This is surely a reference to the events of 1399.
between the French people and their king is debatable, but clearly the translator did not feel that the model was transferable.

Yet, this argument might also be part of how the translator explained the defection of 'English subjects' living in Normandy. It was not that the English had done anything wrong as such; rather it was the law of nature, which dictated that the French people should support their natural lord, Charles VII. This was certainly part of the way in which French sources accounted for the reconquest of the Lancastrian lands. In the *Debate between the Heralds of England and France*, for example, the French herald argued that Charles VII was able to reconquer Normandy because he was the Normans' natural lord which was why he could 'achieve in one year what two kings of England had signally failed to do in the space of thirty-three years'. Allmand has also shown how Valois sources, by referring to the English presence in France as an occupation, were implying that Normandy was French and that by driving out the English, Charles was reclaiming an area which was 'naturally' his. By retaining the reference to France in these passages, the translator seems to have been endorsing this explanation for the defection of the French people. Although it is impossible to know whether the translator deliberately retained the reference to France in order to advance this diagnosis, by retaining it the reader received an account of the relationship between the

---

125 This concept of a 'natural' lord was well established. Nicholas Oresme, in his commentary on Aristotle's *Politics*, argued that it was unnatural if a man who was king of a realm was from a foreign land or belonged to another race, nation and lineage. At the treaty of Calais, French ambassadors argued that Guyenne belonged to the French king 'comme a celluy qui estoit vray et souverain seignuer naturel, de tant de temps que il n'cstoit memoire du contraire'; J. Krynen, "Le Mort saisit le Vif": Genèse Médiévale du Princepe d'Instantanéité de la Succession Royale Française*, *Journal des Savants* (1984): 217-18.


127 Allmand, 'Local Reaction', p. 146. Allmand argues that the inhabitants of Rouen were not as pleased with French rule as has been assumed and that it did not take so long before they became dissatisfied; Allmand, 'Local Reaction', p. 153.
French and their king which stood in stark contrast to that existing in England and an account which might also have explicated the loss of the lands in France.

Were readers and translators, by blaming defeat on lack of finance, trying to marginalise this alternative explanation for the defection of the French? It is impossible to be sure, but on one level, they probably were. The diagnosis offered by these readers constructed an explanation for the defection of the 'English' subjects in Normandy, which stressed that they were forced by mismanagement and neglect to defect. Implicitly, they had not defected because they simply preferred to be 'French'. In a sense, then, this diagnosis excluded competing understandings of their defection. In particular, it might be argued that it avoided discussion of the justness or legality of the English cause.

Worcester, for example, was almost certainly familiar with the argument that the Valois kings were the French people's 'natural' lords, because he read Chartier's works which consistently made this point. Indeed, on one occasion in the Boke of Noblesse, Worcester borrowed Chartier's discussion of the 'natural lordship'. Next to the comment that 'Tullius seithe in his boke of rethorique that licke as a man receuiethe his lyuing in a Region or in a countree so is he of naturall reason bounde to defende it and law of nature aswelle as law imperiall whiche is auctorised Popis and Emperours wol condestende and agre to the same', Worcester wrote that 'yt ys wryten by maistcr aleyn charcter de auriga in hys boke of Quadrilogie secretaire to Charlys whenaunce the yere of crist 1422 yn thys termys' and 'Magister Alanus de Auriga dicit'. Yet Worcester did not once argue that the English king was the Normans' 'natural' lord – he referred to

128 See, for example, Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invectif, pp. 14, 18, 30.
129 BL, MS Royal 18 B.XXII, fol. 12v.
the legal right of the English to Normandy, Anjou, Aquitaine and so on but avoided altogether any notion of a 'natural' right to those lands: the issue of whether the French people felt 'natural' allegiance to the English king was simply not mentioned.

The diagnosis of defeat, which blamed poor counsel, divided leadership and financial mismanagement, is familiar to modern historians because it echoes that given in Yorkist propaganda in the aftermath of the Hundred Years War and throughout the Wars of the Roses. However, the fact that readers participated in these discourses and highlighted the mismanagement of the war and poor counsel as reasons behind the defeat does not necessarily mean that they were Yorkists. Because the defeat in war was so central to Yorkist discourse, there has been a tendency for scholars to label critics of the way war was conducted as 'Yorkist', but these associations were probably much more fluid than this. Just because Yorkist propaganda emphasised the defeat abroad it does not follow that only Yorkists or indeed that all Yorkists felt that way. In other words, the viewpoints articulated by readers should not be identified too closely with either Lancastrian or Yorkist sympathies. Richmond has made a similar point in relation to the manifestos in circulation during the 1460s. He argues that 'the similarity between statements of grievances and suggested remedies from both sides and the strong London interest, which is apparent in some of them [...] indicate a preoccupation with the need to find a stable basis for good government which transcended factional divisions'.

A similar argument, given the pattern of its transmission, can be made for the verse translation of De re mil.ari. This was a Lancastrian text, written by a Lancastrian in

---

favour of Henry VI. Yet in circulation its audience and purpose changed: it became a
text promoting the Yorkist cause. The two later manuscripts, Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45
and BL, MS Cotton Titus A. XXIII, dating from the late 1460s and early 1470s, omitted
the explicitly Lancastrian prologues and replaced Henry VI's name with that of Edward
IV. The second manuscript was owned by William Hacketlyff (d. 1480), physician and
secretary to Edward IV. The point is that the poem was not only altered to accord
with the change of dynasty but was also owned by at least one staunch and loyal
supporter of that dynasty. Moreover, if the identification of John Neele as translator is
accepted, then the translator himself may have become a Yorkist. For all of its
pointed attacks against the Yorkist rebels, the verse translation was first and foremost a
text urging the necessity of political unity and was therefore as appropriate to a Yorkist
context as it was to a Lancastrian context.

Significant in this respect is the fact that the earliest manuscript, CPC, MS 243,
which retains the references to Henry VI, may also have circulated in Yorkist circles.
This manuscript may have been in the possession of the family of William and Ralph
Hastings. William was a loyal supporter of Edward IV and served as chamberlain,
keeper of the mint and replaced Earl Rivers as lieutenant of Calais on 18 July 1471.
Other scholars have found evidence of ostensibly Lancastrian texts being used in
Yorkist contexts. Gross has tentatively suggested that Lancastrian texts, such as the
writings of Fortescue and the *Somnium Vigilantis*, were being 'collated or edited' in the

---

131 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 121, 2880, 2982-5.
132 See my discussion in chapter three, pp. 115-16.
134 See my discussion in chapter three, p. 116.
1470s and 'in a context closely associated with the crown'. The afterlife of these texts is a salient reminder of the danger of ascribing sentiments too closely with either the Lancastrians or Yorkists and forces us to recognise the potential fluidity of associations and loyalties.

The various ways in which Yorkist propaganda explained the defeat in France have long been recognised and have, to some extent, informed historians' own accounts of the fall of France. But it has not been sufficiently recognised that this propaganda was in dialogue with existing perceptions of why military defeat occurred. This is partly because propaganda has not been treated as a form of political discourse that has to correspond in some way to its recipients' understanding of their world. Propaganda can, of course, shape people's perceptions of any given event, but it cannot be entirely divorced from the values and ideals which are already in existence. Propaganda is not produced in a vacuum. As Watts argues in relation to rhetoric: 'To achieve its impact, it has to intersect with other rhetoric and with those schemes of publicly-recognised values which dominate the organisation, and thus the understanding, of experience in a given society'. The Yorkist lords may well have cited poor counsel and financial mismanagement as the reasons for England's defeat abroad merely in order to advance their own particular political agendas, but in so doing they were reflecting, as well as constructing, a model for understanding defeat which was already being applied by contemporaries, as their ways of reading military texts indicate.

137 See, for example, Keen's account of the last years of the occupation of Normandy; Keen, England in the Later Middle Ages, pp. 399-408. This is perhaps a product of historians' tendency, discussed by Watts, to validate Yorkist accounts of the 1440s in their own discussions of the period; Watts, 'Polemics and Politics', p. 4; Henry VI, p. 205.
139 Watts, 'Polemics and Politics', p. 6.
4.3 Demilitarisation

The previous sections have considered some of the ways in which defeat was diagnosed by readers and some of the discourses available to them. It has been demonstrated that writers and readers, through annotation and translation change, emphasised sections of their texts which blamed financial mismanagement, poor counsel and disunity for defeat abroad. The diagnosis offered by these texts paralleled that circulating in other spheres and seems to support Ormrod’s statement that ‘it was generally agreed that the war had been lost because of poor management and poor leadership’. Ormrod also makes the point that this diagnosis of defeat was the dominant one and that ‘the possibility that it [the war] had foundered for lack of political will and financial commitment on the part of the English community was either conveniently ignored or genuinely discounted’.

The implication of this statement seems to be that whilst some modern historians have explained the loss of the lands in terms of a demilitarisation of society or a loss of interest in the Lancastrian land settlement, those who witnessed the loss of France did not diagnose defeat in this way.

An alternative diagnosis was, however, articulated by these texts which did cite lack of political will and financial commitment as central causes for the defeat in France. Readers emphasised, through translation change and annotation, subjects’ responsibility to pay for, and participate in, war. These reinscriptions suggest that defeat was explicated as stemming from a lack of enthusiasm for maintaining the French

---

140 Ormrod, Political Life, p. 108.
141 Ormrod, Political Life, p. 108. This view is justified when applied to the parliament of 1449-1450 which impeached Suffolk.
142 This assumption is also, for example, implied in Keen’s statement that the blame for the loss of France ‘was laid squarely at the doors of Somerset and Suffolk’; M.H. Keen, The End of the Hundred Years War: Lancastrian France and Lancastrian England’, in M. Jones and M. Vale (eds.), England and her Neighbours, 1066-1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais (London, 1989), p. 298.
possessions. Moreover, the texts' emphasis upon the need for a programme of reform, which commemorated and celebrated martial achievement, was intended to counter such a shift in the values of English society and particularly those of the gentry and aristocracy. The rest of this chapter will argue that demilitarisation formed part of the way that these texts explained defeat abroad.

It has already been demonstrated that readers emphasised that military defeat, loss of territories and the defection of subjects, resulted from lack of provision. I have suggested that by emphasising this explanation for defeat, readers were participating in an analogous discourse, which implicated the Lancastrian government and, in particular, the dukes of Suffolk and Somerset. However, readers also explained lack of provision in a more complex way: as being the responsibility of the whole political community. In this next section, I shall argue that these texts articulated a diagnosis of defeat which centred upon lack of financial commitment, as well as financial mismanagement.

First, several readers annotated sections of their texts which argued that the whole political community had a responsibility to pay for war. For example, a reader of a copy of the R translation of the Quadrilogue Invecfif annotated the passage that argued that 'no man ought to spare dispence of goodes' when it came to war. Moreover, the argument that subjects should pay for war was emphasised by the R translator. The translator did not follow the extant French manuscripts, which stated that the nobles 'veulent debouter vostre prince droituer et seigneur naturel que voz vies et voz corps sont tenuz defendre', but argued instead that men should 'be bounde to defende bothe

143 LPL, MS Arc.L.40.2/E.42, fol. 18r; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invecif, 1: 184.
with body and goodis'. This not only exemplifies the discourse outlined above, but also reflected more accurately the English context: in France the nobles did not pay tax, whereas in England they did. In other words, the R translator’s point would not have been appropriate in a French context; it pertained specifically to the English audience for whom he was making the translation.

That readers and translators felt that the lands had been lost through lack of financial provision is further demonstrated by the changes they made to the story of the women of Rome. This story related how the women of Rome cut off their hair in order to provide string for hand and crossbows and as a result saved their city. The prose translator used the example to make the point that the women would rather ‘lyue wip hir housbondes in freedom wip here heuedes a litel while defased than longe tyme vnder enemieys thraldom and seruise in bondage wip bright beaute and fairnesse’. The verse translator, however, stated that he wished more women cared for ‘vertue and honestee’ than for ‘worldly good or bodily beautee’ (my italics). By extending the metaphor to include ‘worldly good’ as well as beauty he emphasised that the model did not only apply to the women’s hair, but also applied to their wealth and implicitly suggested that the sacrifice needed in England, and from his implied audience, was one of wealth.

---

144 The U translation stated ‘the whiche your bodyes with handes and feet aught to defende’; Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invecfýf, p. 18; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invecfýf, 1: 162/163.
145 It was only the peasantry and the lesser bourgeoisie who paid direct taxes in France; P.S. Lewis, Later Medieval France: The Polity (New York, 1968), p. 56.
146 See chapter two, pp. 49-50 for the ways in which the R and U translators of Le Quadrilogue Invecfýf reinscribed this story.
148 It is first mentioned on lines 2340-42; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, ll. 2959-2965.
Worcester chose not to use this example of self-sacrifice, although he clearly knew it as he had the story copied into one of his notebooks, which he then annotated. Instead, he used the story of the widows and ladies of Rome who gave their jewels and goods for the defence of their city, a far more appropriate message in the English context. Worcester concluded the Boke of Noblesse on this theme. He used a story taken from Livy, which concerned the Roman war against Africa. This described how the commons in Rome had grown tired of taxation and the war. In order to enthuse the commons, the political elite, that is to say the senators, estates and governors, agreed to give the majority of their wealth 'for the defence of the contree of Cesille and keping of the lande and see frome ennemies'. The lesson Worcester drew from this was that not only was the Romans' position in the war restored, but also that society as a whole, through this 'largesse', was 'repaped and brought ayen to worship, prosperite and welfare'. He ended the Boke of Noblesse with an exhortation: 'that every harde covetouse hert were of suche largesse and distributif of here meveable good and tresoure to the comon wele, as for defending us frome oure adversaries'. The expulsion of the English from France, according to the Boke of Noblesse, stemmed from the decisions made by those hard, covetous hearts. In Worcester's conceptual framework, therefore, it was specifically money that was needed to restore the common good and to provide for defence. The English had not lost their territories in France because they had lacked strings for their crossbows, but because there had been a shortage of money.

149 Worcester wrote 'quod ciues et mulieres exponent bona liberite pro re p.d. [publica defendenda]; BL, MS Royal 13 C.I, fol. 136v.
151 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 84.
152 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 84.
In this story, the financial support of a specific group in society fundamentally altered the course of the Roman war. By implication, the higher echelons of English society were not so generous when it came to defence. The parallel to the English situation is clear: that those who had been reluctant to invest in the English possessions in France had a duty to do so. According to Worcester, the French lands had been lost because there had been reluctance among England’s political community to pay for them. This analysis of the causes of defeat is borne out by other forms of evidence. Research has shown that less money was voted through parliament for the war between 1429-44 and that, moreover, the collection of this money was a slow and, at times, difficult process. Harriss, for example, has demonstrated that from 1445 military expenditure was reduced by about £30,000 per annum. Ormrod, discussing parliament’s investment in the war effort under Henry VI, has argued that ‘in the later stages of the war, when France was meant to be paying for itself, parliaments became increasingly adept at spreading payment of direct levies over longer periods and effectively blocking themselves from further impositions’. Even in 1449, parliament was reluctant to grant money for the war in France. Ormrod further argues that the reduced revenue produced by the wool subsidy, for example, was not just the product of a decline in trade but also because the 1422 parliament decided ‘to reduce the wool subsidy paid by native merchants by a massive 23% in line with its general policy of throwing the fiscal burden onto the king’s new dominions in northern France’. However, as several historians have pointed out, the costs of war could not be met by

154 Harriss, ‘Marmaduke Lumley and the Exchequer Crisis’, p. 147.
Normandy without English help. John Hardyng argued in his chronicle written in the 1460s that Somerset had asked for money from parliament prior to the fall of Normandy, but ‘He coulde none get, this land was then so pylde, / Through war of Fraunce, they wold not hit releue’. Hardyng thus explained defeat in France as a result of impoverishment, but as Ormrod argues the fall in direct and indirect taxation probably represents ‘loss of political will’ rather than an inability to pay.

What Worcester perceived among those in parliament was a confusion of priorities. Personal goods were of more value than providing land and sea defence. The translators of the Quadrilogue Invectif likewise complained that the rich priest and the burgess ‘wold nat leese a day of thaire ese or vnpurse a peny but with mykell sorowe’ for the war. A similar conflict of interests is implied by the two translations of De re militari. The prose translator of De re militari stated that ‘there nys neyther gaynes of garnementis gold ne siluer ne schining of precious perrey that makith oure enemyes sugettis ne obedient vnto vs, but onliche drede of dowtynesse of dedes of armes’. On one level, these lines set up a distinction between wealth in the sense of riches and wealth in the sense of military strength, but they also suggested that society’s values were confused: that the accumulation of wealth (‘gold’, ‘siluer’ and ‘precious perrey’) was more esteemed than military strength (‘dedes of armes’). The reader of CUL, MS Add. 8706, Thomas Rotherham, annotated this passage.

159 Hardyng, _Chronicle_, p. 399.
163 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 12r.
The verse translator made the point even more forcefully:

Res publica right commendabil is, / If chiualers and armys there abounde,/ For, they present, may nothing fare amys,/ And ther thei are absent, al goth to grounde;/ In gemme, in gold, in silk be thei fecounde,/ It fereth not but myghti men in armys,/ They fereth with the drede of deth and harmys.\textsuperscript{164}

According to the verse translator, ‘Res publica’ depended upon the presence of ‘chiualers and armys’. Moreover, wealth was useless without ‘myghti men in armys’. The verse translator felt that it was necessary and useful to emphasise the consequence of pursuing a policy which neglected military provision. He extended Vegetius’s reasoning which had left this open to interpretation by specifying that without these things ‘al goth to grounde’.

A confusion of priorities is likewise suggested by the use of the story of the Roman conqueror Marcus Curinus in the translation of Christine de Pizan’s \textit{Livre du corps}. When he was besieging the city of Samite, the spies of the city reported that he ‘sat but in right poure estate at the seege, but of men of armes he had inoughe, neuerthelesse of vessell of richesse nor of vetalle no plente’ (my italics).\textsuperscript{165} They tried to bribe him with gifts, but he refused.\textsuperscript{166} The way in which the plenitude of soldiers was juxtaposed against lack of money in this story suggests that somewhere along the line a decision had been made between the two. By refusing the bribe, the leader sacrificed individual gain for the wider objectives of successfully capturing the city. The city of Samite, on the other hand, represented the inevitable conclusion of a policy that prized wealth more than men of arms: able to offer plenty in the way of bribes, but without proper military

\textsuperscript{164} Dyboski and Arend (eds.), \textit{Knyghthode and Baiaile}, II. 404-410.
\textsuperscript{165} Bornstein (ed.), \textit{Middle English Translation of Livre du corps}, book I, chapter 12, p. 66.
\textsuperscript{166} The reader of CUL, MS Kk.1.5 annotated this passage on fol. 15v.
defence and ultimately losing everything, or as the verse translator would have put it, going 'al [...] to grounde'.

A narrative of defeat was therefore developed which stressed the importance of a strong army and juxtaposed this to wealth. Collectively, the changes made by translators and the issues that readers chose to annotate suggest that part of the way in which defeat was diagnosed was in terms of demilitarisation. They identified lack of enthusiasm for maintaining the French possessions, at least where paying for them was concerned. Moreover, annotations and translation change also suggest that readers explained defeat as due to a reluctance among the traditional military class to defend the French possessions.

There has been much debate over whether this is an accurate perception of the fifteenth century. It has been argued that the growing lack of interest in the Anglo-French war meant that men-at-arms, 'the military representatives of “politically significant” society', became less inclined to fight. In brief, it has been argued that over the course of the fifteenth century, there was a significant decline in the military involvement of the gentry and aristocracy and, in particular, that of men prominent in their localities. It is, however, extremely difficult to gauge aristocratic enthusiasm. Keen uses the changing ratio of men-at-arms to archers to indicate the waning enthusiasm for war amongst the traditional knightly class. But this is by no means a conclusive form of evidence, as the changing ratio may reflect economic concerns or even be evidence of

---

167 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knighthode and Bataile*, I. 408.
There is evidence to suggest that members of the nobility were reluctant to serve in France. Morgan has shown that even in 1419 there was difficulty recruiting knights and esquires, whilst Jones has discussed the problems John Beaufort had recruiting members of the nobility for the 1443 campaign. Whether or not there was a decline in interest in the war among the nobility, the fact remains that translators and readers emphasised, through translation change or annotation, unwillingness among the traditional knightly class to participate in war.

The nobility were particularly criticised in these texts because they reneged upon their traditional responsibility of providing defence. The R translator of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* emphasised that it was the responsibility of the second estate to provide for defence by changing ‘l'adhesion de leur seigneur’ into ‘the dewte they ought to have done to their lorde’ (my italics); he argued that subjects ‘fledde from the dewte they ought to have done to their lorde and from the supporting also of their lordshippis’ and thereby altered the French in a manner which emphasised the obligation of subjects to defend their lord. This context may explain the annotations in copies of the R translation. A reader of a copy of the R translation, contained in LPL, MS Arc. L.40.2/E.42, noted that: ‘no man ought to spare peril of body travel of thought nor dispence of goodes’ when it came to protecting their country.

---


172 At the end of May, Somerset had to reduce the number of men-at-arms to be replaced by bowmen because there was a ‘lakke of barons, bannerets and knights'; Jones, 'The Beaufort Family', p. 169.


174 LPL, MS Arc.L.40.2/E.42, fol. 18r; Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, 1: 184.
annotated the passage that argued that ‘nature byndith yow to fortefye the comon wele of the londe wherein ye wer borne and to defende the lordeship’.\footnote{CSJC, MS 76 D. I, fol. 3r; Blayney (ed.), \textit{English Translations of Le Quadriloge Invectif}, 1: 150.}

The R translator also admonished those who went:

nyght and day to the feldys and woodis an huntyng and an hawkyng to chase the bestis and bryddis, which tak litle hede of their grete distruction. And some ther be that kyllen ther horses and peynyn their bodies to conquer estates, offices and goodis and all othir maner of plesurs and woll not putt themself in daunger to diffende their naturale lordeshippis nor the rest of oone nyght woll nat suffir the daunger of one lityll mysease.\footnote{Blayney (ed.), \textit{English Translations of Le Quadriloge Invectif}, 1: 156-158.}

Whereas the French manuscripts read:

Et telz ya qui jour et nuit sont par les bois at par les champs a chacer les bestes et au gibier des oiseaux, et les autres rompent chevaux au pourchaz des offices, estaz, des chevances et de leur autre plaisirs, qui pour honneur acquérir et leur naturel devoir acquiter le laisseroient le repos d'une nuit ne ne souffreroient le danger, estroit ou messaisé hebergement.\footnote{Chartier, \textit{Le Quadriloge Invectif}, p. 15.}

The R translator specifically associated this group’s reluctance to provide for defence as their ultimate failing, which would result in ‘their grete distruction’. Whilst Chartier had argued that such men would not even lose a night’s sleep for their ‘naturel devoir’, meaning for their natural duty, the R translator conflated this duty with the defence of their ‘naturale lordeshippis’. These complaints formed part of the \textit{Quadriloge Invectif}’s argument concerning loyalty; yet, they were also suggesting something fundamental about the relationship between the social elite and the military profession. Members of this class were interested in estate building, hunting and other elitist pastimes, but they
were not interested in war. What the R translator of the Quadrilogue Inveictif was advocating, through his additions, was a return to a now outmoded correlation between noble status and warfare. Of course, Chartier structured the Quadrilogue Inveictif as a discussion between the three estates, whom he labelled 'Le Clerge', 'Le Chevalier' and 'Le Peuple'. At a fundamental level, then, the Quadrilogue Inveictif endorsed a traditional view of the function of the second estate as a group defined by their martial function.

Moreover, the Quadrilogue Inveictif further elaborated upon the function of the second estate. Using the analogy of the bees in the hive, France, personified as a character, implied that the responsibilities of the second estate were to keep 'togedir their assemble and by their litill pollicey to kepe the lordship of their kyng' and to 'suffir themself to be slayne for mayntenaunce of their kyng, of his lordship and of his right' ('pour defendre et entretenir leur assemblee et leur petite pollicie et pour garder la seigneurie de leur roy' and 'se laissent mourir pour luy mainteinir sa seigneurie et sa vie'). This passage also advanced a traditional view of the role of the nobility: as counsellors and warriors. However, France implied that the nobility were not fulfilling their responsibilities, as directly after this passage she states: 'me thinke that ye shuld nat be more disordinate thanne the beestis, but ye shuld enclyn ye to your own saluacion, profight and diffence, lyke as don the flyes that make hony, which iustely kepe their office and their ordir'. The implication of this passage is that the nobles were not keeping 'their office and their ordir'.

178 Of course, this criticism of the nobility had a long pedigree. See, for example, Bernard of Clairvaux, 'In Praise of the New Knighthood', in C. Greenia (trans. and ed.), Bernard of Clairvaux: Treatises (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1977), 3: 127-45.
179 Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Inveictif, p. 65.
180 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inveictif, 1: 244. The R translator also expanded the French phrase which stated that the bees 'gardent leurs offices et leur ordres' by stating that the bees 'iustely kepe their office and their ordir' (my italics). This association between justice and the fulfilment of one's office was also made by Bishop Stillington in a speech to parliament in 1467-8. He argued that justice was 'grounde well and rote of all
A similar conceptual framework informed the verse translation of *De re militari*. 

At the beginning of the work, the translator asserted that 'Therof to the vnitee 'Deo gracias'/ In Trinitee! The Clergys and Knyghthode/ And Comynaltee better accorded nas/ Neuer then now'.

This stressed the divine nature of the social hierarchy, but was also a very conservative vision of society for 1460. Whereas the prose translator followed the spirit of Vegetius by arguing that knighthood ought to be a profession open to all, on the basis of merit not of birth, the verse translator argued the opposite. As Allmand has argued, he regarded knighthood in the 'traditional, hierarchical sense', as an order, which should comprise those 'who are born noble, are possessed of land and fee [...]. The obligation to fight, and in particular to lead, stems from the traditional qualifications of land ownership'. Scribes emphasised that noble birth was an essential prerequisite for knighthood by annotating the lines which argued: 'If chiualers a land shal defende/ Be noble born and have lond and fee' with the gloss 'Nobiles sint milites'. The verse translator also altered Vegetius's argument concerning those who were not suitable for the military profession by changing the disqualification implied by the use of the word 'ignavus' in *De re militari* into 'ignoble': 'what helpeth it, if prosperite, peas and pollityke rule of every Reame'. He went on to say that by 'justice', he meant that 'every persone should doo his office that he is put yn accordyng to his astate or degre'; RP, 5: 622; Watts, *Henry VI*, p. 56. A similar association was made by Caxton in an addition to Book IV of the *Game of Chess* (1st edition, 31 March 1474). He argued: 'Alas what haboundance was sometymes in the royames and what prosperite, in whiche was justice and eveg man in his office contente, how stood the cytees that tyme in worship and renome; how was renomed the noble royarne of Englond, alle the world drcdde hit and spack worship of hit' (my italics); N. F. Blake (ed.), *Caxton's Own Prose* (London, 1973), pp. 86-7. *De re militari*.

---

182 'But smythes, carpunteres, bocheres, hunteres for the herte and the vrylde boor, these mowe abliche be chosen to chyualrye, for hereynne stondeý al the helpe and profyt of comynalte'; Lester (ed.), *English Translation of Vegetius*, book I, chapter 7, p. 55.
184 See, for example, BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXXIII, fol. 5r; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, II. 271-2. Vegetius stated that 'illustres viri' were usually appointed as 'magistri militium' and the verse translator elaborated that such men were 'illustres Lordes, Peerys'; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, I. 858.
ignobilitee/ Have exercise in warre and wayys large'. This point was likewise reinforced by the scribal gloss: 'Ignobiles non sint milites'. The translator, therefore, not only disagreed with Vegetius's argument, but also chose to make the opposite one, without making it clear that this was his argument and not that of Vegetius. Implicitly, the translator felt that nobles ought to follow the military path, which their birth intended for them. It was clearly part of what the translator felt needed to be redressed in order to secure success in 'knyghthode and bataile'.

Furthermore, both the translators of Chartier's *Quadrilogue Invectiv* were concerned with the derogation of the noble class. The U translator, following Chartier, argued that the nobles had degenerated because they were ill disciplined. He argued that the nobles ignored the discipline of arms and as a result there was no difference between their morals or wills and those of other men. Their actions should have distinguished them from other men: 'for suche amonge othir aught to bere suche a marke that thaire deedys may cause thaim to be knowen from other men', but instead 'they suffer thaimself to slide in ordinaunce of othir men withoute difference of condicions or volunteers'. This passage seems to be suggesting something akin to the developed notion in France of derogation, by which a whole range of activity was deemed incompatible with noble status. Military function was considered to be the

---

185 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knighthode and Bataile*, l. 278-9.
186 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectiv*, 1: 237. The French states: 'les nobles hommes y prennent si peu garde que a peu se laissant ja les plusieurs couller en ordonnance des autres, sans difference de meurs ne de voulentez, et ne craignent aucuns encourre male renommee contre qui noble cuer doit avoir plus mortalle guerre que contre autres ennemis, et doivent contre les autres celle merche porter que leurs ouvres les facent cognoiostre des autres et que d'eulx en son semblable ne laisse tache de reprochue sans y donner le remede'; Chartier, *Le Quadrilogue Invectiv*, p. 60.
187 The customary of Poitou compiled in 1417 made this point: 'Ung noble qui use de fait de marchandise ou de labourage ou en autre naiere vit d'art mecanique Rousturierement, communeement et notoirement sans aucunement se porter comme noble, exercer ou frequenter les armes et fait de noblesse, ne joyra pas de privilege de noble'; cited in Contamine. According to Contamine, the expression 'derogant a la noblesse' comes into usage in 1462; P. Contamine,
defining characteristic of nobility as numerous investigations into proof of nobility demonstrate.\textsuperscript{188} The notion of derogation was more developed in France because nobles were exempt from paying tax by virtue of their military function, which, according to Keen, 'generated much litigation, centering round challenges to noble status and the exemption it carried, and was key to the establishment of the noblesse as a juridically defined estate'.\textsuperscript{189} Keen further suggests that perhaps because the English gentry did not receive fiscal exemptions, no English legal equivalent of the French rules of derý geance developed.\textsuperscript{190}

Whereas the U translation suggested that it was the nobles' lack of discipline which was responsible for their derogation, other translators advanced a more conservative interpretation, which focused upon their military function. For example, the prose translator of \textit{De re militari} described how the Roman nobility grew so unused to warfare that they refused to wear armour in battle against the Goths and so 'for defaute of vse of armes it happith hem al scharneffilliche to be slayn as bestes'.\textsuperscript{191} The use of the word 'bestes' in this passage underlined the derogation, as opposed to mere death, of the Roman nobles.\textsuperscript{192} Readers also seem to have had a keen interest in derogation, as is demonstrated by the enthusiastic annotations of Scipio Africanus's words to the prisoners he took from Spain in CUL, MS Add. 8706, a copy of the prose translation of \textit{De re militari}. The reader wrote 'Nota nota nota bene nota' next to '3e ben

\textsuperscript{188} The French Nobility and the War', in K. Fowler (ed.), \textit{The Hundred Years War} (London, 1971), p. 159, n. 27.
\textsuperscript{189} Contamine, 'The French Nobility and the War', p. 160, n. 34.
\textsuperscript{190} Keen, \textit{Origins of the English Gentleman}, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{192} For example, a document dating from c. 1443-50 stated that an apprentice was not to do any 'vile and bestial service' because 'he was a gentleman'; A.R. Myers (ed.), \textit{English Historical Documents, 1327-1485} (London, 1969), p. 1124. In the late fourteenth century, Gower and Walsingham referred to the insurgents in the 1381 rebellion as beasts; see S. Justice, \textit{Writing and Rebellion: England in 1381} (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 207-213.
worthi he seide to be blotte and spotted and fouled and defouled with fen and with drit of water and of blood that in tyme of werre ne werren nouȝt ne wolde nouȝt be bysprayned ne bewat with enemyes blood'.\textsuperscript{193} This image set up a lovely contrast between what they ought to have done (fight) and what they were doing now – labouring with their hands, the ultimate sign of derogation.\textsuperscript{194} One assumes that for the reader this was a valuable and noteworthy example of what could happen when the traditional military class were not prepared to defend their lands.

Other translators utilised the argument that the nobles had degenerated, but cited other reasons for their derogation. This is illustrated by a consideration of a change the R translator of Chartier's \textit{Quadrilogue Invectif} made to his source text. As was seen earlier, the U translator argued that the nobles had degenerated because they were ill disciplined. The R translator made this point, but further located the proof of their degeneration in their lack of 'feere of their soueraines':

Yet ther is a thing that gruggeth me more thanne this that I haue reheircid, for I se hough the nobles and wourshipfull men take so litill hede to themself that is no difference of rewle and condicon bytwen them and the mysgouerned folkis, nothir in their willis nor in feere of their soueraines.\textsuperscript{195}

The translator compared nobles to 'mysgouerned folkis' as opposed to the vaguer 'des autres' and thus not only identified rebellion with those who were 'mysgouerned' but also singled out rebellion or lack of loyalty as a particular failing of the nobility as

\textsuperscript{194} Physical labour and gentle status were regarded as incompatible. For example, Agnes Paston regretted that her two youngest sons had not enough to 'leve theron wythouȝt they shuld hold the plowe be the tayle'; Davis (ed.), \textit{Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century} (Oxford, 1971-76), 1: 44 and see above n. 192.
\textsuperscript{195} Blayney (ed.), \textit{English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif}, 1: 236.
opposed to the more indefinite 'meurs et voulentez'. Instead of making the rather
generic comment that nobles should be distinct in terms of their morals, his alteration
suggested that the defining characteristic of nobility should be their loyalty. Without
loyalty, nobles were no different from the 'mysgouerned folkis'. The alterations made by
the R translator therefore relocated the complaint within the context of civil war and
within England in the third quarter of the fifteenth century.

The translator of the *Livre du corps de policie* also argued that the nobles had
deenerated because they could not be trusted to keep their promises of fealty to their
lords. He argued that 'suche as calle theimselfe noble' should 'be ashamed and
confoundid and haue litle cause to be proude for the noblesse of their kynne whiche is
defoyled in their owyn personis'. This framework may also account for the distinction
the verse translator of *De re militari* drew between the 'beestis' and the 'noblis'. At the
beginning of Book III, the translator, addressing the Yorkists, stated 'Of bestialite, lo, ye
so rude, / The Noblis alle attende on the Antilope'. He then stated 'Hou that the
beestis and the foulys alle, / That gentil are'. The 'Noblis' were those who remained
loyal to Henry VI, whilst those who opposed the king, the Yorkist lords, were identified
as the 'beestis and foulys'. They had lost their noble, 'gentil' status because they had not
fulfilled their function of obeying their king.

The context of civil war also explains why translators stressed the destruction of
the nobility. The R translator, for example, in an addition to his source text, argued that

---

196 Another contemporary usage of the term 'misgoverned' to mean rebels can be found in the
*Arrival of Edward IV* composed shortly after 1471. The unknown author pairs 'traitors' with
'misgoverned men'; J. Bruce (ed.), *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall
Recoverye of His Eynememt from Henry VI. A.D. MCCC.LXXI*, Camden Society, old series 1
(1838), p. 33.


198 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 997-1000.

199 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 1007-8.
the nobles 'tak litill hede of their grete distruccion'. Indeed, the destruction of the nobility became a prevalent motif of literary works and manuscripts produced during the third quarter of the fifteenth century. For example, Riddy has argued that Malory's *Morte Darthur* 'sustains and is sustained by the ideology of [...] an aristocracy in crisis'.

As such, 'the last battle [...] is a symbol of the chivalric world turning its nihilistic energy upon itself, and destroying its own possibility of continuity'. This is also part of the way in which works from earlier in the century were received during the civil wars. For example, the scribal glosses to Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes* (c. 1421-22) contained in Bodl. Lib., MS Laud Misc 416, which also contains a copy of the prose translation of *De re militari* dated 1459, highlighted the destruction of the nobility during civil war. Two of the glosses read ‘¶ How al the gentyl blood of Grece and Thebes was distroyed on o day’ and ‘¶ The worthy blood of Grece was distroyed at the siege and the cyte fynaly brouht to nought’. Chroniclers likewise emphasised the way in which whole lines of noble families were destroyed during the wars.

The nature of the battles that took place during the civil wars probably did mean that more English nobles died than, say, at Agincourt or Verneuil, and this must have affected perceptions of how destructive those battles were. Contemporaries also commented on the way that only common soldiers were given quarter during the battles of the civil war. According to the author of the *English Chronicle*, before the battle of Northampton the Yorkists lords 'lete crye thoroughe the felde, that no man shuld laye hand vpponne the kyng ne on the commune peple, but onely on the lorde, knyghtes

---

200 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inventif*, 1: 156.
203 Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc. 416, fols. 244v and 253r.
and squyres'. Commynes, discussing the battle of Barnet, argued that 'the slaughter was exceedingly heavy because King Edward decided when he left Flanders he would no longer adhere to his custom of shouting that the common soldiers should be saved and that the nobles should be killed, as he had done in his earlier battles'. However, this preoccupation with the destruction of the nobility should not be seen as a reaction to what was necessarily taking place: as McFarlane showed, the argument that the nobility were completely destroyed by the wars is untenable. It was more of a reaction to the threat of what might happen if England's ruling classes continued to pursue 'this lyf afor rehercid' and to the psychological effect of civil war.

Moreover, civil war meant that the noble quality of chivalry could not flourish. There were no heroes. As McFarlane said, during the civil wars, 'heroism could only be achieved by those who met death stoically beneath the executioner's axe- as John Tiptoft did in 1470. Christine de Pizan hinted at the redundancy of chivalric values in the context of civil war in her Lamentacion sur les maux de la guerre civile written in response to the threat of the outbreak of civil war in France and completed on 23 August 1410.

207 K.B. McFarlane, The Wars of the Roses, in England in the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1981), pp. 247-9. Although between 1455-87 at least thirty-eight nobles were killed during or after battle: eighteen were killed in 1460-1 and four after 1471; Goodman, The Wars of the Roses, p. 209.
208 As Goodman argues, 'The deaths in domestic warfare of so many peers, unparalleled in scale in any recent period [...] is likely to have had profound psychological effects on the nobility'; Goodman, The Wars of the Roses, p. 209.
209 This perception of the period is often implicit in secondary literature. For example, Sutton and Visser-Fuchs state that 'it must be admitted that civil war was not a good background for the potential hero' but do not develop this argument; A.F. Sutton and L. Visser-Fuchs, 'Chevalerie... in som partie is worthi ferto be comendid, and in som part to ben amendid': Chivalry and the Yorkist Kings', in C. Richmond and E. Scarff (eds.), St George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages (Windsor, 2001), p. 130. However, contemporary writers did use chivalric terminology to describe those who fought in the wars. For example, the author of the Arrivall of Edward IV discusses the prowess of Edward IV and his 'manly' attributes; Bruce (ed.), Arrivall, p. 20.
She argued 'Ou tu chevalier, qui vient de tele bataille, dis-moy, je t’en pri, quel honneur tu emportes?'.  

The argument that it was impossible to win glory in civil war was also explored by Malory in his *Morte Darthur*. Benson argues that although the feud between Sir Gawain and Sir Lancelot in the final book 'begins as honourable revenge for Gawain, [it] becomes self-destruction. He begs to be killed by the 'traytoure knyght' – but Lancelot does not, can not, win any glory in this'. Indeed, Lancelot implores Arthur and Gawain to stop the descent into civil war, using the argument 'for here wynne ye no worshyp, but magré and dishonoure'. At the end of the last battle, Arthur asks 'Where are all my noble knights become?' and this question seems to express the effect of civil war upon chivalric and noble identity perfectly. It seems to have meaning both literally (where are they; are they all dead?) but also metaphorically: what has happened to their nobility, what have they become or what has this war turned them into? Moreover, the accidental death of Gareth at the hands of Lancelot not only sets in motion the fall of the Round Table but also emphasises the destructive nature of civil war and the way in which chivalrous bonds, forged whilst on campaign or, in this case, on the tournament field, can be rendered apart by civil war. This is emphasised by Malory when he has Gawain remind Lancelot that he made the man he just killed a knight.

---

211 'oh, you, knight who comes from such a battle, tell me, I pray you, what honour did you win there?'; Christine de Pizan, *The Epistle of the Prison of Human Life with an Epistle to the Queen of France and Lament on the Evils of the Civil War*, ed. and trans. J.A. Wisman (New York, 1984), pp. 86/87.


This conceptual framework also informs Worcester's discussion of who ought to be commemorated in the *Boke of Noblesse*. He urged Edward IV to record the:

actis and dedis in armes of so many famous and victorious Kingis, Princes, Dukis, Erles, Barounes, and noble knightis, as of fulle many other worshipfulle men haunting armes, whiche as verray trew martirs and blissid souls have taken theire last ende by werre; some woundid and taken prisoneres in so just a title and conquest uppon youre enheritaunce in Fraunce and Normandie.\(^{216}\)

Worcester was not the only one to issue this advice. Caxton, in his epilogue to his translation of Ramon Lull's *Order of Chivalry* (c. 1484), also expressed similar concerns and is worth quoting at length. He advised the 'knyghtes of Englond', in terms strikingly reminiscent of Worcester:

to loke in latter dayes of the noble actes syth the conquest, as in Kyng Rychard dayes Cuer de Lyon, Edward the Fyrste and the Thyrd and his noble sones, Syre Robert Knolles, Syr Johan Hawkwode, Syr Johan Chandos and Syre Gaultier Mauny. Rede Froissart. And also behold that vctoryous and noble kynge, Harry the Fyfthe and the captayns under hym, his noble bretheren, th'Erle of Salysbury Montagu and many other, whoos names shyne gloryously by their vertuous nobleness and actes that they did in th'onour of th'ordere of chyvalry.\(^{217}\)

Worcester and Caxton were very specific about who exactly should be commemorated. To Worcester, the 'trew martirs' were the forgotten heroes of the Hundred Years War, those who had died 'in so just a title and conquest'. Yet, exactly who ought to be commemorated was also drawn attention to by these authors because there were no current, honourable victories – in 1475, or indeed in 1484, the only acts which could be celebrated were those of the past.

---

\(^{216}\) [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, pp. 3-4.

\(^{217}\) Blake (ed.), *Caxton's Own Prose*, p. 40. Worcester discusses the actions of these figures in more detail in the *Boke of Noblesse* between pp. 12-20.
Perhaps this is why there was such an interest in accounts of honourable feats of arms during this period. Sir John Astley had his own deeds of arms commemorated by incorporating accounts of them into his book. These deeds of arms occurred when he was still a squire: the first was a joust in 1438 in Paris against Piers de Masse whom he killed, the second at Smithfield in 1442 against Philippe de Boyle. Paston's 'Grete Boke' also contains copies of these feats of arms and accounts of the feats of arms performed by Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, against three French knights in Guînes in January 1415 (fols. 16r-17v) and by John Chalons who killed Louis de Bueil in a joust held before Charles VII at Tours, 5 February 1446 (fol. 48v). Paston also added more recent accounts of tournaments and jousts, such as an account of the feats of arms between Sir Anthony Woodville and Antoine, the Bastard of Burgundy, in Smithfield in 1467 (fols. 29v-42v). These accounts testify to the chivalric contacts, and the endurance of those contacts, between members of the Yorkist court and the knights of France, Burgundy and Aragon and to the survival of chivalric identity in spite of civil war.

The impossibility of achieving honour in the context of civil war helps to account for the different ways in which the two translators of Chartier's Quadrilogue Inwif responded to his discussion of the renewal of the Roman custom of making images. Chartier had written: 'pour louenge et memoire, les Rommains faisoient ymages de divers metaulx, ars et cures triumphans a ceulx qui vertueusement se portoient pour accroistre la seigneurie rommaine et augmenter le bien publique de leur

---

218 These are the 'challenge of Piers de Masse to Astley' on fols. 275v-6v and the 'challenge of Philippe de Boyle to Astley' on fols. 277v-79r.

219 For the full list see the manuscript description in Appendix A, pp. 271-2.

220 The translator of the Livre du corps also argued that such images should be 'sett [...] in a certayn place of worchipp whiche was made for the nones and vndir theim made wryte their names and their surnames and the grete pryncipall dedis that they had done' so that others could take example from them; Bornstein (ed.), Middle English Translation of Livre du corps, book II, chapter 17, pp. 152-3.
The Romans made such images ‘triumphant of such as lived in virtuous dispositions for to encrease the regality of the Romayns and for to augment the common wele of thaire cite’. Thus, the renewal of the custom was designed to encourage others. The Romans made such images ‘in remembrance of such worthy persons as increasid their lordshippis and the common wele of their cite’. In the R translator’s version, there is no sense of future – the heroes of the past could be commemorated, but their deeds could not be repeated. The R translator’s reinscription of the passage was, therefore, inextricably linked to the context of civil war.

To return to the complaint that the nobles were not fulfilling their martial function: why might the military profession have been less attractive to such men? Obviously this is a complex issue, but one reason is implicitly offered by these texts. Authors and translators altered the material in Vegetius’s De re militari concerning the function of the soldier in society. Whilst Vegetius stated that soldiers were the means by which enemies respected and supported (financially in the respect of paying subsidies) the Empire, other authors envisaged a domestic role for soldiers as keepers of the peace. Worcester, following Pizan’s Livre des faits d’armes, elaborated upon Vegetius’s point by stating that good men of arms not only ‘surmountethe and conquerithe enemyes’, but also ‘in time of pease wardithe the peple to be in rest’. The verse

221 Chartier, Quadrilogue Invecif, p. 17.
224 The reader of the R translation contained in CSJC, MS 76 D I annotated this passage with the marginal comment ‘Images mayd by the romaynes’; CSJC, MS 76 D I, fol. 6r.
226 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 29. He was referring to the following part of the Livre des faits d’armes: ‘Nothing, Vegetius says, is stronger or more fortunate or more praiseworthy than a country that has a large number of men-at-arms, well trained and hardened in what is required
translator, who was particularly concerned with rebellion, also elaborated upon *De re militari*, by stating that 'knyghthode and bataile' 'chastised' rebellion and therefore made 'the Crowne hol in Maiestee'. He also argued that good men-at-arms 'groweth good gournaunce'. The translator of the *Livre du corps de policie* stated that the good soldier should be 'well manered and of good condicion, true in dede and in courage, wyse in gouernyng and diligent in pursewyng knyghthode' (my italics). These alterations imply that the responsibilities of the traditional military class were not straightforward during this period. Moreover, it might be argued that the additional responsibilities of members of this class, to administer justice in their localities or to represent their counties in parliament, drew men away from the military occupation. Indeed, the prose translator of *De re militari* followed Vegetius and complained that the strength of the army had decreased because 'oure most honest persones han ben occupied in ciuile office' and this passage was annotated by the reader of OMC, MS Lat. 30. As Nigel Saul has argued: 'By the later fourteenth century, the aristocracy in England as elsewhere, were no longer, if they had ever been, an exclusively military elite. They were of them, for neither gold, nor silver nor precious stones overcome the enemy, nor do they make the inhabitants live in peace. Only a valiant and powerful fighting force can do this'; Christine de Pizan, *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*, trans. S. Willard and ed. C.C. Willard (Pennsylvania, 1999), book I, chapter 8, p. 28.

---

227 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 1622-1642.
228 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 1045-7.
230 See Carpenter's interesting discussion of changing notions of knighthood in the county of Warwickshire in the fifteenth century. Carpenter argues that by 1500 there is 'evidence of an unmistakable alteration in the status of the knight, in which administrative responsibility, territorial power and local standing had replaced military experience as the primary qualification, in the eyes of both the government and locality'. These changes, she argues, can also be discerned in the first half of the century; C. Carpenter, *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society, 1401-1499* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 50-92 [88, 61].
231 The statute of 1445 concerning parliamentary election argued that MPs should be 'notable knights, other ellus such notable squyers, gentilmen of birth of the same shires as be able to be knyghtes'; Morgan, 'The Individual Style of the English Gentleman', pp. 18-9.
232 OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 8v; Lester (ed.), *English Translation of Vegetius*, book I, chapter 7, p. 55.
becoming a service nobility, valued by rulers for their administrative abilities as well as for their skills in arms'.

At the same time, there was a growing body of literature which argued that soldiers should be entirely committed to the prosecution of war and and not have other responsibilities. Nicholas Upton, writing in c. 1446, made this point in his *De studio militari*. His sixteenth-century translator, John Blount, stated that ‘men of warre be in soche a restraynte that they owght not to medell wyth tylyng or plowyng off londes, nor kepyng off bestes, nor occupyng of marchandyse, or other mennys bysynes’. This concern is also evident in military ordinances issued during the Lancastrian occupation of France. The ordinances published after the Siege of Orleans in 1429, for example, stated that men who held land or were merchants were not allowed to serve in the army. Curry has argued that these ordinances are indicative of growing governmental control over the army: ‘the control of personnel reflects increasing professionalisation as a result of central control and marks a considerable change in the concept of what the army should be’.

Yet translation changes also suggest that civil office was regarded as being more tempting for men who would normally have followed a military career. The prose translator of *De re militari* implied this by equating civil office with ‘more ese’, an association missing from the Latin. The translator also used Vegetius’s argument that

---


236 ‘Sed longae securitas pacis homines partim ad delectationem otii, partim ad civilia transduxit officia’ was translated as ‘bot forsothe longe sikernes of peas hap made oure werriours to 3iue
soldiers should not have time to serve private interests and elaborated that such interests were 'special offices in townes ne in contrees as to be meyres and baylies in citees or scherreues in contree'. The verse translator also altered De re militari. Vegetius had argued that men chose to follow civil occupations ('honestiores quique civilia sectantur officia'), but the verse translator shifted the responsibility on to the society that allowed this to happen: 'Ciuilians or officers to make/ Of hem that have habilite to werre,/ is not the worship of a lond tawake' (my italics). Clearly translators of De re militari felt that civil office provided too tempting a distraction for members of that class traditionally devoted to war.

William Worcester certainly agreed. He complained that:

who can be a reuler and put hym forthe in suche matieris, he is, as the worlde goithe now, among alle astatis more set of than he that hathe despendid xxx or xl yeris of his daies in gret jubardies in youre [antecessourys] conquestis and werris. So wolde Jhesus they so wolle welle lerned theyrn to be as good men of armes, chieveteins, or capetains in the feelde that befallithe for hem where worship and manhode shulde be shewed, moche bettir then as they have lerned and can be a captaine or a ruler at a sessions or a shire day, to endite or to amercie youre pore bestialle peple, to theire [enpoveryshyng] and to enrichem silfe or to be magnified the more.

hem to delices of sloggynes and slouýe, and some to gouernayl and office in citees and townes as for more ese'; Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book I, chapter 28, p. 74; Reeve (ed.), Vegetius: Epitoma rei militari, book I, chapter 28, p. 30. 237 Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book II, chapter 18, p. 95. 238 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, U. 285-7 corresponding to De re militari, book I, chapter 7. 239 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, pp. 77-8. Interestingly, at the same time, Caxton also complained about men of law. In an addition to Book III, chapter 3 of his edition of the Game of Chess (1st edition, 31 March 1474) he complained 'Alas, and in Engeland what hurte doon the advocats, men of lawe and attorneyes of court to the comyn peple of the royame as wen in the spirituell lawe as in the temporall: how tome they the lawe and statutes at their pleasir [...] I suppose that in alle Cristendom ar not so many pletars, attorneys and men of the lawe as ben in Englond onely [...] they entende to theyr synguler wele and prouffyt and not to the comyn'; Blake (ed.), Caxton's Own Prose, p. 86.
Keen argues that this passage is not telling us 'about a sea change that has come over English upper class society', but rather that, as a result of Henry V's conquests, 'the preoccupations of English gentlemen who chose to take part in their counties drew them apart from those other gentlemen who chose to take their chance in the king's war overseas'. For Keen, this separation or division of interest between men who were committed to the localities and those who fought in France explains why Lancastrian France fell between 1449 and 1453: because the land settlement in France was 'quite separate from that of the community of the English homeland' men had to choose between England and France. He argues, referencing Castor's work, that 'even such a rich and successful soldier as Sir John Fastolf found that his absences made it difficult for him to integrate himself into local power structures' when he returned from France. Curry has also suggested that the nature of English military needs from 1417 onwards may have deterred men with commitments in England from serving abroad. As a result, 'the occupation of northern France in the fifteenth-century was the work of a comparatively narrow group of quasi-professional soldiers who became increasingly isolated from the domestic political community'. Ormrod has also suggested that this 'division in interest' might explain the fall in direct taxation outlined above.

This 'division of interest' between those who fought in France and those who remained in England is further reflected in Worcester's Boke of Noblesse. Worcester was anxious to emphasise that those men who were dispossessed by the cession of Maine and the loss of Normandy were English subjects, living by the same laws as the English.

---

240 Keen, 'The End of the Hundred Years War', p. 311.
241 Keen, 'The End of the Hundred Years War', p. 310; See my discussion of this argument in chapter one, p. 7.
243 Curry, 'English Armies', p. 47; Carpenter, Locality and Polity, p. 60.
244 Ormrod, 'The Domestic Situation', p. 95.
245 Ormrod, 'The Domestic Situation', p. 95.
in England: 'seeing they bene christen men, and lyvyng under youre obeissaunce, lawes-yoving, and yelding to youre lawes as trew Englisshe men done [...] why shulde it here after be suffred that suche tormentrie and cruelte shulde be shewed unto theym?' 246 Yet the problem he indirectly identified was that the experience and the situation of these men was markedly different from those living in England who had not lost as much, in material terms, from the fall of the French lands.

Moreover, Worcester frequently insisted that those soldiers who had been dispossessed as a result of the loss of the English territories in France should be recompensed in some way and he used the voice of the dispossessed in order to do so: 'we dolorous parsones suffring intollerabille persecucions and miserie, aswelle in honoure lost as in oure lyvelode there unrecompensid, as in oure meveable goodes bereved, what shalle we doo or say?' 247 This insistence, however, suggests the extent to which the soldiers living in France had been forgotten and their interests had not been represented. Indeed, Worcester, by using the voice of the dispossessed in his text addressed to Edward IV, was implying that their voice was not being heard through other channels, as was clearly the case, as they still had not received compensation. 248 These exhortations seem to be in reaction to that body of opinion which did not regard

---

246 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, pp. 73-4.
247 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 49.
248 Allmand attributes this lack of recompense to 'a calculated indifference to the fate of the king's subjects in Normandy'; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 263. Jones has described how the money that was designed to recompense landowners dispossessed by the cession of Maine was misappropriated. 3,000 livres tournois were paid to John, Viscount Beaumont, for his barony of Mayenne, and he received this, Jones argues, on the intercession of Margaret of Anjou. Apparently, 'the rest was absorbed into the general military expenditure of the duchy with priority being given to those in civil or military administration'; Jones, 'Somerset, York', p. 298. This, of course, caused a series of problems in England, especially because Somerset received a large amount in compensation. Richard, duke of York described how Somerset 'would not dispose the same money [...] but keepith it still to his owne use and singular availe'. Compensation was also mentioned in Fastolf's questions to Somerset, drawn up in 1449; Gairdner (ed.), The Paston Letters (1904) 1: 107; Stevenson (ed.), Letters and Papers, 2: 722.
the French lands as part of England’s ‘natural’ lordship and was anxious to retain the separate identity of the two.249

Keen’s interpretation of Worcester’s complaint about lawyers is compelling, yet it does not quite account for Worcester’s further comment that such men were more respected than those who had fought in the war. Worcester was not chastising those who entered law instead of war, but rather the society that allowed this to happen: ‘And if the vaillaunt Romayns had suffred their sonnes to mysspende their tyme in suche singular practik, using oppressing by colours [of custom of the law, they had not conquered twyes] Cartage ayenst alle the Affricans’.250 It was a complaint levelled specifically at those who paid more heed to peacetime pursuits than to war. Worcester’s complaint suggests a further reason why the traditional military class might be distracted from their true purpose. Success in the courtroom invited precisely those things which success on the battlefield ought to have done. By practising law these men not only grew rich but were also ‘magnified the more’.251 Such rewards should have accrued to the military man, but they did not.

The complaint that lawyers were more esteemed than those who had spent ‘xxx or xl yeris of his daies in gret jubardies in youre [antecessourys] conquestis and werris’

249 Allmand observes that there was ‘a division of interest, indeed of liability’, emerging in parliament in the 1440s. For example, William Booth, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, proposed in the June 1449 parliament that those who held land in France should, in effect, be responsible for paying for them; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 262; R.A. Griffiths, ‘The Winchester Session of the 1449 Parliament: A Further Comment’, Huntington Library Quarterly 42 (1979): 186-7, 189.
250 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, pp. 77-8.
251 It is interesting that they were not respected explicitly because they were rich. This was the argument that the English translation of Pizan’s Livre du corps made. It argued against those who maintained ‘ther is non honour but in rychesse and withoute rychesse honour may not be had’, which implicitly suggests that personal wealth had become the indicator of honour as opposed to martial virtue; Bornstein (ed.), Middle English Translation of Livre du corps, book II, chapter 14, pp. 145-6.
explicates Worcester's inclusion of an account about the foundation of the Order of the Garter in his Boke of Noblesse. According to Worcester, the Order of the Garter was founded because of knights' 'gret prowesse and here manlynesse approved in armes' and because of their 'gret labouris in werre and vaillaunt dedis of armes [...] that they have ben yn for the righte title in the crowne of Fraunce'. Thus Worcester made two crucial points: it was founded to reward martial service and furthermore martial service undertaken in France. However, the Garter was not being used for the purpose — indeed, how could it have been given that there was no war with France in which to perform such deeds of arms. There was obviously less opportunity for service abroad so the number of militarily experienced knights admitted to the Order decreased. Collins has recently argued that more courtier-knights, peers and household men were elected to the Garter in the 1450s and so 'the degree of martial distinction seemed to decline in these later nominations, even in comparison with the moderate experience possessed by the knights admitted during the first ten years of Henry VI's majority'. Worcester's inclusion of this material might be interpreted as a gentle reminder of the purpose for which the Order of the Garter was established.

Likewise, it has been argued that a significant proportion of the recipients of the Order of the Bath under Edward IV were sheriffs, JPs or aldermen. Pilbrow concludes that this evidence suggests that 'knights could serve with honour in

---

252 [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 46.
household, governmental and diplomatic service and in local office holding'. The same is true of knightings more generally. Barron demonstrates that whereas in the fourteenth century it was unusual for London aldermen to become knights, under Edward IV it became much more common. This change, she argues, must reflect 'not only the Yorkists' anxious search for support, but also the increased desire of London merchants to become knights'. But it also, of course, suggests that the concept of what a knight was or should be had become progressively more demilitarised.

It has also been argued that there was a shift in the relationship between the granting of arms and military service during the course of the fifteenth century. Keen, using evidence derived from patents of arms, argues that in the later fifteenth century the clients of the heralds were not generally military men and that coats of arms came to be seen as symbols of status rather than as martial insignia. By the late fifteenth century, according to Keen, 'conceptions of what an English gentleman of coat armour should be [...] had become progressively and ultimately very substantially demilitarised'. Maddern has also argued that a non-martial concept of honour, focusing on faithful service, friendship and reputation, can be discerned in the Paston Letters.

---

256 Pilbrow, 'The Knights of the Bath', p. 215. Service rendered in non-military ways was also, of course, a route to gentility; Morgan, 'The Individual Style of the English Gentleman', p. 26.
257 C. Barron, 'Chivalry, Pageantry and Merchant Culture in Medieval London', in P. Coss and M. Keen (eds.), *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2002), p. 239. Morgan has also drawn attention to the numbers of London aldermen who received knighthood under Edward IV; Morgan, 'The Individual Style of the English Gentleman', p. 23.
This context, in which men were knighted not necessarily as a result of their martial prowess, may explain the annotations in two copies of the prose translation of *De re militari*. Readers annotated the section of the text which argued that:

\[
\text{boru3 negligence and disese of times passud, be strengbe of legiouns is fouliche feynted and broken. ffor sibbe bat proude desire of worshippe hap ben medid and rewardid wip be rewarde of vertu was woned to restreyne, and also sepbe bat fauour and grace hap chosen and promoted oure kni3tes, pat were woned to ben chosen by worshipful and trauailous dedes of armes [...] be my3t and strengbe of oure legiouns ne is no3t so worshipful as it was (my italics).}^{262}
\]

This passage argued that knights were chosen for reasons which had little to do with the performance of ‘worshipful and trauailous dedes of armes’ and this observation clearly had a resonance for readers of this translation.

This discursive environment may also explicate Caxton's complaint in his epilogue to his translation of Lull's *Order of Chivalry* (c. 1484). He addressed contemporary knights:

Allas! what doo ye but slepe and take ease and ar al disordred fro chyvalry? I wold demaunde a question yf I shold not displease. How many knyghtes ben ther now in Englond that have th'use and th'exceryse of a knyghte, that is to wete that he knoweth his hors and his hors hym, that is to seye he beyng redy at a poymt to have al thyngh that longeth to a knyght, an hors that is accordyng and broken after his hand, his armures and harnoys mete and syttyng and so forth et cetera? I suppose and a due serche shold be made ther shold be many founden that lacke, the more pyte is. I wolde it pleasyd ourc soverayne lord that twyes or thryes in a yere or at lest ones he wold do crye justes of pees to th'ende that every knyght shold have hors and harneys and also the use and craft of a knyght, and also to tornoye one ageynste one or ii ageynst ii and the best to have aprys, a dyamond or jewel, suche as shold please the Prynce. This shold cause gentylmen to resorte to th'auncyent custommes of chyvalry to grete fame and renommee, and also to be alwey redy to serve theyr prynce whan he shalle calle them or have nede.\(^{263}\)

\(^{262}\) Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, fol. 29v; OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 27r; Lester (ed.), *English Translation of Vegetius*, book II, chapter 3, pp. 79-80.

\(^{263}\) Blake (ed.), *Caxton's Own Prose*, p. 40.
I find this passage fascinating because Caxton was a businessman and a successful promoter of his translations and publications. This passage suggests that Caxton was marketing the text to an audience who would share these sentiments—it is unlikely that he would criticise his implied audience in this way. Significantly, Sir John Paston bought a copy of Caxton’s translation of this text. Caxton’s exhortation seems to imply that there was a subculture in gentry society, a division between those who would identify with Caxton’s complaint that knights ‘these days’ did not know how to ride a horse and those other members of the gentry who had been knighted, but not as a result of their martial prowess.

These texts insisted that men of arms ought to be commemorated and rewarded; that there ought to be a culture which was supportive of soldiers and which recognised their inherent value. The translator of Pizan’s *Le Livre du Corps* complained that men of arms were not ‘rewardid in Englond aftir their desertis’. The translator enthusiastically adopted Pizan’s model of the Roman triumph and changed the referent from France to England. This encouraged identification by an English audience: by changing ‘France’ to ‘England’ the work could now be read as a commentary on English society. The translator argued that England should ‘kepe suche reule and gouernaunce as did the Romayns. For whan the prynces of Rome came home victoriously from any grete conquests, they wer receyued with grete honour whiche was called tryumphhe’.

264 It is mentioned in his inventory of books; Davis (ed.), *Paston Letters*, 1: 517. This may be BL, C.10.b23, which came into the possession of Garter King of Arms, Thomas Wrythe. For this possibility see chapter three, p. 125.

265 Bornstein (ed.), *Middle English Translation of Livre du corps*, book II, chapter 8, p. 132. Jewels were given for those who had fought and overcome an enemy; those who were first to enter a castle that was taken by assault and those who had fought hand to hand. If a soldier won a city, he received a crown of gold; ‘and for othre dedes of armes some shulde haue colers, some cappes, some gyrdellis, some garturis, some bracellettis of golde’, so that ‘euyer persone by that
Implicitly, a culture that prized military victory was not present in France when Pizan was writing or in England when the translation was being made.
4.4 Hannibal and the gold rings

That demilitarisation was central to English explanations for why the war in France had been lost can also be demonstrated by a consideration of the translators’ use of the story of Hannibal and the gold rings. This story was used by all of the authors and translators except the verse translator of *De re militari*.\(^{266}\) It described the defeat of the Romans at the hands of Hannibal and his army at the Battle of Cannae. So many knights and noblemen died at this battle that, according to Worcester, ‘the ringis of golde take frome the fingers of the ded bodies of the said Romains, whiche were men of price and renomme [...] were extendid and mesureid to the quantite of mesure .xij. quarters or more’.\(^{267}\) By taking the rings back to Carthage, Hannibal ‘shewed that the power of Rome was grety mynussed and fegled’.\(^{268}\) The rings symbolised the Romans’ inner martial virtue. Taking them back to Carthage was not only a sign of victory, but emblematic of the shift of power: the Romans’ martial strength had been both literally and symbolically appropriated by the victors.

Within this model, however, the story was used to demonstrate different points. As such, the variations reflect the different conceptual frameworks of the authors and of their implied audiences.\(^{269}\) Chartier and the translators attributed the defeat at Cannae to

\(^{266}\) It was not used by the verse translator because it was not in his source text and he may not have been familiar with the story.


\(^{268}\) [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 50.

\(^{269}\) Pizan used the story to illustrate how when Hannibal won a battle, he would bury all the knights and nobles on the field. It might be assumed that the precise size of the vessels which held the rings was only important in so far as it conveyed the total destruction brought about by Cannae. In this sense, Pizan’s use of the story is really quite strange. She described how after the battle, Hannibal ‘envoya en son pays troys muis d’aneaux d’or qui furent oostez des dois des nobles hommes occis. Car d’aneaux porter estoit la coustume des nobles adont. Et quoyque celle chose semble merveilleuse et forte a croire, si le tesmoingent ainsi tous les historiografes qui en ont parlé. Mais puet bien estre que le mui n’estoit mie si grant comme cellui de France et que c’estoit une autre mesure ainsi appellee’; Pizan, *Le Livre du corps*, book I, chapter 17, p. 30.
poor leadership and hastily made decisions: ‘the innumerable losses’ were the result of ‘the folisch enterprise of Varo’. This was linked to their diagnosis of defeat at the Battle of Agincourt in 1415, which was similarly catastrophic for the French nobility and was likewise attributed by some to poor counsel. Yet an alternative explanation was offered by other authors and translators which argued that the defeat was the result of neglected military training and preparation. For example, the prose translator of *De re militari* added the story of the rings to his translation, as did Pizan in her *Livre des faits d’armes*, in order to make this argument. It was because the Romans had neglected their training and ‘vse of armes’ that they were defeated at Cannae. The prose translator argued that:

\[
\text{be Romayns were in so grete pees and reste as victors and lordes of alle oher naciouns aboute hem pat bey toke non nede of vse of armes, in so moche pat in \text{he secounde werertime pat Hanybal, pat was duke of Cartage, began vppon be Romayns, for defeute of vse of armes be Romayns were vnmy3d to wipstonde hem, and in \text{pat batail Hanybal slow}3 so many kni3tis of be Romayns that he sent home to Cartage iii busshelles of gold rynges of kni3tis fingeres that were slayn of the Romayn side.}
\]

To the prose translator, demilitarisation was the result of lack of external war: ‘bot forsothe longe sikernesse of pees hæp made oure werriours to 3iue hem to delices of

---

270 Early readers of the R translation annotated this passage: LPL, MS Arc.L.40.2/E.42, fol. 20r; NL, MS f.36, Ry 20, fol. 12v; Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inventif*, 1: 192.

271 French losses were exceptionally high whilst the English losses were surprisingly low. This was a major concern of the chroniclers' writings, 'almost an obsession, one might suggest'; A. Curry (ed.), *The Battle of Agincourt: Sources and Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 471. Michel Pintouin, monk of St. Denis, reproached the French in his *Chronique du religieux de Saint-Denis* because they did not accept wisdom in their counsel 'you have tarnished this brilliance [of their ancestors] by your ill-considered rushing forward, your disorder and your ignominious flight'; Curry (ed.), *The Battle of Agincourt*, p. 338. The R translator of the *Quadrilogue Inventif* retained the reference to Agincourt and thus located the warning within a specifically French context. The U translator, on the other hand, removed the reference to Agincourt and instead referred to the 'vnhappy batail', which invited the reader to substitute his/her own referent; Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inventif*, 1: 190; 191.

272 Pizan argued that the Romans: 'who had conquered many lands, let themselves go to the point where they were conquered by Hannibal'; Pizan, *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*, book I, chapter 8, p. 27. Compare her use of this story on this occasion with that in the *Livre du corps de polities*, see above, n. 269.

sloggyne and sloupe, and some to gouernayl and office in citees and townes as for more ese'.

The prose translator's diagnosis of defeat at Cannae was rooted in his own understanding of the context in which he was writing which saw no military enterprise overseas. From 1390 to the accession of Henry V there were few opportunities for military service abroad. Keen has argued that this break in the war with France had important repercussions on the martial values of landed society and, in his view, it helps to explain why there was declining interest in the war during the latter stages of the Lancastrian occupation. This situation of no external war is the context for Thomas, Lord Berkeley's commissioning of the 1408 prose translation of De re militari and it is reflected both in the translator's use of the story of Hannibal and the gold rings and in other additions he made. For example, he stated that in the past 'mo [men] folowed chiualry and armes þan þere doth now' and, in an addition to the prologue of Book II, he argued that he was compelled to write about 'not onliche þilke þinges þat nedful ben to ben lerned of newe 3ong vntau3t werriours bot also suche þinges þat for defaute of use of armes ben for3ete' (my italics). It seems that already in 1408 people were becoming conscious of a demilitarisation of society and of the long-term effect that lack of external war might have upon their society's values.

275 M.H. Keen, 'English Military Experience and the Court of Chivalry: The Case of Grey v. Hastings', in Nobles, Knights and Men-at-arms in the Middle Ages (London, 1996), pp. 167-185; Keen, Origins of the English Gentleman, p. 89. Keen has also argued that the proportion of county knights who had military experience declined between 1400-1420, while the number of professional lawyers increased. He argues that Berkshire, Essex and Wiltshire, Worcestershire are particularly good examples of counties in which this happened; Keen, Origins of the English Gentleman, pp. 89, 173, n. 3.
The prose translator and Pizan argued that the Romans were defeated at Cannae because their victories abroad had allowed them to neglect their training. It was explicitly because the Romans were in 'grete pees and reste as victors' that they began to grow soft and were, therefore, defeated in battle. Worcester likewise used this story to illustrate the catastrophic consequences of demilitarisation, but did not link it explicitly to the Roman victories. This made the story a far more appropriate diagnosis for English military failure in 1450. He argued that the losses sustained by the Romans were the result of 'defaute and negligence lost by a litlle tyme left the exercise of armes'. In the margin of the first reference to Hannibal he wrote 'Nota quod pro defectus exercicii armorum mala sequuntur exercitui Romanorum'. The manuscript's rubric for this section read: 'How for defaute of exercise of artnes the gret nombre of Romains were scomfited by men of Cartage'. Titles and marginalia attempt to control or contain the multiplicity of meanings available to the reader, which suggests that Worcester wanted the story of Cannae to be read as a meditation on the problems accruing to a demilitarised society. He then annotated the story several times with 'nota bene'. What makes Worcester's use of the story even more remarkable is that he knew it from his reading of Chartier's Quadrilogue Inventif. In his copy of the Boke of Noblesse, he wrote the marginal gloss 'Syr Alanus de Autiga' next to this story about Hannibal. He was thus acknowledging his source, but using the story to make a different point from that in his source text.

Negligence was central to Worcester's diagnosis of defeat in France. He wrote the instruction 'Concideracio' next to the passage in his copy of the Boke of Noblesse,
which read: 'it is to suppose that it is rather in defaute of exercising of armes left this 
xxiiij yere day that the londes were lost'.\textsuperscript{282} Clearly, he felt that the experience of the 
Romans at the battle of Cannae was similar to the English experience in France at the 
end of the Hundred Years War and he wanted his audience to recognise the similarities 
between the two situations and to meditate upon the implications of those similarities. 
That other readers did read the story in this way is suggested by the annotations in two 
manuscripts of the prose translation of \textit{De re militari}. An early reader of BL, MS 
Lansdowne 285, possibly Sir John Paston, annotated the story of Hannibal in his copy 
of the prose translation and this is the only annotation of this text.\textsuperscript{283} An early reader of 
OMC, MS Lat. 30 also annotated this passage.\textsuperscript{284} They only wrote 'nota bene' so it is 
impossible to know what they particularly wanted to remember about this story or to 
emphasise for other readers, but it does not seem too implausible to suggest that they, 
like Worcester, identified the causes of the defeat at Cannae with those of the defeat of 
the English.

The different ways in which authors and translators responded to the story of 
Hannibal and the gold rings provides an insight into how military defeat was explained. 
For Chartier, the defeat was the result of one badly made decision, of a commander 
allowing his men to be drawn into battle at the wrong time. For Worcester and the 
prose translator, it was the consequence of long-term societal change; the wholesale 
destruction of the nobility does not happen within the space of three hours on a 
battlefield, but is the product of changes which have taken place over years. Worcester 
and the prose translator's use of the story focused the problem specifically onto the 
demilitarisation of society.

\textsuperscript{282} BL, MS Royal 18 B.XXII, fol. 14v; [Worcester], \textit{Boke of Noblesse}, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{283} BL, MS Lansdowne 285, fol. 115r.
\textsuperscript{284} OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 24r.
Although demilitarisation was central to arguments surrounding defeat in battle for both French and English writers, the reasons given for demilitarisation did differ. This is demonstrated by the changes the English translator of Pizan’s Livre du corps made to his source text. Pizan had stated that an adversary of the Athenians died and:

quant ilz orent perdu cellui qui souvent les travelloit par grant guerre, et qui souvent les batoit en bataille, et sus qui il avoient envie pour sa vaillance, ilz devindrent pareceulx, et plus ne despendirent en gens d’armes ne par terre ne par mer comme ilz souloient, mes en festes et en jeux, et convertissoient les rais de leurs devanciers en chançons. Et leur souffissoit recorder des guerres et riens en faire, pour lesquelles choses le hault renom de Grece defailli jusques au tems de Phelippe, pere d’Alizandre, qui les remist sus.  

In Pizan’s model, an adversary of the Athenians had forced them into battle and kept them on their guard and prepared for war. The translator, however, altered this passage in a very suggestive manner. He stated that when the Athenians lost the worthy prince Epymynydes they:

began to faile of their vertue and of their strengthe. For whan they had loste him that ofte tyme brought thiem forthe to the werres and to many gret batailles, anon they cam aftir ydle and slouthfull and spendid not their good upon men of werre nothir by see nor by londe as they wer wonte to doo, but they bestowed their goodis upon festes and playes and turned the worthy dedis of his aunceters vnto songgis and that suffysed heim inough to recorde and talke of the werres that they wolde not occupie theimselfe, for whiche cause the grete renowne of Grece defayled and was extimed.  

---

285 Pizan, Le Livre du corps de poliçie, book I, chapter 30, p. 51. When they lost him who had often forced them into great battles, and who had often defeated them in battle, and who they envied for his bravery, they became lazy, and did not spend money on men of arms neither by land nor by sea as they had done, but on feasts and games, and converted the deeds of their ancestors into songs. And it sufficed them to record the wars and do nothing, for which things the high renown of Greece fell until the time of Philip, father of Alexander, who reestablished it. Pizan may have been evoking ‘bateler’ in the choice of ‘batoit’ (sonner, s’agiter) - in that case, the meaning would be ‘he who had often called/incited them in to battle’. Even if this was the case, the translator was clearly making a different point to that of Pizan judging by the other alterations he made.

The central point is that the translator explicitly removed the reference to the defeat in battle. He omitted the clause ‘et qui souvent les batoit en bataille’ and the clause which argued that the Athenians had envied the Epymynydes ‘et sus qui il avoient envie pour sa vaillance’. He also changed the French clause which stated that the Athenians turned the deeds of their ancestors into songs ‘et convertissoient les fais de leurs devanciers en chançons’ and said instead that the Athenians turned the deeds of his (Epymynydes’s) ancestors into songs. The translator therefore made Epymynydes the leader of the Athenians, as opposed to their enemy, without whose leadership they became idle and slothful. The translator thus identified lack of military leadership with a change in society’s values. This change manifested itself in lack of financial support for military enterprise and eventually resulted in that society’s destruction.

These were deliberate alterations. The translator did not want to make Pizan’s point, which in an English context might have implied that the prowess of the French had once been responsible for English military prowess. Rather he wanted to stress that the change that had overcome English society was the result of lack of domestic leadership. The translator therefore made the story of the Athenians a narrative of the demilitarisation of society, which was precipitated by the death of a war-loving leader: an altogether more appropriate diagnosis of the demilitarisation of English society. Although the point was not explicitly made, the implication was that Epymynydes was replaced by a very different leader, with a different set of priorities. This had an obvious parallel to the English situation and the contrast between the success of the war in France under the kingship and leadership of Henry V and that under Henry VI. Several other sources made this comparison. In his Boke of Noblesse, William Worcester implicitly suggested, through his frequent references to the ‘glory days’ of Henry V and his
brother, John, duke of Bedford, that since their deaths military standards and enthusiasm had declined.\(^ {287} \)

Several historians have likewise located the turning point in English military fortunes in France with the death of Henry V and John, duke of Bedford.\(^ {288} \) Indeed, much modern scholarship has rested upon the premise that the attitude and behaviour of the king has a large impact upon the attitudes and behaviour of his nobles and have made connections between lack of domestic leadership, demilitarisation and waning enthusiasm for the war in France.\(^ {289} \) Morgan has also argued that the change he identifies in the style of the royal household from retinue to court, which begins in the 1430s and 1440s, was a result of Henry VI’s disinclination to fight in France.\(^ {290} \) He demonstrates that ‘although there were points after 1450 when the household figured in its old role as the active nucleus of war enterprise, by and large the household came to play instead the changed political role which the language of the “court” is used to emphasize’.\(^ {291} \)

A range of writers in the third quarter of the fifteenth century attributed defeat in general and, in some cases, defeat in the Hundred Years War in particular, to what may be termed the demilitarisation of society. Defeat in the Hundred Years War was

\(^ {287} \) Hardyng also drew a contrast between Henry V and Henry VI but in terms of domestic peace and justice as opposed to success in the French war. This passage is reproduced in Myers (ed.), *English Historical Documents*, 4: 274-5.

\(^ {288} \) See, for example, Vale, *The End and Aftermath of the Hundred Years War*, p. 151.

\(^ {289} \) For example, Carpenter argues that ‘as the French war lost its central place in the life of the landed elite under Henry VI, knights in Warwickshire became an increasingly civilian body, serving the crown in an ever more civilian capacity’. She also argues that the absence of the king on campaign in the 1440s might explain why there was less financial and military support for the war with France; Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, p. 88; *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 99; Curry, *English Armies*, p. 47.


not, then, only explained as being the result of domestic corruption, as perhaps a consideration of propagandist texts alone might suggest. Nor was William Worcester the only writer to articulate this particular diagnosis of defeat, to blame a society whose battles took place in the courtroom rather than on the battlefield. Yet, as the example of the Athenians demonstrates, demilitarisation was indirectly considered to be the responsibility of Henry VI; that peace-loving king, who after 1431, ‘never set foot in France [...] and whose later appearances on the battlefield were altogether involuntary’.292

---

Chapter Five

'The weffeours thus taught, shal make peax'.

This chapter explores how the military texts discussed in this thesis explained civil war. First, it argues that they stressed the effect that lack of external war had on domestic peace and demonstrates that this framework for understanding civil war was also used in a range of other texts and contexts. Secondly, it argues that translators rewrote the discussions of internal war that were present in their source texts in ways which reflected contemporary discourse surrounding the causes of the English civil wars of the 1450s and 1460s. Furthermore, it demonstrates that translators and readers stressed the importance of loyalty, obedience and discipline and so participated in a wider public debate surrounding the legitimacy of opposition and the common weal of the realm.

---

1 R. Dyboski, and Z.M. Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataik*, EETS, original series 201 (1935), l. 431.
5.1 External war and internal peace

The association between external war and internal peace was a commonplace of the later middle ages. In the third quarter of the fifteenth century, lack of external war was consistently cited as the reason for civil discord and was articulated in texts produced in a range of contexts: parliamentary speeches given in the late 1460s and early 1470s, literary works and manuscripts and, of course, in these translations and readers’ annotations. As the English translator of Pizan’s *Livre du corps de police* argued, lack of external war meant that the Athenians ‘felle in myschiefe and distruccion’. Thus, although the connection between the end of the Hundred Years War and the subsequent civil wars has been marginalised in most modern scholarship, for contemporaries this connection was central to how they explained civil unrest.

The English translators of the *Quadrilogue Invenit*, for example, argued that lack of outward war caused internal war. According to the R translator, ‘the long pees’ caused ‘the grette batails, the vnlawfull werres and grette discordis among the

---

2 Crusading propaganda for example viewed the crusade as a solution to domestic conflict. See Fulcher of Chartres’ account of Urban II’s speech launching the first crusade at the Council of Clermont in 1095; O.J. Thatcher and E.H. McNeal (eds.), *A Source Book for Medieval History* (New York, 1905), pp. 513-17. A speech delivered to Charles VII in 1451 by Jean Germain, bishop of Chalon-sur-Saône, argued that ‘young noblemen and others will be nurtured on Christendom’s public wars, thus avoiding the various forms of idleness which are often the cause for war breaking out between Christendom’s princes’; cited in N. Housley (ed. and trans.), *Documents on the Later Crusades 1274-1580* (Basingstoke, 1996), p. 143.


4 See my discussion in chapter one, pp. 7-8.
Romayns’. Chartier had argued that the civil wars of the Romans meant that ‘la seigneurie rommaine, plus par eulx-mesmes que par estranges ennemis, est decheue du tout et sans ressource, qui fut tele et si haulte comme les ruines le demonstrent’. This passage was reinscribed by the R translator of the Quadrilogue Inventif: the civil wars meant that ‘the lordechip of the Romayns was more hurte and greuid thanne by straunge enemyes, whiche is seene at this day by the grete rwynes befallene in the seid lordechip’. The R translator interpreted the final clause ‘qui fut tele et si haulte comme les ruines le demonstrent’ as ‘whiche is seene at this day by the grete rwynes befallene in the seid lordechip’. The referent here was purposefully ambiguous: it did not specifically refer to the downfall of the Roman Empire as it did in the French, but might also have been applied to the contemporary situation, the ‘grete rwynes’ that were once England. Moreover, the inclusion of the phrase ‘whiche is seene at this day’ would have encouraged the audience to relate this observation to contemporary events.

Internal division had also characterised England’s experience of external ‘peace’. This perhaps explains the scribal annotations in three of the five manuscripts of the prose translation of De re militari produced between c. 1445 - c. 1460. The scribes of Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291, CUL, MS Add. 8706 and PML, MS M 775 wrote ‘nota de Unite’ next to the passage that states that in the Roman army there was: ‘suche acorde of good wiHe amonge hem that not with standinge that horsemen and footemen kyndely contrarien and discorden in condiciouns and maneres 3it amonge hem was suche acorde that eueryche of hem loued and worshiped othir as broýer and broýer and this acorde

---

6 Alain Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Inventif, ed. E. Droz (Paris, 1950), p. 26. Although Worcester had this passage copied into one of his notebooks (Royal 13 C.I, fol. 136v), he did not use it in his Bokes of Noblesse, unless it was used in some of the folios now missing.
7 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inventif, 1: 176.
of loue helde euere the legioun stronge through pees'. ⁸ 'Acorde of loue' made the legion strong 'through pees'. These lines represented for scribes, and one assumes for readers, a stark contrast with the state of England in its period of 'peace'. That scribes felt this issue was worth drawing attention to during this period demonstrates the extent to which this unity was considered to be a remarkable achievement in times of external peace.⁹

Worcester implicitly referenced the connection between external peace and internal strife in the notebooks now called his *Itineraries*, which he made between 1478-1480. He wrote lists of those who had died on the battlefields in the civil war and explicitly stated whether or not they had fought in France prior to the fall of the French lands. For example, under the heading 'Apud Heggecot felde prope Banbery de nobilibus et generosis hominibus occisi per exercitum Comitis Warwici de gentibus borialibus regni Anglie', he noted the deaths of 'Johannes Ap Wyllem frater domini Herbert armiger in Francia'; 'Willelmus Norman armiger fuit in Francia'; 'Johannes Eynan de Pernbrokeshyre fuit in Francia cum duce Ebor' and so on.¹⁰ Worcester's interest in whether those killed at Edgecote had fought in France perhaps reflects the argument that an absence of external war results in internal war. The list not only showed what happened to those men who had fought in France after the fall of the lands, but also juxtaposed their success in France with their ignominious deaths.

---

⁸ CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 35r; G.A. Lester (ed.), *The Earliest English Translation of Vegetius' De re militari* (Heidelberg, 1988), book II, chapter 20, p. 97. The scribe of the copy contained in Bodl. Lib, MS Douce 291 also wrote the marginal note 'nota de vnite' on fol. 43v. In PML, MS M 775, judging from the microfilm, the scribe only wrote 'nota' close to the inside margin, so I assume that an examination of the manuscript would show the rest of the phrase. The Latin reads: 'Per hanc ergo contextionem in legionibus et omnium cohortium et equitum peditumque servatur una concordia'; Reeve (ed.), *Vegetius: Epitoma rei militaris*, book II, chapter 21, p. 55.

⁹ See my discussion of this passage in chapter four, pp. 157-8.

The relationship between internal war and external war was also implicitly made in John Vale's collection produced after the death of Thomas Cook, a former mayor of London, in 1478. One section of this collection consists of predominantly military material, such as the articles of the surrender of several towns in France, military ordinances (1417-25) and documents relating to the treaty of Troyes, and therefore witnesses the high point of English martial achievement in France. Yet the collection also contains an account of the battle of St. Albans, Yorkist and Lancastrian bills, manifestoes and letters dating from the 1450s and 1460s, and Lydgate's *Serpent of Division*, which warned of the dangers of civil discord. Success in outward war and the unity this invoked were implicitly juxtaposed in this collection against internal division and failure in outward war.

This discourse is also evident in other literary texts of the period and particularly in Malory’s *Morte Darthur*, written in 1469-70. Malory’s source for Book Five, which concerns the Roman war, was the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*. In this work, the fall of the Round Table occurs directly after the Roman war: the implication is that Arthur’s absence abroad in pursuit of external conquest results in Mordred’s rebellion at home. However, Malory chose not to use the ending of his source text. In Malory’s version, the Roman war does not precede Arthur’s death, but takes place much earlier. This rearrangement of events has several implications. First, as Riddy has argued, by omitting the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*’s tragic ending, Malory ‘turned the story of the Roman war into a grandiose vision of England in Europe’. Moreover, according to Vinaver, Malory altered the route taken by Arthur so that it paralleled that of Henry V’s

---

11 BL, MS Add 48031A, fols. 100v-119v.
12 BL, MS Add 48031A, fols. 165v-175v. Lydgate’s *Serpent of Division* is extant in three other manuscripts: Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS English 530; Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS Pepys 2006; Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS MacClean 182.
Agincourt campaign. Secondly, as Lynch has argued, by not using this ending Malory avoided the criticism of external war, which was implied by the author of the Alliterative Morte Arthure. Malory seems to have deliberately rejected the idea that successful external war could be responsible for internal division: one assumes that such a moral would not have made sense to Malory or to his intended audience; it was demonstrably not the case as ‘history’ told it.

The circumstances which lead to the Roman war in Malory’s version are also remarkably different from those in the Alliterative Morte Arthure and Malory’s changes are, I would argue, rooted in the context of the late 1460s. Withrington argues that, in contrast to Malory’s source the Alliterative Morte Arthure, in Malory’s version Arthur goes to fight the Roman war before he has fully pacified the realm: at this stage he has only ‘vanquished the moste party of his enemyes’ (my italics), and so ‘the implication is that there still remains opposition to overcome at home’. Withrington suggests that the arrival of the Roman embassy at this point reinforces ‘the sense of fragility that surrounds the newly-established realm’. Stability is only achieved once Arthur has achieved success in external war. This impression is reinforced by the opening lines to

the following book: Arthur's knights are jousting and tourneying, in other words, they are enjoying the chivalric pastimes of peace.\textsuperscript{18}

Withrington and Lynch do not contextualise Malory's reinterpretations at all, but it seems clear that they are the products of the context in which Malory was writing. Unlike the author of the Alliterative \textit{Morte Arthure}, writing in c. 1400, Malory was writing in a discursive environment which argued that outward war would actually pacify the realm. In the late 1460s when Malory was writing, Edward IV began to consider a new campaign in France: at the opening of the second session of parliament at Westminster on 12 May 1468, the chancellor announced that Edward intended to invade France and reference was made to how the 'disposition of the people of this lond' meant that 'they must be occupied'.\textsuperscript{19} External war in Malory's version resulted in internal peace and similar hopes were expressed in the late 1460s and, as we shall see, in the 1470s.

The rhetoric produced in favour of a new campaign in the early 1470s also blamed lack of external war for internal unrest. A document, which was probably produced in the early 1470s, argued that 'but we have werre with our aunycyent enmye of Fraunce or in some other londe we can not longe lyf in pece here within our realme of Englonde'.\textsuperscript{20} The famous parliamentary speech of 1472, recorded in the letter books of Christ Church, Canterbury, promoting the new campaign in France, argued that 'it is nat wele possible, nor hath ben since the Conquest, that justice, peax and prosperite hath contened any while in this lande in any Kinges dayes but in suche as have made werre

\textsuperscript{18} Malory, \textit{Workr}, p. 149, ll. 1-3; Withrington, 'Caxton, Malory, and the Roman War', p. 353.
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{RP}, 5: 623.
\textsuperscript{20} Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS Peniarth 394D (Hengwrt 92). I am grateful to Professor Anne Curry for allowing me to look at her copy and transcription of this document. On palaeographical grounds, I believe the extant copy dates from the 1470s.
outward". It elaborated that Henry VI 'stonde ever in glorie' while the war continued, but that once it was over 'successively all fell to decay'. It also used the example of the Punic wars to argue that lack of outward war encouraged civil strife:

Right so it happed in olde daies at the Citee of Rome; for after that Carthage was clerly overthrown and distroied, the residue of the world obeying the Romanys, they nat havyng werre with any contre outwards where they might sett thayr warrely purpose in ocupacion, fell amongs thaim self to suche division and inward bataille, that finally they were brought to ruyne and desolacion.

Why, though, was there this connection between lack of external war and internal peace and on what grounds did contemporaries make it? Two main arguments were advanced in the later middle ages. The first was that external war actively benefited the realm because it provided occupation for criminals and for those who otherwise might disturb the peace of the realm. A document entitled the 'Remembrauncc of the charge yeven to the constabbilis there by the kynggis comissioners', which relates to the

---

21 J.B. Sheppard (ed.), Literae Cantuarienses: The Letter Books of the Monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury, Rolls Series 85 (1887-9), 3: 283. There is still some confusion around when the speech was delivered. Most scholars accept that it was made at the opening of parliament in 1472. Scofield argued that the speech can be dated on internal evidence to 1472: it mentions Edward's desire for a treaty with the Hanseatic league, which was signed on 28 February 1474, and it also refers to instructions given by the duke of Burgundy to Lord Gruthuyse and to the fact that 'last summer' the duke of Burgundy had been in England, both of these can be dated to the summer of 1472. Scofield also points out that the speech refers to the threat of invasion by Denmark and Scotland, but treaties were made on 11 May 1473 with Denmark and 30 July 1474 with Scotland; C.L. Scofield, The Life and Reign of Edward the Fourth (London, 1923), 2: 44, n.1. However, Genet argues that the speech dates from July 1474, but it is not clear on what evidence; J.P. Genet, 'New Politics of New Language: The Words of Politics in Yorkist and Early Tudor England', in J. Watts (ed.), The End of the Middle Ages (Stroud, 1998), p. 32.


23 Sheppard (ed.), Literae Cantuarienses, 3: 282. What is so strange about this argument is that the model is not actually fully transferable. England had been defeated in external war and then became internally divided.

24 As Powell has argued, Henry V's policy of recruiting criminals for his French campaigns actually reduced local disorder because it physically removed troublemakers. He argues that 'the muster roll of the Earl of Arundel's retinue at the siege of Harfleur [PRO, E 101/47/1] reads like a list of those indicted in king's bench for their misdeeds in Shropshire'; E. Powell, 'The Restoration of Law and Order', in G.L. Harriss (ed.), Henry V: The Practice of Kingship (Oxford, 1985), pp. 71-72 [72].
grant for the financing of 13000 archers made by parliament in 1473, argued that the lords and commons:

have by gret deliberacion studyhyd the weyys and the moyans that myght best serve to leye a pert manslaughters robbers extortioners and oppressioners and other ryotters [...] And among all othyr thynggis hit was thouhte and advyse that the most convenient moyen and remedye therof, and also to gete ayen the grete wurshipy and riches that of old tyme hethe be in this londe, were to make werre outeward, specially in to Frauns wyche of longe tyme hethe be and yet is grettet estemy to this londe by the whyche warre makyng the kyng shuld not only by Goddys grace gete hit to his abeysauns accedyng to his ryght but also gretely enriche hyme self and all this reeme, and set the pepill now beyng idyll, by whom the myscheves aboveseyde hathe grouyn, in goode ocupacion.\(^{25}\)

A letter, preserved in John Vale’s book, which was to be read by sheriffs to their county communities, also argued that outward war would have the added benefit that ‘thidell people of this owr lande shalbe sette in occupasion’ and so ‘shall growe abundance of richesse with reste and peax in this owr realme’\(^{26}\). Another document, which was probably produced in the early 1470s, likewise argued that that a new campaign in France would mean that ‘iff there be eny lord here of our relame it were or wold be at debate with other’ he could be sent ‘in to siche cuntres as we have werre with [...] for to pref his manhod and to gett hyme worshipe’\(^{27}\)

A second related argument was that the return of soldiers at the end of a campaign, particular that of criminals who had been pardoned in return for military


\(^{27}\) See above, n. 20.
service, caused civil unrest and threatened public order. As early as 1449, a link was made between internal unrest and the return of soldiers from France. Item 17 of the recommendations for the security of the English possessions in France, drawn up in 1449 and copied into one of William Worcester's notebooks, argued that 'multi Anglii, nobiles et alii, (qui durante guerra in Francia laute vivere soliti sunt, et illam vitam in Anglia continuare non possent), forsan niterentur nostram turbare rempublicam; et tunc forte multi familiares hostes, nunc latitantes et dissimulantes, possent insurgere, ut Wallici, Scoti, et alii, tam intranei quam extranei'. York's articles against Somerset dating from 1452 also seem to have been hinting at the connection between the end of the war and civil unrest. They argued that because Somerset stole the money which was intended to compensate those 'Englishmen' dispossessed by the cession of Maine, 'the seid Englisshmen [were caused] to be here in grete povertee: of which povertee no doute commyth grete myscheve daily within your said roiame'.

This reasoning was certainly present in Worcester's work and was used in order to promote the new campaign in France. He argued in favour of a redistribution of wealth so that the conquest might be advanced, the people relieved and especially those 'that have lost theire londis, livelode and goode in the werres'. His justification for this

---

28 This argument had fourteenth-century antecedents.Ormrod and Musson have argued that 'the fourteenth-century polity created a lasting political agenda founded in the notion that the pursuit of foreign war challenged the state of public order within the realm'; A. Musson and W.M. Ormrod, *The Evolution of English Justice: Law, Politics, and Society in the Fourteenth Century* (Basingstoke, 1998), pp. 79-80 [80].

29 'many English, nobles and others (who whilst the war in France lasted have been used to living splendidly and might not be able to continue that way of life in England) perhaps would strive to disturb our common weal; and then perhaps many familiar enemies who are currently lurking and deceiving us might rise up such as the Welsh, Scots and others, as much domestic as foreign'; London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 48, fol. 333r printed in Stevenson; J. Stevenson (ed.), *Letters and Papers illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry VI*, Roll Series 22 (1861-4), 2: 726.

30 J. Gairdner (ed.), *The Paston Letters* 1422-1509 (London, 1904): 1: 107. A high proportion of indictments for theft, and especially for violent assault, label the accused as 'soldier'. Were they really soldiers or did the term 'soldier' carry connotations of violence and dispossession? The labelling of criminals as 'soldiers' perhaps functioned as some sort of explanation for their conduct. I am grateful to Dr Grummitt for this information.
policy was that ‘a roiaume is bettir withoute treasoure of golde than without worship’.

He knew this expression from his reading of John of Wales’ *Breviloquium*, which he owned in French translation, as is demonstrated by his annotation of the passage in his copy of the text: ‘Car vng chascun amoit mieulx viure et conuerser comme poure homme et vng Rice Roiaume que estre riche et viure et vng poure roiaume’. However, Worcester expanded this conventional expression, extolling the virtues of being ‘poure in a riche empire’ as opposed to being ‘riche and plentuous in a poure contre’, by adding the consequences that these positions would have upon internal peace. He argued instead that ‘bettir it is to lyve a pore life in a riche roiaurne in tranquilite and pease than to be riche in a pore roiaume where debate and strife reignithe’. The implication was that whilst external war would result in ‘tranquilite and pease’ and occupy those who had ‘lost theire londis, livelode and goode in the werres’, without this there would be ‘debate and strife’. Implicitly, Worcester was suggesting that until there was a new campaign in France, England would be threatened by internal division.

The anxiety, which this reasoning was attempting to manipulate, was utilised by the parliamentary speech of 1472. Significantly, the speaker used the prospect of the renewal of civil war as a form of threat. He suggested that the long-awaited peace was in jeopardy; unless there was a new campaign in France, internal war might start again.

---

31 CUL, MS Add. 7870, fol. 23v.
32 For example, the English translation of Pizan’s *Livre du corps de poltie* celebrated ‘prynces [who] had lever be poure in a riche empire than be riche and plentuous in a poure contre’; Bornstein (ed.), *Middle English Translation of Livre du corps*, book I, chapter 12, p. 66. This was annotated by the reader of CUL, MS Kk.1.5, fol. 15r.
35 Giovanni Pietro Panicharolla, Milanese Ambassador at the Burgundian Court, in a letter to the duke of Milan dated 22 October 1475, wrote that ‘More than 2000 Englishmen have come to
Although peace had been restored, 'yet is there many a grete sore, many a perilous wounde left unheled, the multitude of riotous people which have att all tymes kyndeled the fire of this grete division'. 36 Whoever wrote this speech took a calculated risk: it was worth implying that the country was not wholly unified and pacified in order to extract money from parliament. The speech also argued that a new campaign in France would provide occupation and wages for those men of war who would otherwise cause trouble at home and who were 'idell and riotous' and 'like to contenue the mischief in this lande that they do nowe'. 37 It seems that in 1472 the causes of civil war were being reinvented and attributed to dispossessed soldiers. 38

How are we to treat this diagnosis? Was civil war really considered to be the result of demobilised soldiers? Modern historians have stressed that although soldiers returning from Normandy were involved in events such as Jack Cade's revolt, they did not cause the civil wars. 39 The end of the war did not result in the return of 'thousands of household retainers with nothing to do but brawl and bully'. 40 As McFarlane argued, usually when such men were mentioned during the wars, it was to 'receive charity rather than weapons and a fee'. 41 This argument, then, should perhaps be seen as an attempt to serve the duke [of Burgundy], who has accepted them, saying that he well knows they will be cutting one another's throats in England; A.R. Myers (ed.), English Historical Documents, 1327-1485 (London, 1969), 4: 326.

38 Ironically, there were disturbances in Hampshire and Wiltshire following Picquigny, which were apparently caused by demobilised soldiers; C. Ross, Edward IV (London, 1974), pp. 236-7. Goodman has also argued that unemployed soldiers 'may have formed a pool of support for dynastic pretenders in the 1480s and 1490s'; A. Goodman, The Wars of the Roses: Military Activity and English Society 1452-97 (London, 1981), p. 223.
41 McFarlane, 'The Wars of the Roses', p. 240. He cites the examples of Worcester, as Sir John Fastolf's executor, giving a mark to John Lawney in 1460 because he was related to Fastolf ' & eciam fuit cum domino in guerris Francis pluribus annis non habens vnde viuere' and 16d to
by Yorkist propaganda to reinvent the past: presenting civil war as the result of dispossessed soldiers deflected attention away from its other, more problematic, causes and once more implicated the Lancastrian government. In this same speech, Edward IV was portrayed as healing internal division, certainly not fuelling it. ⁴² Yet, this reasoning also featured in Worcester's work, as he suggested that unless dispossessed soldiers were employed in some way there would be internal strife and debate. Moreover, the U translator of the Quadrilogue Invectif argued that a feature of civil war was 'ill content sowdiours'. ⁴³ Perhaps, then, the dispossessed soldier came to rhetorically represent the effect of defeat in war upon the country. It was not necessarily that people believed that internal war was caused by dispossessed soldiers, but rather that this was a means of expressing the nebulous relationship between external war and internal peace. ⁴⁴

Unsurprisingly, a new campaign would encourage unity, just as the end of external war was seen as leading to internal division. Worcester argued that if there was war with France 'worshipfyll men whiche oughte to be stedfast and holde togider' would be 'of one intencion, wille, and comon assent'. ⁴⁵ After his discussion of the Order of the Garter and of those 'noble martirs' who fought in France, he surmised: 'And therefore of you may be saide that ye were always stedfast and obeieng youre souvereyn

John Chambre 'quondam soldarius cum domino in Frauncia & valde pauper postea' (OMC, muniments, Fastolf Paper, 72, mm. 1 and 3).

⁴² The speech argued that 'the principall occasion of this grete unrestfulness is now, thorouth Goddes grace and the most victorious prouesse of our Soverayn Lord, rotely taken awaye and extincte' so there can be no doubt that Edward is 'sole and undoubted kyng, verray and rightwis possessor of this lande'; Sheppard (ed.), Literae Cantuarienses, 3: 275.

⁴³ Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 213. Interestingly, the R translator argued that the soldiers were not 'ill content' but 'eville payde'; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 212. The French states that they were 'souldoiers mal contens'; Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invectif, p. 46. See my discussion of this alteration in chapter four, pp. 173-4.

⁴⁴ As Keen says, 'the distress of the returning soldiery was visible proof of the damage that defeat abroad had inflicted on Englishmen'; M.H. Keen, England in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1973), p. 407.

⁴⁵ [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 4. Riddy has explored Malory's use of the motif of 'holding togider'; Riddy, Sir Thomas Malory, p. 145.
unto the jupardie and perille of dethe'.

In this passage, Worcester connected loyalty, obedience and external war and implicitly criticised those men who did not fight in France and who were not 'always stedfast and obeieng' their king. The verse translator of *De re militari* also implied that external war would quell internal unrest. He argued that 'Good businesse' would prevent 'roore' and 'bolnyng' within a host. Similarly, the 1472 speech argued that war would obviously benefit the realm 'considering the state that this lande was in afore that cuntre was lost, and in what case it hath stonde sithen' and more explicitly that outward war 'may best serve for the pacifieng of the londe inwards'.

As was demonstrated earlier, the implication of Malory's change to his source text was that external war created internal harmony. A narrative of external war was thus constructed in which outward war promoted unity, prevented internal division, bred peace and promoted the common good.

The extent to which members of the political community were exposed to the arguments in favour of a new campaign in France is suggested by several pieces of evidence. The 1472 speech, for example, may have circulated as a document: a grant of an aid recorded in the parliament rolls, dated 18 July 1474, referred to 'a declaration in writyng, delyvered amonge us youre seid commens' urging support for the campaign in France and to the many speeches made 'dyvers tymes by the mouth of youre chauncellers'. The Second Anonymous Croyland Continuator also referred to the 'many speeches of remarkable eloquence [which] were made in parliamene' in support of

---

46 [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, p. 48.
47 "Sumtyme amonge an ooste ariseth roore. / Of berth, of age, of contro, of corage/ Dyuers thei are, and hoom thei longe sore,/ And to bataile thei wil, or out of wage./ What salue my this bolnyng best aswage?/ Wherof ariseth the? Of ydilnesse./ What may aswage it best? Good businesse"; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knjgbihode and Bataile*, ll. 1174-1180.
49 See above, pp. 230-1.
50 *RP*, 5: 111. This is generally taken to be a written version of the 1472 speech.
the campaign in France.\textsuperscript{51} Furthermore, letters which echoed many of the arguments made in the 1472 speech were also read by sheriffs to their county communities.\textsuperscript{52} The prevalence of this rhetoric is also reflected by the manner in which the commons framed their grievances and petitions during the 1472-5 parliament. For example, the grant of aid mentioned above referred to 'the grete jeopardy' of the realm, 'the grete conspired malice of the manyfold ennemies environyng the same' and how outward war would ensure 'the wele and suertie of this your said reame ynward, and the defence of the same outward'.\textsuperscript{53}

Yet who would have found this rhetoric convincing? It has generally been assumed that the arguments in favour of a new campaign had limited impact. William Worcester's enthusiasm for war with France, for example, has generally been treated 'as no more than an echo from a vanished past'.\textsuperscript{54} As Powicke states in relation to the \textit{Boke of Noblesse}, 'the absence of any but a solitary manuscript must make one sceptical about the influence of this treatise'.\textsuperscript{55} The impression that Worcester's sentiments were unusual has in some ways been compounded by Lander's argument that there was a lack of enthusiasm for the renewed campaign in France in 1475 and by the fact that the campaign ended unheroically with the treaty of Picquigny.\textsuperscript{56}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{52} Kekewich et al (eds.), \textit{John Vale's Book}, p. 146; BL, MS Add 48031A, fol. 34r.
\textsuperscript{53} RP, 5: 111.
\textsuperscript{56} Picquigny was certainly depicted as unheroic. For example, Louis de Breteles, a Gascon in the service of Earl Rivers, apparently told Connynnes that Edward had won nine victories and lost only one battle, the present one; and that the signonomy of his returning so soon, after such vast preparations, would be a greater disgrace and stain to his arms than all the honour he had gained in the nine former victories; Philippe de Connynnes, \textit{Memoirs: The Reign of Louis XI, 1461-83}, ed. M. Jones (Harmondsworth, 1972), p. 261. Of course, this evidence has to be treated somewhat cautiously, given that it emanates from a French chronicler. Giovanni Pietro Panicharolla, Milanese Ambassador at the Burgundian Court, in a letter to the duke of Milan dated 22
However, the evidence Lander used to argue that there was little interest in the 1475 campaign is open to other interpretations. For example, Lander argued that there was a lack of interest in the campaign among the nobles. He estimated that the army Edward took to France comprised only ‘eighteen bannerets and knights and fifteen other prominent men’. He further argued that below the ranks of the peerage there were only thirty-three men of importance in their localities. Yet, as Richmond has shown, Lander’s argument that the 1475 campaign was badly supported by the nobility rested upon his comparison of the figures for the Agincourt campaign and that of the 1475 campaign: twenty-three peers went to France in 1475, whereas half the nobility went on the Agincourt campaign. However, ‘the number of English noblemen in 1475 was 46; in that year therefore the peers were no less reluctant to fight than their predecessors had been.’ Furthermore, 11,000 combatants went to France in 1475, as compared to the 8,000 of the Agincourt campaign and 10,000 of the 1417 army of conquest.

Lander also argued that the army Edward recruited was of a poor quality because of the ‘astonishingly high’ ratio of archers to men-at-arms. The army that was recruited for Edward IV’s 1475 campaign in France had a ratio of 7:1. However, as Curry has argued, it is problematic to assume that armies with a high proportion of archers were automatically seen as inferior. She points out that Henry V’s campaigns in 1415 and 1417 ‘were won with armies which had twice the proportion of archers of October 1475, wrote that ‘The King of England, to the great disgust of his kingdom, has returned with his army to England’; Myers, English Historical Documents, 4: 326.

57 Lander, Crown and Nobility, p. 239.
58 C. Richmond, ‘1485 and all that, or what was going on at the Battle of Bosworth’, in P.W. Hammond (ed.), Richard III, Loyalty, Lordship and Law (London, 1984), p. 188.
59 Richmond, ‘1485 and all that’, p. 205, n. 116.
60 Lander, Crown and Nobility, pp. 239-40.
Edward III's force of 1359. Furthermore, Grummitt has recently argued that Lander's 1475 ratios belie a more complex situation. He draws attention to the fact that the sources from which these ratios were drawn were made primarily for financial purposes and so the term 'archer' reflects a soldier's pay rather than function: 'Indentures and accounting documents, from which Lander compiled his figures, do not mention billmen, crossbowmen or handgunners because they did not occur in the categories by which the Exchequer assigned the soldiers' pay.'

Lander also argued, partly on the basis of the famous parliamentary speech of 1472, that the French campaign of 1475 was not 'a revival of the genuinely aggressive policies of Henry V, but [...] a defensive response to the development of Anglo-French relationships'. He stated that this speech had a 'markedly defensive tone' and that the inducements offered were 'a very far cry from Henry V's aggressive clarion calls to conquest'. He then summarised that 'it looks as if Edward IV realized that he must use all the arts of propaganda at his disposal to whip up an aggressive spirit in a blasé and indifferent people'. However, it would have been inappropriate to market the campaign in any other way. It was unlike Henry V's aggressive 'clarion call' because

---

61 A. Curry, 'English Armies in the Fifteenth Century', in A. Curry and M. Hughes (eds.), *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War* (Woodbridge, 1994), p. 46. The readers of military texts certainly saw the value of including archers in the army. The scribe of CUL, MS Add. 8706 annotated the passage in the prose translation that argued that Scipio Africanus's success against the Romans was due to the fact that he 'hadde putte in euery warde of his cost chosen archeris of pris'; CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 13r; Lester (ed.), *English Translation of Vegetius*, book I, chapter 15, pp. 63-4. Whereas the prose translation emphasised the benefits of archery to the army, the verse translator suggested that such an emphasis was unnecessary: 'That archery is grete vtihtee, / It nedeth not to teUe eny that here is'; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 446-7.


63 Lander, *Crown and Nobility*, p. 228. How far Henry's arguments were in fact 'genuinely aggressive' is open to debate, but, as Gross argues, the speech does 'depart from the precedents of Henry's reign by demoting dynastic claims to a secondary position'; Gross, *The Dissolution of Lancasterian Kingship*, p. 95.

England had experienced twenty-two years of political instability and civil war. This shared experience of civil war was actively manipulated by the 1472 speech, which referred to how ‘every man of this lande that is of resonable age hath known what trouble this reame hath suffred, and it is to suppose than noon hath escaped but att oo tyme or other his part hath be therein’.65 Thus, even if the speech was defensive, it does not follow that it was addressed to a ‘blasé and indifferent people’. Rather the speech represents a calculated targeting of the priorities of parliament: a sophisticated speech, which appealed to the tide of public opinion that found defensive rhetoric more relevant than an aggressive ‘clarion call’. Furthermore, the speech worked: in 1475 Edward sailed to France with a force more impressive than any seen during the Hundred Years War and parliament did grant him a large amount of money, even if its collection was difficult.66

A reappraisal of the 1475 campaign therefore suggests that there was enthusiasm for the war with France in England. Moreover, the desire shown by English soldiers, such as Sir John Middleton, Sir John Ditchfield and Hugh Conway, to serve in the army of Maximilian, duke of Austria in the late 1470s might also be cited as evidence for the existence of pro-war sympathies among the political community.67 Similarly, M.K. Jones has demonstrated the degree of enthusiasm in England for the projected campaigns in

66 Lander argued that there was great difficulty in collecting money for the campaign in France; Lander, Crown and Nobility, p. 233. Margaret Paston’s complaint that ‘the Kyng goth so nere us in this cuntre both to poore and ryche that I wote not how we shall lyft’ suggests that there was some reluctance to pay for the war; N. Davis (ed.), Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1971-76), 1: 375.
France in the late 1470s. Consequently, Worcester’s enthusiasm for war with France cannot be simply dismissed ‘as no more than an echo from a vanished past’.

Moreover, although Worcester’s Boke of Noblesse does not seem to have circulated widely, the rhetoric it used is found in a range of different texts that had a wider audience. As has already been seen, the rhetoric produced in the early 1470s in favour of the new campaign clearly had parallels with Worcester’s work. For example, the 1472 speech, like the Boke of Noblesse, referred to the Punic wars, to truce breaking, to the benefits of being able to provide younger sons with land, and suggested that dispossessed soldiers caused internal war. It also argued that those dispossessed by the fall of the French lands should be recompensed: outward war was necessary if Edward IV was to ‘doo his parte in requisicion of justice or of some resounable recompence’ to those English men who had held lands in France, a point also made by Worcester.

Worcester’s Boke of Noblesse and the 1472 speech also seem to have emanated from the discourse community shared by readers of the prose translation of De re militari. Readers of the prose translation annotated passages concerning the importance of outward war. For example, the scribe of OMC, MS Lat. 30 annotated the statement ‘who so de-syreth pees aray ym for werre’ and those passages which argued that outward war maintained freedom. There are also parallels between the 1472 speech and the annotated copy of the prose translation owned by Thomas Rotherham, a future

---

69 Lander, Crown and Nobility, p. 226.
70 See above, pp. 235-37.
71 Gross discusses some of these similarities in The Dissolution of Lancastrian Kingship, p. 97.
72 Sheppard (ed.), Literae Cantuarienses, 3: 279. For Worcester’s discussion on the importance of offering compensation to those dispossessed see [Worcester], Boke of Noblesse, p. 49 and my discussion in chapter four, pp. 208-210.
chancellor of England and, some have argued, the author of the speech. The producer of his manuscript, CUL, MS Add. 8706, annotated the passages that argued that 'here nys nothing so strong so worschepful as is he comynalte in whiche is plente of wel tau3t werriours' and those which emphasised the importance of unity.

Moreover, the 1472 speech also reflects the conceptual frameworks of other works, such as Pizan's *Livre du corps de policie*. The 1472 speech argued that no-one had escaped the effects of civil war because 'suche is the condicion of every body that the disease of oo membre distempereth all the other', which echoes the statement in the English translation of Pizan's *Livre du corps* that 'for like as the body of a man is defecytf and deformed when he lacketh any of his membres [...] and as sone as any of them fayleth, of verray necessite all the bodye shall fele it and be diseased ther by'. Gross has also argued that there are parallels between the 1472 speech and the Lancastrian text, the *Somnium Vigilantis*, which was written in support of the attainder of the Yorkist lords in 1459. He argues that both the *Somnium Vigilantis* and the speech refer to the concept or assumption that the execution of strict justice might expose the realm to foreign invasion. However, the similarities between this speech and Caxton's prologue and epilogue to the *Game of Chess* (1st edition, 31 March 1474) are also striking and have not hitherto been noted. In the prologue, Caxton wished the lords 'peas, helth, joye and victorye upon your enemyes' and then in the epilogue elaborated:

---

74 J.B. Sheppard dated the speech to 1474 and so thought it was given by Thomas Rotherham, who was chancellor at that time. Genet likewise believes the speech was delivered by Rotherham; Genet, 'New Politics of New Language', p. 32. However, if, as seems most likely, the speech was delivered in 1472, it was given by John Alcock, bishop of Rochester, which further suggests that these ideas circulated widely.


I pray Almighty God to save the Kyng our soverain lord and to gyve him grace to issue as a kyng and t'abounde in all vertues and to be assisted with all other his lordes in such wyse that his noble royame of Englond may prospere and habounde in vertues, and that synne may be eschewid, justice kepte, the royame defended, good men rewarded, malefactours punysshid and the ydle peple to be put to labour, that he wyth the nobles of the royame may regne gloriously in conquerynge his rightfull enheritaunce that verray peas and charite may endure in bothe his royames and that marchandise may have his cours in suche wise that every maneschewe synne and encrece in vertuous occupacions... [God] sende yow th'accomplisshement of your hye, noble, joyous and vertuous desirs. 

Blake stated that the reference to victory upon your enemies in the prologue was 'probably a general reference without specific application'. However, these passages are heavily contextualised. Several aspects of the 1472 speech given to parliament and of Worcester’s treatise reappear in this passage in Caxton’s own prose: the idea that external war encourages virtue; that criminals might be punished through external war, the stress on the commercial benefits of such a conquest and, as the speech put it, the idea that ‘werre outward’ might ‘sette in ocupacion of the forseid idell and riotous people’. The use of this rhetoric in several overlapping, but distinct, social spheres and contexts, suggests both its pervasiveness and that the benefits of external war were not only extolled in such rarefied environments as parliament or William Worcester’s notebooks.

---

79 Blake (ed.), *Caxton’s Own Prose*, p. 160.
80 Sheppard (ed.), *Litterae Cantuarienses*, 3: 278.
81 The connection between external war and internal peace continued to be made. Morgan has recently argued that in acts such as Caxton’s printing of the *Brut* and Wynken de Worde’s 1498 printing of Malory’s *Morte Darthur* we find that the ‘generalized expression of the interdependence of war-enterprise and the public weal remained interestingly recurrent, underpinned by continued attention to earlier material’. Morgan also draws our attention to Blount’s translation of Nicholas Upton’s *De studio militari* in 1511-15 and the production of the first ‘life’ of Henry V in English at the time of Henry VIII’s projected campaign in France; D.A.L. Morgan, ‘The Household Retinue of Henry V and the Ethos of English Public Life’, in A. Curry and E. Matthew (eds.), *Concepts and Patterns of Service in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 76-77.
This rhetorical context, which extolled the benefits of outward war in France, may help to explain why there was such interest in texts which discussed military matters in the late 1460s and early 1470s. Three translations of military texts were undertaken at this time, three copies of the prose translation, two copies of the verse translation, three copies of the R translation of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* and the only extant copies of the U translation of the *Quadrilogue Invectif* and the English translation of the *Livre du corps de policié*, are datable to this period. People were quite literally buying into the rhetoric of external war. Was this a result of their exposure to this rhetoric, perhaps in parliament or in their localities? Or alternatively was Edward's campaign of 1475 prompted by the existence of pro-war sympathies, which the proliferation of military texts and translations belies? Philippe de Commynes recorded a conversation in which Louis XI told John Smert, Garter King of Arms, that Edward's invasion of France was due to pressure from Burgundy and from the commons of England. This pressure from parliament may just have been the result of the fact that they had provided so much money for the campaign, but it might also have been due to a genuine desire among the political community for the war with France.

---

82 These are BL, MSS Sloane 2027, Lansdowne 285 and Add. 14408; Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 45, BL, MS Cotton Titus A.XXIII; LPL, MS Arc.L.40.2/E.42; Bodl. Lib, MS Rawlinson A 338; CJSC, MS 76 D.I; OUC, MS 85 and CUL, MS Kk. 1.5. For information on the dating of these manuscripts, see the descriptions in the appendices, pp. 267-303.

83 See above, pp. 238-39.

84 Commynes, *Memoirs*, p. 239. This passage is also discussed in Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 226.

85 See above, pp. 242-43 for the existence of pro-war sympathies among the political community.
5.2 Loyalty and obedience

The argument that civil unrest was caused by a lack of external war can be categorised as a Yorkist interpretation of the past, in the sense that this was the explanation for civil war given in the 1472 speech.\(^6\) Some of the other ways in which these texts explained the civil wars, and constructed those who fought in them, seem to be more directly influenced by Lancastrian and Yorkist rhetoric or interpretations of civil war. These translators rewrote the discussions of internal war that were present in their source texts in ways which reflected contemporary discourse surrounding the causes of the English civil wars of the 1450s and 1460s. Furthermore, translators and readers stressed the importance of loyalty, obedience and discipline and so participated in a wider debate surrounding the legitimacy of opposition and the common weal of the realm.\(^7\)

First, some of the different ways in which translators reinscribed the discussions of civil war or rebellion present in their source texts will be considered. The R and U translators of the *Quadrilogue Incestif*, for example, responded in different ways to Chartier's definition of internal war. Chartier defined war as 'ung latrecin habandonné, force publique soubz umbre d'armes et violente rapine que faulve de justice et de bonne ordonnance fait estre loisibles'.\(^8\) The U translation followed the French definition literally: war was 'a pryve robberye, atheft out of alle mesure, force publique vnder shadowe of armes, and violent rapine through defaute of iustice and good ordinaunce'. This passage was concerned with the way in which war was conducted by men of arms. 'The Land' suffered because of the pillage and rape of her people, the 'violent rapine',

\(^6\) See above, pp. 231-2.

\(^7\) Watts has demonstrated that 'the disorderly events of the 1450s, 1460s and 1480s were accompanied by a rich debate over the rights and duties of rulers and subjects'; J. Watts, 'Ideas, Principles and Politics', in A.J. Pollard (ed.), *The Wars of the Roses* (Basingstoke, 1995), p. 111.

\(^8\) Chartier, *Le Quadrilogue Incestif*, p. 21.
which was allowed to happen because of 'defaute of justice and good ordinaunce'. The R translator, however, translated the same passage differently.\(^9\) He defined war as 'a thefte which takith awaye by force the comon wele of the realme vndir the colour of armys, and is ravischid away by violence for defaute of justice and good gouernaunce'.\(^9\)

In the R translation, the understood subject of 'is ravischid' was 'the comon wele of realme'. The R translator, thus, recontextualised the passage: it was the war itself, not the style of its prosecution, which resulted from lack of justice and government. In this respect, war was a necessary evil. This accords, of course, with a Yorkist interpretation of the civil war. The Yorkists argued that the war was necessary if justice and good governance were to be restored.\(^9\)

The way in which Vegetius's discussion of rebellion in the context of the military host was altered by the prose and verse translators of *De re militari* is also suggestive of the different ways in which internal unrest was explained. Vegetius had argued that 'Numquam enim ad contumaciam pari consensu multitudo prorumpit sed incitatur a paucis, qui vitiorum scelerumque inpunitatem sperant peccare cum plurimis'.\(^9\) The prose translator argued, however, that 'it is no3t comynliche yseie that a comynalte reyseth eny grucchinge or eny greet wordes maken ayenst hir soueraynes bot by steringe of a fewe proude men'.\(^9\) He applied the advice to the realm as a whole — in

---

\(^9\) Consideration of the extant French manuscripts confirms that the translator did change the meaning of his source text.

\(^9\) Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, 1: 166.

\(^9\) See, for example, 'The account of the Battle of St. Albans' contained in John Vale's book, in which, according to its author, York apparently cited 'misgovernance' as the justification for taking up arms; Kekewich et al (eds.), *John Vale's Book*, p. 192. Although, of course, similar arguments were adopted by Warwick in 1469-70.


his model it was a 'comynalte' rising against its sovereign. Moreover, he identified those who initiated rebellion as 'proude men', which may have been interpreted as a reference to the Yorkists who were frequently accused of suffering from pride.

The verse translator of *De re militari* also altered Vegetius's argument. He argued: 'For verteily, the hole multitude/ Of oon assent entendeth not rebelle,/ But egged ar of them that be to rude,/ And charge not of heven or of helle,/ With mony folk myght thei her synys forto wynne,/ Suppose thei, if mony be ther inne'. He thereby played upon the dual connotations of the word 'mony', which meant both 'many' (and therefore made Vegetius's point) and 'money' in the modern sense. Whereas Vegetius had not offered an explanation for why rebellion took place, the verse translator did: he argued that soldiers rebelled because they thought 'mony be ther inne'. Internal division, in the verse translator's version, also stemmed from greed and the promise of financial reward. Attributing rebellion to purely financial motives had the effect of delegitimising or displacing other, more problematic, factors. A similar device had been used in 1450 against Jack Cade. Henry VI's proclamation for the taking of Cade argued that although his aims appeared 'holy and good', in actual fact his intention was 'tenriche himself be robbing and dispoiling of the kinges liegemen'. The author of the

94 Moreover, a leader must administer justice to anyone who caused dissension in the host for 'betre it is that they be punished and chastised as the law asks than all the host is contrarious and rebel to here souverain' (my italics); Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book III, chapter 4, p. 112.

95 The verse translator argued that Henry should 'With liil slaught putte his foo fro pride'. He then argued that 'Her [the Yorkists'] lord is Lucifer, the kyng of pride'. In the naval battle, which comprises most of the final book of the translation, the Yorkists are labelled as 'pride': 'Lo pride ghtbodt and Bataile, U. 1580-86, hath vs betrapped, fy! o pride'; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 1580-86, 2019, 2902, 1237-1243.

96 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, ll. 1237-1243.

97 There is, of course, a Calais context to this translation change, given that mutiny was an established method by which the garrison extracted overdue wages; see Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison* (forthcoming).

98 See also the comments of Watts in 'Polemic and Politics in the 1450s', in Kekewich et al (eds.), *John Vale's Book*, p. 24.

Yorkist chronicle, the *Arrival of King Edward IV*, writing shortly after the Battle of Tewkesbury, also observed that one of the reasons why the Bastard of Fauconberg was admitted into London in 1471 was because some of the inhabitants were 'powre' and wanted the opportunity to 'put theyr hands in riche mens coffres'.

The R translator of the *Quadrilogue Invecq* also attributed civil war to greed. Internal war was the consequence of the nobles' 'vnstaunchable couetis and cursid ambicions'. He argued that many subjects would 'disavow their naturale lorde for thencressing of their richesse'. The translator, addressing the nobles, further argued that the 'confusion wher ye be at this howr' was caused by 'the grette ambicion of estatis, couetise to gette good and envye for to governe'. These statements were present in the *Quadrilogue Invecq*—in other words they were part of Chartier's diagnosis of French civil war, and not original to the R translation, but the R translator's addition of 'at this howr' would have presumably encouraged his audience to relate this criticism to contemporary, English events.

Furthermore, some of the other changes made by the R translator seem to advance a Lancastrian ideology or at least to be informed by Lancastrian rhetoric. The R translator described how 'Diuers knyghtes and nobles cryen "To harneyce"', but elaborated that rather than fighting for their lord or for the common weal 'thei seeche meanys of couetice how thei may encroche lyvelode and goodis'. He thereby expanded and altered the French 'Pluseurs de la chevalerie et des nobles crient aux

100 J. Bruce (ed.), *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverie of His Kingdomes from Henry VI. A.D. M.CCCC.LXXI*, Camden Society, old series 1 (1838), p. 34
101 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inveclif*, 1: 152.
102 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inveclif*, 1: 182.
103 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Inveclif*, 1: 196.
armes, mais ilz courent a l’argent’. Whilst the French argued that men were distracted from the true purpose of war by the prospect of profit, the R translator suggested that their purpose in fighting in the first place was to ‘encroche lyvelode and goodis’. A similar irony was suggested by the verse translator in the lines that read: ‘Seyde ofte it is: the wepon bodeth peax, / And in the londe is mony a chialere, / That ha grete exercise doubtlesse’ and in the line ‘The werreours thus taught, shal make peax’. Knights were using their weapons, just as they were crying ‘to hameyce’, but they were using them for individual gain, not to bring peace.

The R translator also argued that those who undertake war ‘but entende on nothing but to gette goode may nat be callid the wele willars of the comon wele’ (my italics). He therefore altered Chartier’s statement that ‘ceulx qui le bien de vertu et la salut publique, mesmement aux entreprisnes de guerre, ne veulent plus que le gaing n’y feront ja au paraller oeuvre salvable’. This reinscription is reminiscent of the passage in the Lancastrian text, the Somnium Vigilantis, which argued that he who did not obey his king and keep justice (i.e. the Yorkist lords): ‘may not be called withoute lesynge protectoure or procuroure of pe commen welth’.

---

105 Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invectif, p. 14. Both the R and the U translators introduce the word ‘covetice’. The U translator argued that ‘Many of the nobles cryen to harneys but thei renne to couetise of the siluer; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 155. The U translator missed out ‘and the knights’ in his translation of the passage: it may have been missing in his exemplar or alternatively, knights and nobles may have been synonymous to him and he therefore felt it unnecessary to include both.

106 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knyghthode and Bataile, ll. 1685-1698, 431.

107 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 222-4. The U translation argued ‘And they that the well of vertu and the publique saluacion, namelye in theenterprise of werre, desire nothinge ellys sauf the gettinge of goddes, they shall neuer doo at the longe wey no soluable ne actuell decee; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 1: 223-5.

108 Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invectif, p. 53.

The R translator's reinscription of this passage also seems to be juxtaposing rhetoric with actions, which has an obvious parallel to the way in which Lancastrian sources constructed Yorkist opposition in the 1450s.\textsuperscript{110} Whereas the Yorkists argued that the common weal of the realm had been destroyed by Henry VI's self-interested advisors and that their own intervention was to protect the common weal from those around the king, the Lancastrians argued that the Yorkist claim to be working on behalf of the common weal was 'merely a front for the satisfaction of their own covetous interests'.\textsuperscript{111} The verse translator of \textit{De re militari}, for example, attempted to discredit the Yorkists by contrasting their assumed role as protectors of the common weal with their actions, an argument which is encapsulated in the line: 'Thou gretest, Goddis child as though thou were;/ But into the is entred Sathanas'.\textsuperscript{112} He referred to the Yorkist lords as those who 'robbeth and reveth see and londe;/ The kyng or his ligeaunce or amytee,/ Thei robbe anende, and sle withoute pitee'.\textsuperscript{113} This construction of the Yorkists had a wider cultural significance because it carried certain recognisable connotations in chivalric discourse. It constructed the Yorkists as dishonourable, and the cause for which they fought as illegitimate, thus legitimising the Lancastrian cause and the actions advocated by the poem. The conflict between the rhetoric used by the Yorkists and their actions meant that their claims of working for the common good were exposed to considerable scepticism: to allow pillaging was demonstrably not safeguarding the common good of the realm.\textsuperscript{114} This is why both sides during the civil war constructed

\textsuperscript{110} See Watts, 'Polemic and Politics', pp. 3-42 for the development of these positions during the 1450s.

\textsuperscript{111} J. Watts, \textit{Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship} (Cambridge, 1996), p. 352. According to the author of the \textit{Somnium Vigilantis}, York claimed to 'entende the commen welthe of alle the royame' and so his actions 'ought to be asrybed rather to vertue and magnanymite than to rebellyoun'; Gilson, 'A Defence of the Proscription of the Yorkists', p. 515.

\textsuperscript{112} Dyboski and Arend (eds.), \textit{Knighthode and Bataile}, ll. 1171-2.

\textsuperscript{113} Dyboski and Arend (eds.), \textit{Knighthode and Bataile}, ll. 985-991.

\textsuperscript{114} See also Watts, 'Polemic and Politics', p. 21 for the difficulty York had reconciling his rhetoric with his actions.
the armies of their opponents as pillaging, ill-disciplined hordes.\textsuperscript{115} The author of the Somnium Vigilantis likewise contrasted Yorkist claims with their actions; referring to the destruction of lives and property that had resulted from their intervention on behalf of the common weal, he remarked that: 'thes ben notable poyntes of preservyng the common welth'.\textsuperscript{116}

These texts also stressed the importance of loyalty and obedience. In the context of civil war, the potential meaning and significance of these discussions were transformed. For example, Lancastrian sources argued that, despite their claims of loyalty to Henry VI, the Yorkist lords were in fact rebels and traitors and that although they claimed to be working on behalf of the common weal, the common weal of the realm actually depended upon obedience.\textsuperscript{117} Of course, how these discussions of loyalty were interpreted would also have been affected by the political affiliation of the reader: presumably, Yorkist and Lancastrian readers would have read this material in different ways.\textsuperscript{118}

This stress on the importance of loyalty is demonstrated both by the way in which translators linked the derogation and destruction of the nobles with their

\textsuperscript{115} The author of the English Chronicle argued that in 1460 proclamations were made in Lancashire and Cheshire to the effect that anyone who fought for Henry VI was allowed to pillage the south east. According to this author, men from the north pillaged and despoiled churches 'as they had be paynems or Saracenes, and no Crysten men'; J.S. Davies (ed.), English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI, Camden Society, old series 64 (1856), pp. 98, 107. This argument is also reflected in Clement Paston's letter to his brother John Paston I of 1461 and in Whethamstede's chronicle cited in chapter two, p. 100. Conversely, both the Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire and the Arrival of Edward IV, produced in the early 1470s, frequently emphasised how well Edward IV victualled his host. See, for example, J.G. Nichols (ed.), Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 1470, Camden Society, old series 39 (1847), p. 119; Bruce (ed.), Historie of the Arrival, p. 167.

\textsuperscript{116} Gilson, 'A Defence of the Proscription', p. 519.

\textsuperscript{117} Watts, 'Ideas, Principles and Politics', p. 128 and below, p. 259.

\textsuperscript{118} See the comments of Sharpe and Zwicker concerning the different ways in which readers interpreted the same material depending on their political or religious beliefs; K. Sharpe and S. Zwicker, 'Introduction: Discovering the Renaissance Reader', in K. Sharpe and S. Zwicker (eds.), Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England (Cambridge, 2003), p. 9.
rebellion, as was discussed in the previous chapter, and in more explicit comments upon
the function of knighthood. The verse translator of *De re militari*, for example, argued
that 'Knyghthode an ordir is, the premynten;/ Ob ey saunt in God, and rather deye/
Than disobeye'. The prose translator of *De re militari* argued that 'sacrementis oweth to
be done to the emperour in faithful and deuoute service as to a bodily god. For be he
knight or what euere ellis he be that feithfully serueth the emperour; he serueth god in
as miche as he feithfully loueth him that regneth be goddis ordinaunce'. This clearly
found favour with some readers: Thomas Rotherham wrote 'the othe off knightes'
underneath the scribe's 'nota nota bene' and the early reader of OMC, MS Lat. 30 also
wrote 'nota' in the margin next to this passage. The fact that readers and scribes were
annotating sections concerning the importance of loyalty at some point in the 1450s was
perhaps a response to the problems caused by inadequate kingship – perhaps even an
attempt by readers to consolidate their own positions with regard to Henry VI.

Moreover, these texts stressed that the obedience required in a military context
paralleled that required in other contexts. The U translator of the *Quadrilogue Invec tif*
emphasised that the arguments he made concerning military discipline ought to be
applied to other, non-martial, contexts by stating that 'knyghtly discipline [ought] to be
kept as well with worship in the noble mennys houses as in the hoste of a prince'.
Furthermore, the premise that the obedience required in a military context was also
pertinent to the realm is suggested by a 'mistranslation' of the R translator. The U
translator argued that:

119 See chapter four, pp. 197-198.
120 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knysythode and Bataile*, ll. 132-134.
122 CUL, MS Add. 8706, fol. 24v; OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 28v.
123 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invec tif*, 1: 239.
sithen it is that in oon houshold most be kepte ordre and obeisaunce, how than shuld endure an hoste of men, garnysshid with harneyes and meeuid of corages, nor hou may thaire suerte be kepte agains thaire enmyes and thaire pees amonge thaimself and thaire frendes sauf oonly by that thaire voluntes ben in the puissaunce of oon chief and thaire powers limited to obeye the commaundement of him that vpon thaim may kepe justice of armes and cheualrye? 124

The R translator altered the final sentence and argued instead:

Nor also I wote neuir hough the seurte of the lordis myght be kepte ayeinste their enmyes and peace among themself and their frendis in lasse than their willis were vndir the power of a hede and their power lymitid vndir the obeisaunce of a commaundour, which may kepe ouir them justice of armes and knyghtly disciplyn (my italics). 125

Whereas the U translator was arguing that a military host could not be kept safe from enemies unless it obeyed its captain, the R translator applied this warning to the lords. By changing the subject of ‘a hoste of men’ to the ‘lordis’, he implicitly related the problem surrounding lack of discipline in a military context to the problem of lack of obedience faced by the Crown in England. In other words, he seems to have altered this part of the text to accord with his experience of civil war and, by so doing, appears to have endorsed the argument that both external security and internal peace (‘seurte [...] ayeinste their enmyes and peace among themself’), were reliant upon obedience to a single ‘hede’.

Furthermore, William Worcester and the verse translator of De re militari persistently conflated obedience to a military commander with obedience to a sovereign.

124 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invecq, 1: 229-231. The French manuscripts read ‘Et s’il est ainsi qu’en une famille faffle garder ordre et obeissance vers ung chief, comment durera ung ost de gens garniz d’armes et esmeuz de couraiges, ne comment se pourra garder leur sceurté vers les enemis et leur paic entre eulx et leurs amis, se non que leurs voulenz soient en la puissance d’un chief et leurs povoirs limitez a l’obeissance du commandeur qui sur eulx puiss garder justice d’armes et discipline de chevalerie?’; Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invectif, pp. 55-56.
Worcester likened military command to 'a prince is office'. The verse translator of *De re militari* also compared a military leader to a prince, and argued that he should be responsible for his soldiers, 'all the Citesens' and the 'commyn wele'. He also altered and recontextualised Vegetius's discussion of the oath taken by soldiers to the emperor in order to stress that the obedience owing to the king ought to parallel that owing to God. He argued that both 'knyght and comynere' should honour the king 'Right as to God ther bodily present'. A central feature of the verse translator's construction of the Yorkists rested upon the argument that because Henry VI was divinely appointed, those who opposed him were disobedient to both the king and to God. So the translator stressed the divine nature of kingship by labelling Henry VI as 'Saviour' and as 'Goddes Sone'. In turn, this construction of Henry VI allowed the translator to label the Yorkists as heretics. In an addition to Book IV, he urged the reader to ensure that 'Cristis and the kyngis foos vchone/ Be dryven out or chastised, and noone/ Alyve lefte, that wil not wel beleve' and so he conflated Henry VI's enemies with those of Christ and, echoing the *Somnium Vigilantis*, stressed that no mercy should be shown to the Yorkist lords. This had the effect of positioning those who supported the Lancastrians within a 'just war' framework and thus discredited the Yorkists and 'sanctified' the war between the king and the rebels.

126 [Worcester], *Boke of Noblesse*, pp. 55, 21.

127 'Forthi the duke, that hath the gouernaunce,/ Therof may thinke he is a Potestate,/ To whom betakyn is the prosperaunce/ Of al a lond and euerych Estate,/ The Chiualesers, if I be fortunate,/ The Citesens, and alle men shal be/ If I goueme wel, in libertee./ And if a faut is founden in my dede,/ Not oonly me, but al the comyn wele/ So hurtech it, that gretely is to drede/ Dampnationoun, though noman with me dele./ And forthi, negligence I wil repele/ And do my cure in feithful diligence/ With fauorunce of Goddis excellence'; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, II. 1622-1642. This is based on *De re militari*, book III, chapter 10.

128 'Next God is hym to drede and hym to honour is;/ Right as to God ther bodily present,/ To themperour, when he mad Emperour is;/ Devotioun; vch loyal ympendent/ Is to be vigilaunt, his senyent;/ God serueth he, both knyght and comynere;/ That loueth him, to God that regneth here'; Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, II. 691-97.

129 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, II. 7 and 17.

130 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knyghthode and Bataile*, II. 2231-2237.

131 This tendency to 'sanctify' secular wars became more pronounced in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Indeed, in the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, 'contemporaries were
Moreover, the verse translator argued that opposition to the king was similar to the ultimate treachery: the betrayal of Christ by Judas. He warned that just as Judas hung himself through desperation ‘so wulle thei that haunt/ Rebellioun or ellis heresie’. The EETS editors of the verse translation suggested that ‘heresie’ in these lines referred to Lollardy. Undoubtedly, the use of such a provocative word was designed to engender the societal fear associated with Lollardy, but the translator was also making a wider ideological point: rebellion towards one’s king was synonymous with disobedience towards God. Although other sources of the period, such as Hardyng’s Chronicle, used the term ‘heretic’ to mean ‘rebel’, within this context, the labelling of the Yorkists as heretics underlined the divine status of the king and reinforced the ideological foundations of the Lancastrian position advanced in the poem.

These texts also promoted the importance of obedience through their use of Roman models. A popular exemplum was that of Manlius Torquatus who slew his own son because he disobeyed his commandment and charged before the order had been given. This story was used to demonstrate the importance of obedience to one’s commander. The R translator of the Quadrilogue Invectif, for example, argued that Torquatus:

---

132 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knightsbode and Bataile*, ll. 1671-77.
133 Dyboski and Arend (eds.), *Knightsbode and Bataile*, p. 149.
made smyte of the hede of his owne son for bycause he did fight with enemyes ayeinst the commaundement of his fadir notwithstanding that he had obtened victorie, and yet this yong knyghtis victorie myght nat hide the disobeisaunce that he had don, but was put to dethe as a transgressour ayeinst the lawe. And so rigorouse discipline of knyghthode ouircame the naturall pite of the fadir.

The translator of the *Livre du corps de polici* used a slightly different example, that of Aulus Postinus, to make the same point. His son disobeyed him and as a result: ‘he gaue a iugement and said that it was mor harme to saue that man fro dethe that breketh the lawes and comaundementis of prynces, notwithstondyng that he had the victorie of his enmys, and also for example to othir men, than the discomfetur of a fewe people was wurthe, and furthe with he made smyte of his sonis hed’. These stories underlined the premise that even when something was ostensibly done for the benefit of the whole, this did not license disobedience, and that, indeed, ‘it was only through obedience to the king and to his laws that the common weal could be served’. In this respect, these stories might be seen to reflect or advance Lancastrian ideology.

These stories were already present in the translators’ source texts so it cannot be argued that translators deliberately used them in order to promote the Lancastrian position. However, the fact that the author of the Lancastrian text, the *Somnium Vigilantis*, which was written in support of the attainder of the Yorkists lords in 1459,

---

135 Blayney (ed.), *English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif*, 1: 226-228. Nicholas Upton, in *De studio militari* written in c. 1446, used this example on several occasions. Interestingly, his sixteenth-century translator argued that Manlius Torquatius slew his son ‘tugeyng herein moche better for the father to lesse hys sonne (ware he never so bolde A man) than the cowntrey to lak there order & dissciplyne in warre and batell’. He then asked whether a soldier who charges against the enemy before he has received the order and as a result ‘made a gret conflict & wonne the felde’ should be executed and his conclusion was that ‘he schall lesse hys hed’, because ‘vertewe off obedience ys of a grete strengthe, and an yll dede schall not be excusyd by the reason that a good effecte ffollowythe a pon hytt’; C.G. Walker, ‘An Edition with Introduction and Commentary of John Blount’s English translation of Nicholas Upton’s *De Studio Militari*’ (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1998), 1: book I, chapter 4, p. 19; book I, chapter 16, pp. 34-35.


also used one of these stories is indicative of the political purpose to which they could be put and suggests that these stories were, indeed, regarded by their readers as reinforcing Lancastrian ideology. The author of the Somnium Vigilantis used one of these stories to make the point that disobedience automatically worked against the common weal and to urge Henry VI to show no mercy to the Yorkist lords:

Ye say perhaps that it longeth to every persone of be comynalte to oppose himselfe to be ruyne of the good publique. But it is not so whann autoryte laketh. Remembre of a noble emperoure the which punysshed his one sonne of capitall payne for be cause he went withoute autoryte to theexpedicioun of the commen welth, and yet he had a noble triumphe and a glorious victorye of his enmys. But for to circumscribe the boldnes of presumpcioun in other men he executed justice opon his owne son.¹³⁸

The Somnium Vigilantis argued that the Yorkists' actions invalidated their claims to be working on behalf of the common weal.¹³⁹ According to the author, because the common weal of a realm depended upon the ‘due subjeccion’ shown by subjects to their king, the Yorkists, by opposing the king, had actually destroyed the common weal they claimed to be defending.¹⁴⁰ It was this discourse which the verse translator of De re militari was referencing when he asked his audience ‘Is not their [the Yorkists] owne cryme her own bane?’.¹⁴¹ In other words, had not the state of the common weal, which

---

¹³⁸ Gilson, ‘A Defence of the Proscription of the Yorkists’, pp. 519-20. One feels that the author of the Somnium Vigilantis would have approved of the R translator’s argument that if ‘any faulte war done aynest the discipline of armes, pyte myght haue no place, lignage ne high porte had no favour’; Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invenit, 1: 234. Note also that the early reader of OMC, MS Lat. 30 annotated the passage in the prose translation of De re militari which argued that a military leader ought to ‘chastice and awreke hyheliche alle gutles and trespaces of his kni3tes by lawe of armes, and þat he be no3t yseye to spare ne for3iue no trespas ne erour þat is doone wiþynne the oost’; OMC, MS Lat. 30, fol. 68v; Lester (ed.), English Translation of Vegetius, book III, chapter 10, p. 130.

¹³⁹ For further discussion of this argument and the ideological stance of the Somnium Vigilantis see Watts, ‘Ideas, Principles and Politics’, pp. 128-9 and Henry VI, pp. 43-6.

¹⁴⁰ Gilson, ‘A Defence of the Proscription’, p. 518. Watts also argues that this conceptual framework helps to explain York’s claim to the throne without an over reliance upon his ‘private’ (greed, ambition, power) motivation: ‘If York was the true king, then he had no duty of obedience to Henry: he was not a rebel, but a contender in a just war’; Watts, Henry VI, p. 358.

¹⁴¹ Dyboski and Arend (eds.), Knightsbode and Bataile, l. 1689.
the Yorkists cited as their justification for taking up arms, in actual fact been damaged
by their own actions. The concept that the common weal depended upon obedience may account for
an alteration made by the U translator of the _Quadrilogue Invectif_. The U translator
associated loyalty to one's lord with the maintenance of the common good. Chartier had
argued that men should risk their lives for the common good: 'a leurs vies exposer pour
le salut publique'. The U translator argued, however, that they should 'expose thaire
lyues to the publique well and saluacion of thaire lorde'. Thus a prerequisite for the
fulfilment of the common good, in the U translator's conceptual framework, was loyalty
to, or defence of, one's lord. Obedience was the basis upon which the common weal
depended.

The fact that these translators and readers stressed the importance of loyalty,
discipline and obedience has further implications for this study and for where we locate
these texts within the intellectual and ideological context of the later fifteenth century.
With their stress on loyalty and obedience, these texts were advocating a different model
of chivalry, divorced from the traditional chivalric values of prowess and individualism.
Rather than endorsing a model of chivalry which 'had as much investment in knightly
autonomy and heroic violence as in any forms of restraint', 'the hallmarks of a model
for political relations which encourages the exercise of individual rather than communal
force' or which could be used to defend the nobility's rights in the face of royal

---

142 It has also been argued that the chronicle which covers the period 1431-71, contained in
John Vale's book, reflects this argument; Watts, 'Polemics and Politics', p. 5.
143 Chartier, _Le Quadrilogue Invectif_, p. 53.
144 Blayney (ed.), _English Translations of Le Quadrilogue Invectif_, 1: 225.
145 Watts, 'Ideas, Principles and Politics', p. 128.
intervention, as it apparently did in fifteenth-century Germany, these texts promoted a chivalric ideal which relied upon discipline, loyalty and obedience.¹⁴⁶

In his Boke of Noblesse, for example, Worcester annotated a passage in a very telling way. In the margin next to a story which related how Publius Decius rode recklessly into battle and, as a result, enabled his side to win, he wrote ‘Publius Decius non est recomendandus in hoc negotio’ (‘he is not to be recommended in this matter’).¹⁴⁷ When he went back to revise the treatise, Worcester added a passage next to this marginal note: he seems to have wanted to justify his comment. He presented a conversation in which Fastolf compared the ‘manly’ man, who placed the welfare of his companions foremost, with the ‘hardy’ man and advocated the behaviour of the ‘manly’: ‘for the hardy man that sodenly, bethout discreccion of gode avysement, avauncyth hym yn the felde to be halde courageouse, and wyth grete aventure he scapyth, voydith the felde allone, but he levyth hys felyshyp destrussed’.¹⁴⁸ In this story he explicitly juxtaposed, and thereby acknowledged the existence of, two models of chivalry: one based upon individual prowess and the other upon loyalty to one’s companions and he endorsed the latter model.

These texts’ promotion of a model of chivalry based upon loyalty and obedience is perhaps part of the process of change taking place in England over the course of the fifteenth century and into the sixteenth century. A chivalric code based upon the model

¹⁴⁸ [Worcester], The Boke of Noblesse, pp. 64-5.
of individual prowess was replaced by a model which emphasised loyal service to the king or state. Moorman identified in Malory’s Morte Darthur a new concept of chivalry in which loyalty to the state, not just to the king, was paramount.\textsuperscript{149} Gunn has emphasised the importance attached by the Tudor court to the ideal of loyal service. He argues that ‘the mottoes chosen by courtiers to express their knightly identity suggest that loyalty was the quality prized above all others’.\textsuperscript{150} James has shown that by the early seventeenth century, a ‘state-centred honour system’ had emerged which meant that ‘the traditional two-sided concept of honour, as a support for a dissident or oppositionist stance [...] was undermined’. This development, he argues, was partly the product of ‘the emphasis in the providentialist approach on obedience’.\textsuperscript{151}

Recent research into the development of the early Tudor state has also argued that, alongside the transformation of the nature of military service in England in which a growing body of men owed exclusive military service to the crown, there was an added stress on the duty of the subject to serve his prince. This research has likewise underlined the role that loyal service to the Crown played in the formation of chivalric identity, but has stressed that loyal service rendered in the military sphere was most prized: ‘military prowess was still central to knightly identity but the concept of prowess...”

was reconstructed to mean feats of arms in the service of the king'. These texts and translations were both the products of, and contributors to, that change.

152 See S. Gunn, D. Grummitt and H. Cools, "Warfare and State Formation in England and the Habsburg Netherlands, 1477-1559" (forthcoming). I am grateful to Dr Grummitt for allowing me to see a draft of this. Vale identifies a similar shift in relation to Burgundian and French chivalric culture and relates this to the formation of standing armies in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. He explores how 'chivalrous sentiments of honour and renown were welded on to concepts of service to the prince to produce what have been called "national chivalries", pledged to serve him in war, diplomacy and administration'. He also argues that the Renaissance 'cult of honour' had much in common with the medieval 'cult of chivalry'; M.G.A. Vale, War and Chivalry: Warfare and Aristocratic Culture in England, France, and Burgundy at the End of the Middle Ages (London, 1981), pp. 168, 174.
Conclusion

Defeat was diagnosed in a variety of complex ways in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. Readers emphasised, through translation change and annotation, the importance of counsel, unity and provision for war and these acts of appropriation can be contextualised alongside better-known diagnoses of defeat, such as that articulated by Yorkist propaganda and in the works associated with William Worcester. Translation change and readers' annotations suggest that there was an awareness that the defeat in France was the result of a lack of financial commitment and that alongside this, readers recognised that there had been a shift in values amongst the traditional military class. Contemporaries also connected the end of the war in France with the subsequent civil war in England. This connection was not only made by William Worcester or in parliamentary contexts, but can also be discerned in the writings of Sir Thomas Malory, William Caxton and in readers' annotations and translators' rewritings.

The fact that military texts which offered explanations for military defeat and celebrated the importance of external war proliferated between c. 1445 and c. 1475, and were evidently engaged with by their readers, has several implications. It suggests that, contrary to the impression derived from most secondary literature on the period, there was a keen interest in war and how it should be prosecuted among the political community. It further demonstrates that defeat in France did initiate a process of diagnosis. The experience of defeat abroad and war at home initiated a cultural process in which practical military texts were translated, circulated and were, indeed, read.
These texts were read, not only in a narrowly military way, but also in a context of a wider set of problems and interests. This perhaps helps to make sense of why manuscripts containing these translations were owned by such a range of people in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. Although these texts did have a military audience, they were also owned by men who had no martial experience and by female members of the gentry. We can either interpret this as yet another example of the gentry reading about matters of which they had no experience,1 or we can consider that perhaps these translations and the advice they contained occupied a less specific and marginalised space in mid fifteenth-century political discourse. These texts, especially in translation, offered readers more than practical advice concerning military affairs: they could be read as a comment on the English situation and could be used to diagnose defeat and civil war. The values these texts promoted and the outward war they extolled were central to the way in which some members of the fifteenth-century gentry explained, and hoped to reform, their troubled times.

Treating translation change, scribal rewriting and readers' annotations as creative acts opens up a new line of enquiry for intellectual and cultural historians. In the margins, or indeed, in the altered, omitted or expanded phrase, we have unique access to the way in which contemporaries dealt with the questions with which most fifteenth-century historians are concerned. How, for example, did the experience of civil war affect notions of kingship, aristocratic, chivalric or mercantile identities? Turning to, say, how mirrors for princes, prose romances, or texts such as the Libelle of Englisch Poliçye,

1 This attitude is often implied in secondary literature. For example, see Pollard’s statement that: ‘The entertainment, literature and outward display of the later-fifteenth-century gentleman may still have been ostensibly chivalric in form and style, but his actual life interests were increasingly civilian’ and Carpenter’s comment that: ‘The gentry’s mostly vicarious involvement in the king’s wars by paying for them was transformed in their reading into an active pursuit of military glory’; A.J. Pollard, The Wars of the Roses (London, 1988), p. 57; C. Carpenter, Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society, 1401-1499 (Cambridge, 1992), p. 49.
were read and rewritten, appropriated or displaced, at specific moments brings us closer not only to some of the answers but also to the individuals who were confronting similar questions.
Appendix A

Codicological descriptions of manuscripts containing the prose translation of *De re militari*
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

Class-mark Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 8706.

Date s. xvmed

Secundo folio 'knowen'.

Scribe(s) One.

Script Mid fifteenth-century anglicana.

Decoration Prologue and chapter headings in red. Initials in blue and red; blue and red paragraph marks. Pen and line decoration for initials red and blue.

Measurements page 170x275mm.
writing 100x180mm.

Material Gold-edged vellum.

Ruling Prickings visible on the outer margins.

Frame 4 verticals and 2 horizontals for enclosing top and bottom lines. Ruled within.

Lines per page 30.

Pagination Modern.

Number of leaves ii+104+i.

Number of quires 13.

Collation In eights.

Catchwords Yes.

Signatures Signed a-n quite a way up the leaf — these were either done at the time of writing (thus prologue in red so signed in red) or the producers were so concerned by the aesthetics of the page that they signed it accordingly.

Binding Modern.

Contents

1. The prose translation of De re militari (fols. 1r-102v), without title.

Incipit 'here bigynneth a schort treatise'.

Explicit 'hath yschewed. Explicit liber quartus et vltimus'.

Owner(s) T. Rotherham' signed fol. 22v in brown ink. 'Thomas Rotherham boke' written on fols. 35r, 71r, 72r, 102v.
The notes 'Explicit liber anglicana qui quidam liber constat Roberto Buk' and 'constat Robord Buk' are written on fol. 102v.
A seventeenth-century hand has written 'faciendum est beflum, vt acquiratur pax' and signed J. St. John on fol. 1r.

Other comments
An early owner has written the book number on the top of each leaf.
On the first leaf, in a fifteenth-century hand, there is a medical recipe for a cure for the sheep pox.
A later hand has written a will on fol. 103r.
### Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of *De re militari*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class-mark</th>
<th>London, British Library, MS Add. 4713.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>s. xv&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundo folio</td>
<td>'hauen I written'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribe(s)</td>
<td>One.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Late fifteenth-century anglicana hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td>Red and blue pen decoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>Three-line initial; two-part border, extensive use of gold ball with green; acanthus leaves in red/pink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements</td>
<td>page 210x145mm. writing 140x95mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Vellum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruling</td>
<td>No. No prickings visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>2 verticals and 2 horizontals. Ruled in red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per page</td>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagination</td>
<td>Modern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of leaves</td>
<td>iii+93+ii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of quires</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>1-10&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;, 11&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; (wants 3, 4, 5, 6), 12&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; (wants 7, 8).&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchwords</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signatures</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Post-medieval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contents

1. The prose translation of *De re militari* (fol. 4r-93r), without title.

**Incipit** 'Here begynneth a short tretis the whiche Vegidius that was the worship-fulle Erle Renate sonne wrote'.

**Explicit** 'the tenthe yere of kyng henry the fourth'.

**Early Owner(s)** The initials 'I.M' appear on fol. 93r.

### Other comments

On fol. 93r there are two quotations in Latin, in a hand slightly later than that of the rest of the manuscript, taken from Godardus, monk of Malmesbury, and Valerius, followed by the comment: 'Hec bene mente nota; quia sunt velut aura tota'. Also in this hand are the initials 'I.M' and the marginal note 'per W. Caxton imprimendum'.

---

Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

Class-mark       London, British Library, MS
Add. 14408.

Date             1473.

Secundo folio   [torn] 'as nother'.

Scribe(s)        One. Scribal note 'scriptori merita
mater pia redde macia anno domini millesimo
cccclxxiij' on fol. 73r.

Script           Anglicana formata.
 Uses elaborate abbreviation marks, 's' is very
thick, comprising an 'o' with ascender curving
round to the right.

Decoration       Red underlining.

Measurements
page             190x270mm.
writing          120x200mm.

Material         Paper.
 Watermarks are similar to Briquet 1968, nos
12996 (1446) and 3037 (1441-2) and 13006
(1451-1461).

Ruling           Yes – no prickings visible.

Lines per page   31.

Pagination       Modern.

Number of leaves 73.

Number of quires 6.

Collation        112, 216, 316, 418, 54, 66

Catchwords       Yes – in ornate boxes.

Signatures       No.

Binding          Post-medieval.

2 This scribe also wrote Aberystwyth, National
Library of Wales, MS 572; see M. Mills and D.
Huws (eds.), Fragments of an Early 14th Century

Contents

1. Lydgate and Burgh's Secrets of Philosophers
(fols. 1r-48v), without title.

Incipit         Torn.

Explicit        'Men schall þe correcte'.

2. The prose translation of De re militari (fols.
49r-66r), without title.

Incipit        'In olde tyme it was þe maner of þe
customs þt sotyluar and studies'.

Explicit        'here is aplesaunt recommendacyon to þe
Emperour and an ende of þe firste boke. Explicit'. [Explicit written in black].

3. An English translation of the Consilia Isidori
(fols. 66v-73r), without title.

Incipit        'here begynneth the boke of Saynt
Isodore'.

Explicit        'withoute fayle. Explicit'.

Owner(s)
This manuscript was made in 1473 for
'Nycolas de Saint lo Cheualier', of Somerset,
whose ex Abris is on fol. 73r. 'C'est liure
appertient nycolas de saint lo cheualier'.
'nycholas saynt lo escluire' is written on fol.
30r in a later hand.
The name Tytherton Lucas is written on fols.
22r, 29r, 32r, once with the word 'london' and
with the dates 1782 and 1783.

3 Mills and Huws (eds), Guy of Warwick, pp. 1-5.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of

De re militari

Class-mark London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 285.4

Date s.xv3

Scribe(s) Six hands.
Scribe A (William Ebesham): fols. 2r-43r, 48r-56v, 84r-142r, 155r-199v.
Scribe B: fols. 60r-82v.
Scribe C: fols. 43v-47v, 144r-153v.
Scribe D: fols. 43r.
Scribe E: fols. 153v-154r.
Scribe F: fols. 154r-154v.

Script
Ebesham: a secretary hand with some anglicana forms.
Scribe B: secretary.
Scribe C: 'a document hand, but large and showy, especially in the headings'.
Scribe D: 'a laterally compressed bastard hand with extensive use of hairstrokes'.5
Scribe E: bastard hand.
Scribe F: secretary.

Decoration Fols. 2r-199v - red and blue underlining, capitals and paraphs. There are several large, coloured initials (fols. 2r, 5v, 9r, 11r, 29v, 84r, 155r).

Measurements
page 225x310mm.
writing 140x195mm.

Material Paper.

Watermarks - A jewelled ring - similar to Briquet 689 (1457); a bull's head - comparable to Briquet 14323-5 (1460-5); a bull's head - comparable to Briquet 14331 (1468) and 14334 (1469); a lozenge paly beneath a diadem, comparable to Briquet 2066 (1473) and more closely to Heawood's 8 (in use in England before 1459); a hand with a six pointed star or flower - similar to Briquet

5 Lester, Sir John Paston's 'Grete Boke', p. 18.

11088 (1437) and 11089 (1456); a hand and star again - similar to Briquet 11155 (1477).

Ruling
Scribe A ruled in ink between the prickholes.
Scribe B used drypoint and did not make prickholes.
Scribe C used prickholes and drypoint.
Scribes D-F wrote only in blank spaces in ready-prepared quires.

Lines per page 32-34.

Pagination Two systems. Medieval roman numerals beginning at 'T' and modern.

Number of leaves 223.

Number of quires 19.

Collation 112, 212, 310, 4-512, 612, 7-1212, 1312(wants 1), 14-1712, 1810, 1912 (wants 8). Quires 1-17 are the 'Grete Boke', 18 and 19 are additions made after Paston's death in 1479.

Catchwords No.

Signatures No.

Binding Modern.

Contents
1. Order for the service for the coronation in England (fols. 2r-5v).

2. Poem on the English coronation of Henry VI (fols. 5v-6v).

3 Verses by Lydgate from the 'sootiltees' at the English coronation banquet of Henry VI (fols. 6v-7r).

4. Ceremony for creating Knights of the Bath (fols. 7v-9r).

5. Arms and armour needed for foot combat (fols. 9r-v).

6. How to organise 'jousts of peace' (fols. 9v-10v).
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

7. Regulations for trial by battle (fols. 11r-15r).
8. Challenge of Philippe de Boyle to John Astley (fol. 15r-v).
9. Challenge of Piers de Masse to John Astley (fols. 15v-16r).
10. Feat of Arms by Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick (fols. 16r-17v).
11. Challenge of Lord Scales to the Bastard of Burgundy (fols. 18r-22v).
14. Challenge to the Pas a l'Arbre d'Or (fols. 26r-29r).
15. Combat between Lord Scales and the Bastard of Burgundy (fols. 29v-43r).
16. Statute of Arms (fol. 43r).
17. Challenge of Guillaume de Boursset (fols. 43v-44r).
18. Proclamation of a tourney in Bruges (fols. 44r-46r).
19. Proclamation of jousts at Smithfield (fols. 46v-47r).
20. Ordinance regulating the fees of heralds (fol. 47v).
21. Jousts between John Chalons and Louis de Bueill (fols. 48r-52r).
22. Fictional background to a pas d'armes in Burgundy (fols. 52r-56v).
23. The Pas du Perron Fée (fols. 60r-82v).

24. The prose translation of Vegetius De re militari (fols. 84r-138r), without title.

Incipit ‘Here begynneth a shorte tretise the which Vegicyus’.

Explicit ‘space to oure amendynge and his face to see at oure endyng. Amen. Quod W. Ebesham’.

25. Sailing instructions (fols. 138r-142r).
27. Ordinances of war of Thomas Montague, Earl of Salisbury (fols. 150r-152r).
29. Extracts from Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia regum Britanniae (fols. 153v-154r).
30. Extracts from the Polychronicon (fol. 154r-v).
31. Lydgate and Burgh’s Secrets of Philosophers (fols. 155r-199v).

Early Owner(s) Sir John Paston. The manuscript has been identified as the ‘Grete Boke’ referred to in the Paston letters as belonging to Sir John Paston (d.1479). It then passed to Sir Thomas Wriothesley (d. 1534).6

6 See chapter three, pp. 115, 125.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
*De re militari*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class-mark</th>
<th>London, British Library, MS Royal 18 A XII.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1483-4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundo folio</td>
<td>'eldre that I am'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribe(s)</td>
<td>One.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>A clear cursive hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td>Paragraph marks in red, blue or gold, with red or blue penwork. Each chapter begins with an initial letter of gold on coloured ground – dark rose and blue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>Sutton and Visser-Fuchs describe the illumination as follows: 'Book I (fol. 1r) has an 'H' enclosing the arms of England supported by the silver (now oxidised) boars of Richard III beneath an imperial crown; in the centre of the lower border, a gold griffin on a green mound for the earldom of Salisbury held by Richard's son and derived from the family of Queen Anne Neville; naturalistic flowers in the borders are pink roses and columbines. Book II (fol. 26r) begins with an 'T' composed of entwined acanthus leaves; with naturalistic pink marshmallows and yellow acorns in bright green cups in the borders. Book III (fol. 49r) has an 'H' enclosing the arms of Queen Anne Neville; flowers in the border are thistles, daisies and violets. Book IV (fol. 98r) has an 'H' filled with formalised foliage; plants in the border are periwinkles, thistles, strawberries, pinks, acorns and a single mauve crocus'. It can be directly linked to other work produced in London, such as the Wax Chandlers Charter granted 16 February 1484.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements</td>
<td>page 240x155mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>writing 170x105mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per page</td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagination</td>
<td>Modern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchwords</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signatures</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Vellum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruling</td>
<td>Yes – prickings visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>2 verticals and 2 horizontals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of leaves</td>
<td>123.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of quires</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>1-178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Red leather stamped with the arms of George II, dated 1757.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contents**

1. The prose translation of *De re militari* (fol. 1r-123r), without title.

**Incipit** 'Here begynneth a short tretise'.

**Explicit** 'This boke was translate into English in the vigill of All Hallowes the yere of oure lord god mccc and viijthe yere'.

**Owner(s)** Its intended use is suggested by the presence of the arms of Richard III, his wife Anne, and the griffin of his son.

---

Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

Class-mark  London, British Library, MS Sloane 2027.
Date  s. xv3.

Secundo folio 'wethir hytt'.
Scribe(s) One, who can be localised to East Midlands.8
Script An unusual, cramped anglicana formata script.
Decoration Three-line initials in black, rope design for each chapter of the prose translation.

Measurements
page 295 x 200mm.
writing 150x210mm.
Lines per page 39.
Pagination Modern.
Catchwords No.
Signatures Yes.
Ruling In drypoint.
Frame 2 verticals and 2 horizontals.
Material Paper.
Watermarks Close to Briquet’s no. 9481 (1467 and 1474). It appears in its clearest form on fol. 94.
Number of leaves iii+188+iv.
Number of Quires 15.

Collation Booklet format: 1-218 (item 1 - missing a quire at the end) // 316 (item 2) //424 516 (item 3) // 7-1512 (items 5-6).
Binding Post-medieval.

Contents
1. The prose translation of De re militari (fols. 1r-36r), title torn.9
Incipit 'here be gynnyth a schort'.
Explicit 'longe and stronge at thyr blad'.

2. Boke of Nurture attributed to John Russell (fols. 37r-52r), without title.
Incipit 'patris god kepe me et filij ffor charite'.
Explicit 'ys good chamise. Explicit'.

3. Lydgate and Burgh’s Secrets of Philosophers (fols. 53r-92r).
Title ‘This is the booke off the gouernaunce of kyngis and pryncis’
Incipit ‘God almyghti saue and confferme our kyng’.
Explicit ‘schall the correcte. Explicit librum aristotiles ad alexandrum magnum’.

4. Robert of Gloucester’s Chronicle (fols. 96r-169r), without title.
Incipit ‘the yer ffro the be gynnyng’.
Explicit ‘Englonde yn to Ryghte grete derd’.

4. A prose Brut continuation (fols. 170r-188r), without title.
Incipit ‘whan kyng John had don hys omage’.
Explicit ‘kyng yaff ym the’

Owner(s) The signature ‘WyUiztn Braundon (also Brandon) of knoU in the counte of waryke’ occurs on fol. 96r and on fols. 94r, 95r, 142r. ‘Wylliam’ is also written on fol. 62r.10

9 It ends abruptly in the middle of chapter 24.
10 See chapter three, p. 114.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

Class-mark New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M 775.11

Date Before 1461.12

Secundo folio No.

Scribe(s) Five.
Scribe A: items 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 (from line 11 of fol. 73), 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16.
Scribe B: item 1.
Scribe C: item 8.
Scribe D: items 18, 19.
Scribe E: item 22.

Script
Scribe A: bastard anglicana.
Scribe B: bastard anglicana.
Scribe C: anglicana formata.
Scribe D: bastard anglicana.
Scribe E: bastard anglicana.
Scribe F: fere-textura.

Decoration Finely illuminated initials and borders. Ff. 5r-274v: one-line gold and blue paraph signs and letters with brown and red flourishing; two-line blue letters with red flourishing; two- three- or four-line gold letters on rose/blue ground with sprays; two borders: f. 25r, 2 four-line coloured letters on gold ground with third quarter page border and arms added in lower margin, and f. 26r, six-line coloured letter infilled with aroid on gold ground, with a full bar-frame border with sprays and coloured motifs; ff. 276r-278v: two-line rose letters with rose flourishing; ff. 283r-288v, Calendar, one-line gold and blue letters; fol. 293r-303r, one-line gold and blue letters (not flourished); two-line gold letters on rose/blue ground with sprays.13

Illumination
Full-page miniatures – knights breaking lances at the tilt (fol. 2v); coastal sea-scape (fol. 130v); tournament scene (Paris, 1438) with John Astley and Piers de Masse jousting (fol. 275v); John Astley and Philippe de Boyle in foot combat (Smithfield, 1441/2) (fol. 227r). Others: a man being armed (fol. 122v); Hector as a boy receiving a message from the goddess Othea; three counsellors beside; tree with coat of arms (fol. 200r); Hercules fighting Cerberus (fol. 202r); King Minos (fol. 204r).

Artist(s)
Illustrator A was responsible for the full-page miniature on fol. 2r and the half-page on fol. 122v. As Scott argues, 'two parts of the manuscript thus have a hitherto unrecognised connection through the illustrator'.14
Illustrator B (known as the Wingfield master) made the three remaining surviving pictures of the Epistle of Othea.
Illustrator C made the 2 full-page pictures (fol. 275v and 277v) that illustrate the tournament accounts.

Measurements
page 243-4x165mm (cropped).

Material Parchment.

Lines per page 28.

Number of leaves ii(paper) +320 and ii.

Number of quires 23.

Collation 1-28, 32, 44, 58, 6-148, 154, 162, 17-188, 192, 20-228, 234

Catchwords Yes.

Binding Post-medieval.

11 The codicological description follows that given in G.A. Lester, ‘Sir John Paston’s “Grete Boke”: A Bespoke Book or Mass-Produced?’, English Studies 66 (1985): 93-104. I have only been able to consult this manuscript on microfilm, thus I have been unable to ascertain the writing space or the presence of quire signatures.

12 Two pieces of evidence suggest that the manuscript was produced before 1461: Astley’s armorial bearings lack the Garter, which he received in 1461, and there are two references to Henry VI (now erased) who was deposed in 1461.


14 Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, 2: 290.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
*De re militari*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A version of 'How to organise jousts of peace' (fols. 2v-4v).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A table of the ratio of daily expenses to an annual expenditure (fols. 5r-11v).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The assize of bread and ale, and a table of various weights and measures (fols. 12r-13v).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A version of the poem on the coronation of Henry VI (fols. 14r-15r).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A version of the verses by Lydgate from the 'sooitiees' at the English coronation banquet of Henry VI (fol. 15r).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A version of the order of service for the coronation in England (fols. 16r-23r).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The last part of the aforesaid verses by Lydgate (fol. 24r).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The prose translation of Vegetius's <em>De re militari</em> (fols. 25r-121v), without title.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Incipit** 'here begynneth a shortte tretys'.

**Explicit** 'Grace of oure offendynge. Space to oure amendynge and his face to see at oure endynge'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A medical recipe added in a late fifteenth century hand (fol. 275r).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. A version of the challenge of Piers de Masse to John Astley (fols. 275v-6v).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. A version of the challenge of Philippe de Boyle to John Astley (fols. 277v-79r).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. The oath of a herald on appointment, added in a late fifteenth/early sixteenth-century hand (fols. 279v-80r).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Weather prognostications. Same hand as last (fols. 280v-82v).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Astrological diagrams, added in a late fifteenth-century hand (fols. 289v-90v).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. <em>Parvis and Magna Cato</em> in Latin with a translation in English verse by Benedict Burgh (fols. 293r-320r).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. <em>Four things that make a Man fall from Reason</em>, a seven-line stanza by Lydgate (fol. 320r).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Owner(s)** Sir John Astley. The names 'Thomas fyzhugh', 'Bryan Tunstall' and 'Thomas Tunstall' occur on fol. 2r

---

15 See chapter three, pp. 113-4.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

Class-mark Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 233.

Date Between 1408 and Berkeley's death in 1417.

Secundo folio 'as the comentour'.

Scribe(s) Two - one scribe wrote the texts and another corrected them. The dialect of Digby's scribe is southwestern, with features localisable to the region around Berkeley castle. The same scribe corrected this manuscript as corrected Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 953, a copy of Rolle's glossed prose English psalter, which was certainly produced locally for Sir Thomas Berkeley. These corrections appear to have been done before the manuscript was illuminated. De regimine principum was corrected more extensively than the prose translation portion of the manuscript.

Script Scribe A: anglicana formata of the early fifteenth century.
Scribe B: a more angular hand.

Decoration Scott describes the decoration as follows: 'three-line gold letters on a rose/blue ground with sprays containing coloured leaves, gold balls (without green), and sometimes ending in kite-shaped leaves; at book divisions (ff. 62v, 102v, 131, 198v, 217v), partial borders with bar beside text, ending in sprays'. Blue and red paraph marks.

Illumination Two miniatures. Fol. 1r - Giles of Rome presenting his book to Philip the Fair; fol. 62r, Giles of Rome, kneeling in a black habit, courtiers etc in attendance. Scott suggests a regional location for the decoration. The border artist for this manuscript was also responsible for the borders in Bodl. Lib, MS Bodley 953. The prose translation does not contain miniatures.

Artist(s) Both miniatures appear to be the work of the same artist.

Measurements
page 460 x 325mm.
writing 280x195mm.

Material Parchment.

Ruling Yes. Ruled in plummet.

Frame 4 verticals and 2 horizontals.

Lines per page 43. Double columns.

Pagination Modern.

Number of leaves ii+227+iii.

Number of quires 29.


Catchwords Yes - in little bands.

Signatures No.

Binding Early modern.

Contents
1. John Trevisa's translation of Giles of Rome's De regimine principum (fols. 1r-182v), without title.

Incipit 'To his special lord icome of kinges blood'.

Explicit 'pat is iblessed for euermore'.

2. The prose translation of De re militari (fols. 183r-226r), without title.

Incipit 'here bygnnep a schort'.

17 C.F. Briggs, Giles of Rome's De regimine principum: Reading and Writing Politics at Court and University, c. 1275-1525 (Cambridge, 1999), p. 85.
19 Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, 2: 124.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

Explicit ‘worschepful [translator’s rebus] toun’.

Other comments
It is missing Book I, chapter 6.

Owner(s)
It was probably commissioned by Thomas, Lord Berkeley.

The swan badge on fol. 199v suggests the intended ownership of Thomas Berkeley’s daughter, Elizabeth and her husband, Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick.

A late fifteenth-century note on fol. 228r reads: ‘loyallte me ley/ Mary Hastyns Hungreford/ bottreaux mollens and Mulles/ god help me’. Mary, Lady Hastings and Hungerford, was daughter-in-law of William, Lord Hastings, chamberlain of Edward IV.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

Class-mark Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 291.

Date c. 1445.

Secundo folio 'Beauchampe of Ryme'.

Scribe(s) Five hands.

Scribe A: fols 1r-93v.
Scribe B: fols. 93v-120v.
Scribe C: fols. 121r-135v.
Scribe D: fol. 136r.

Script
Scribe A: anglicana formata.
Scribe B: this scribe uses different letter forms for 'w', 't', etc. and letters taller in relation to width; could be same hand writing different font, or could be a second hand in the manuscript.
Scribe C: a spikier hand than the others, but still anglicana formata. The 'h' tends to separate at the top (see fol. 121r). When at the end of a word there is an oblique stroke curving backwards.
Scribe D: a late fifteenth-century hand.

Decoration Fols. 1v-3r and margins of fols. 4r-17r depict the pedigree of the Chalons family; well-drawn coats of arms in a range of colours; alternating red and blue paraphs.

Illumination Begins fol. 1v with 4-line blue initial with white highlights, on illuminated gold ground with foliage patterns inside letter and on ground outside letter extending into margin (as does the gold ground), with sprays to top and left margins; smaller similar letters on fol. 3v; fol. 4v: 4-line red initial with white highlights on similar gold ground with solid border down left side; and on fol. 5r, 5-line pink initial with similar ground and decoration with full solid border in blue, red, pink, gold. Smaller 2-line illuminated gold initials on pink and blue grounds with white highlights that follow shape of letter, no sprays or tendrils.

Measurements page 255-172mm.
writing 165-120mm.

Material Vellum with paper flyleaves.

Ruling Yes. Prickings are visible on the outer margins.

Frame 2 verticals, 4 horizontals enclosing top and bottom lines, extending to margin, and ruled inside square.

Lines per page 24-25.

Pagination Modern – begins at flyleaves.

Number of leaves iii+136+i.

Number of quires 17.

Collation In eights.

Catchwords Yes, by scribe, in far lower inside corner, with small black sleigh beneath.

Signatures Yes - in lower right corner of rectos, first half of quire, letters and roman numerals, but unusually the letter is beneath the roman numerals: e.g., 'ii' over 'e' on fol. 37r; because of cropping, only roman numerals remain for some quires, no signatures at all for others.

Binding Post-medieval leather binding with the Douce arms.

---

21 This scribe also wrote BL, MS Egerton 2863, a copy of the Canterbury Tales, BL., MS Harley 45, a prose Speculum vitae and Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, MS Eng. 3. I am grateful to Professor Mooney for this information. The scribe has a south-west Midlands dialect; G.A. Lester (ed), The Earliest English Translation of Vegetius' De re militari (Heidelberg, 1988), p. 41.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of  
*De re militari*

Contents

1. Genealogy of the Chalons family with heraldic illustrations (fols. 1r-3v).

Title ‘The Pee de gree of chalouns’.

Incipit ‘the grete Erle of Chalons’.

Explicit ‘lord of peltimore’.

2. The prose translation of Vegetius *De re militari* (fols. 4r-120v), without title.

Incipit ‘Here bygynnyth a schort tretys’.

Explicit ‘This is his name þat turned þis book fro Latyn to Englisshe [translator’s rebus] toun’.

Other comments

The prose translation has been corrected. There have been several insertions into the text in darker ink where the scribe either made a mistake or an omission.

3. An English translation of a French ‘Lapidary’: a guide to the properties of precious stones (fols. 121r-135v), without title.

Incipit ‘for the loue of philippe kyng of ffraunce that God hath in his kepyng was made this boke’.

Explicit ‘shal not be overcome in no bataiJe’.

4. A guide to judging a good horse (fol. 136r).

Title ‘Maister how schall a man knowe a hors of gode entaill’.

Incipit ‘the hors of gode entaille schall haue lytell heed’.

Explicit ‘and sykerer of foote’.

Early owner(s)

The first owners of this manuscript may have been the Chalons family of Challonsleigh in Plympton, Devon. The note ‘This book was wrote in the life time of Robert Chalons, son of Robert Chalons, by Joanne Beauchamp... and I take it this Robert dyed 23 H6’ is written in a seventeenth-century hand on fol. vi. The manuscript also contains a genealogy of the Chalons family with heraldic illustrations on fols. 1r-3v and contains a reference to ‘Robert Chalouns knyght that now is’ on fol. 3v. Sir Robert Chalons was the son and heir of Robert Chalons and Joan, daughter of John Beauchamp.22 He died in 1445, so the manuscript must have been made at some point shortly before then.

After the Chalons, this book came into the possession of John Smert, who was Garter King of Arms from 28 March 1450 to 1478. According to Lester, ‘an erased inscription on fol. 136r, partially visible under ultraviolet light’, says ‘Iste liber constat Joham Smert, alias dictus Garter Regi Armorum’ and ‘Liber Gartier Regis Armorum’ is also written on the initial vellum flyleaf.23 The manuscript may have first been owned by Smert’s father in law, William Bruges, 1st Garter King of Arms (d. 1449); beneath the defaced shield on fol. 1r are the words ‘WB[P] book’.

---

Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of
De re militari

Class-mark  Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS
Laud Misc. 416.

Date  The prose translation portion of the
manuscript is dated to 1459.

Scribe(s) One. The prose translation ends
with the note 'Scriptum Rhodo per Johannem
Newton die xxv Octobris 1459' on fol. 226v.

Script  Bastard secretary, written in a
professional hand.

Decoration  Only in the form of rubrics and
some flourishes. The decoration for all of the
texts is different, which suggests that it was
produced in booklet format. Items 1 and 2 are
not decorated; item 3 has blue and red penwork; item 4: title in red, red and black
rope design for chapter headings; items 5, 6
and 7 are not decorated.

Measurements
page  210x300mm.
writing  128x200mm.

Material  Paper. Watermark similar to Briquet
2064 dated to Perpignan 1464. The prose
translation has a different watermark similar to
Briquet 2405 (1463).

Frame  2 verticals and 2 horizontals.

Ruling  Items 1-4 are not ruled whereas items
5-7 are ruled in drypoint, with no prickings
visible.

Lines per page
Items 1 and 2: 36 lines/6 stanzas.
Item 3: 46 lines/2 columns.
Item 4: 42 lines.
Item 5: 40 lines/2 columns.
Items 6 and 7: 36 lines/5 stanzas.

Pagination  Two – medieval and modern. The
medieval foliation has been added in Roman
numerals, beginning at xxxvii, thus the
manuscript is missing 37 folios.

Number of leaves  289.
Number of quires  23.

Collation  18, 212312, 412, 512 (wants 9),
612, 714, 816, 916, 1016, 1114, 1216, 1314 (wants 6,
7), 14141 // Booklet one 1512 (wants 9), 1612,
1712, 18121 // Booklet two 1912, 20121 // Booklet
three 2112, 2212, 2314 (wants 14).

Catchwords  Yes in rectangular boxes.

Signatures  None for the prose translation,
but there are some elsewhere. The Siege of
Thebes has signatures which start with an ‘a’,
thus supporting the view that the manuscript
was constructed in booklet format, as does The
Secrets of Philosophers.

Binding  Medieval. The binding supports were
set in channels on the outside of the wooden
boards, where they were nailed. Pegs were also
used to strengthen the board attachments.

Contents
1. Text on the Ten Commandments (fols. 1-
34), without title.

Incipit  ‘And that will I preve by a lytill fable’.

Explicit  ‘Explicit the x commaundemcnt’.

2. Peter Idly's Instructions to his Son (fols. 35r-
65v).

Title  ‘Here begynneth a tretyce of the vij
dedly synnys’.

Incipit  ‘Of the vii dedly synnys now will I
telle’.

Explicit  ‘wherefor thu ast wth out help or
socour’.

3. Cursor Mundi (fols. 66r-181v).

Title  ‘Here begynneth the boke of stories
callid Cursor Mundi’.

Incipit  ‘Men lykyn jestis for to here/ And
romance rede in diuers manere’.

Explicit  ‘Explicit Cursor Mundi’.
Other comments
There is a 'calendariurn' preceding the text with page references.

4. The prose translation of Vegetius *De re militari* (fols. 182r-226v), without title.

**Incipit** 'here begynnyth a short tretyce the which vigesyous that was the worshipfull'.

**Explicit** 'space of oure amendyng and his face to se at our endyng; amen.'

Other comments Misses sections of the text which correspond to G.A. Lester (ed.), *The Earliest Middle English Translation of Vegetius' De re militari* (Heidelberg, 1988), p. 73, line 31 - p. 77, line 27, due to the loss of one leaf.

5. Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes* (fols. 227r-254v).

**Title** No original title. A later fifteenth-century hand wrote 'The sege of thebes' in top right margin.

**Incipit** 'Whan bright phebus passid was the ram/ mid of aprell & in the bull cam'.

**Explicit** 'Here endith the destruccion of Thebes'.

Other comments on the text(s) This is a booklet as well. There was a full leaf left blank between the end of the *Siege of Thebes* and the *Secrets of Philosophers*.


**Title** 'This is the book of the gouernaunce of kynges and pryncis'.

**Incipit** 'god all mighty saue & confermeoure kyng'.

**Explicit** 'ffor werre shuld be last of thy werkes Explicit'.

Other comments on the text(s) Finishes at the same point as BL, MSS Arundel 59 and Harley 2251 on stanza 352.


**Title** 'Of the assemble of the byrdis on Seint Volantins day'.

**Incipit** 'The lyf so short the craft so long to lerne'.

**Explicit** 'The which I gan astonyed to behold'.

Other comments *The Parliament of Fowls* was perhaps once complete, as the manuscript is certainly missing one folio at the end, and perhaps lacks more quires.

Owner(s) On the rear pastedown is the name 'syster Anne colvylle', together with the note: 'of your charyte pray for sustyr Clementia trysburgh'. Anne Colville was a nun at Syon in the early sixteenth century. Colville and Thasebrough are named in a 1518 list of Syon nuns.24

On fol. 1r 'Liber Guilielmi Laud Archiepiscopo Cantuarii et cancellari Universitatis Oxon 1633'.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Prose Translation of <em>De re militari</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class-mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundo folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribe(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of quires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchwords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Owner(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 Scott identifies other examples of this artist, whom she dates to the late 1440s, in Tokyo, Waseda University Library, MS NE 3691 (Nicholas Love's *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*); K.L. Scott, 'The Illustration and Decoration of the Manuscripts of Nicholas Love's *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*, in S. Oguro et al (eds.), *Nicholas Love at Waseda* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 61-86.
Appendix B

Codicological descriptions of manuscripts containing the verse translation of *De re militari*
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Verse Translation of
*De re militari*

Class-mark Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 243.

Date s. xv³

Secundo folio ‘whil te deum’.

Scribe(s) One.

Script: Secretary, with some anglicana forms.

Decoration Coloured initials, rubrics. Penwork in script in red. Stanzas marked ‘a to h’.

Measurements page 241x166mm.
writing 164x95mm.

Material Parchment.

Ruling Yes. No prickings visible.

Frame 2 verticals and 2 horizontals.

Lines per page 28.

Pagination No.

Number of leaves 56.

Number of quires 8.

Collation In eights.

Catchwords Yes. In box in red and brown.

Signatures No.

Binding Post-medieval.

Contents

1. *Knyghthode and Bataile*. This probably had an index which may have been in a separate, now lost, quire (fols. 1r-56r).

Title ‘Of knyghthode and bataile’ (fol. 3r).

Incipit ‘Salve festa dies’.

Explicit ‘ner multiplye. finis’.

Owner(s) Wakelin has argued that the manuscript may have been owned by the family of William and Ralph Hastings.¹ The place names ‘glyntham’ and ‘brantynghorp’ are written in the manuscript and it contains a warrant dated ‘in the xxiith yere of our [Henry VIII’s?] Reyn’ at Woking. The warrant requests servants ‘within my park at wansted’ to deliver to ‘Richard Arture’ a ‘sprinkke of seafun’ from the estate. William, Lord Hastings (c.1430-1483) owned land in Bruntingthorpe, Leicestershire while his brother, Ralph Hastings (d. 1495) owned Wansted Park, Essex.²

---

² Wakelin, ‘The Occasion, Author and Readers of *Knyghthode and Bataile*.'
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Verse Translation of *De re militari*

| Class-mark | London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus A XXIII. |
| Date       | s. xv³. |
| Secundo folio | 'Themanaul this lord'. |
| Scribe(s)  | One. |
| Script     | Bastard secretary. |
| Decoration | Blue and red ink decoration at beginning of each book only. |
| Measurements |  
| page       | 214x140mm [cropped]. |
| writing    | 160x90mm |
| Material   | Paper. The watermarks are most like Briquet 9181-83 (1464, 1467 and 1472). |
| Ruling     | No. No prickings visible. |
| Frame      | 2 verticals and 2 horizontals ruled in drypoint. |
| Lines per page | 28 (four stanzas). |
| Pagination | Modern. |
| Number of leaves | i +56+ i. |
| Number of quires | 7. |
| Collation  | 1-78a. |
| Catchwords | Yes. For example, '3 quair' on fol. 25v. |
| Signatures | No. |
| Binding    | Post-medieval. |
| Contents   | 1. *Knyghthode and Bataile* (fols. 1r-56r) with a table of contents added by the scribe on fols. 54r-56v. |
|            |  

Title  | [Torn] 'knyghthode and bataile'. |

Incipit | '[s]omtyme it was the gise'. |

Explicit | 'That neith he take of ner'. |

Other comments | The scribe corrected the text in 41 places.³ |

Early owner(s) | 'Constat Edwardo Hatteclif' (fol. 57r). The scribe wrote 'Finis libri' on fol. 56v which was then finished in Greek with 'qvod ετεχλω' written in another hand. |
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the Verse Translation of
De re militari

Class-mark Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 45.

Date s.xv³

Secundo folio Torn.

Scribe(s) One.

Script Bastard secretary.

Decoration Blue and red with gold. Running titles; each stanza is lettered.

Measurements page 135x205mm. writing 80x140mm.

Material Parchment.

Ruling No. No prickings visible.

Lines per page 28 (4 stanzas).

Pagination No.

Number of leaves Originally 56. There are 26 leaves now extant. It is missing fols. 8-17, 24-40, 44-45.

Number of quires Presumably 7.

Collation Presumably in eights.

Catchwords None visible, but it has been trimmed extensively.

Signatures None visible.

Binding Post-medieval.

Contents

1. Knyghthode and Bataile (fols. 1r-56r)

Title 'of knyghthode and bataile'.

Incipit 'sumyyme it was the gise'.

Explicit 'neither he take of ner multiplie'.

This is bound with three other manuscripts:


iv) Eight books of astrology written by John Glanvill, Lincoln's Inn about 1610.

Early Owner(s) The name 'William Browne' is written in the margin of fol. 42r.
Appendix C

Codicological descriptions of manuscripts containing the R translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class-mark</th>
<th>Cambridge, St. John's College MS 76. D. I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>s.XV(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundo folio</td>
<td>'so moch'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribe(s)</td>
<td>Two. Scribe A: fols. 1r-43r, fols. 56r-91r. Scribe B wrote only first quire of the Treatise of Hope (fols. 43r-56r).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Two anglicana hands of the third quarter of the fifteenth century. The 'a' is always double compartment and always much larger than the other letters. Hardly any hairlines. The letters 'v', 'h' and 'd' curve to the left. Not so many forms of secretary, 'g' and 'b' are still in tact. Scribal mark for the first scribe who tends to place 'n' marks round his rubrics like the Hengrwt-Ellesmere scribe. In scribe A's second bout there seem to be more secretary forms. Government trained scribe — almost certainly London.(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td>Red rubrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>Gaps left for miniatures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements</td>
<td>page 290x180mm. writing 145x209mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Parchment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruling</td>
<td>Visible prickings. Ruled throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>4 horizontals. 3 verticals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per page</td>
<td>Scribe A - 40 lines. Scribe B - 29 lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagination</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of leaves</td>
<td>91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of quires</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>18^3-48^3, 51^0 / 6^4, 7^4, 8-10^4, 11^8 (wants 7), 12^4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchwords</td>
<td>Yes, by both scribes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signatures</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Post-medieval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>1. The R translation of Chartier's Quadrilogue Invectiv (fols 1r-27r) — without title and prologue. Incipit 'Inc. quadrologium [inuectuum]' word in brackets added later. Explicit 'by good exortacion than for repref to any persone'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. English translation of Chartier's Familiar Dialogue Between the Friend and the Fellow (fols. 27v-41v). Title 'A famylyer dyaloge of the ffrende and the ffelowe vppon the lamentable compleynte of the Calamyte of ffraunce'. Incipit 'What ys yt my moste trysty ffrende'. Explicit 'Here endeth the famylyer dialogue of the ffrende and the ffelowe vppon the lamentable compleynte of the Calamyte of ffraunce'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. English translation of Chartier's Treatise of Hope (fols. 43r-91v), without title. Incipit 'In the tenttith yere of my sorull exyle'. Explicit 'as thei served god and dyde dewe sacrifycye to the dyuynte'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) I am grateful to Professor Mooney for looking at this manuscript with me.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the R translation of the
Quadrilogue Invectif

Other comments on the texts
The copy of the Familiar Dialogue is written as continuous prose, but the names of the
speakers are written in red and are underlined.
The Treatise of Hope, unlike other copies of this text, is not written in two columns.

Early Owner(s) On fol. 42r, in a hand of the second half of the fifteenth century,
there is the note 'be et knone to aull men that I Robert Aulbrow as bout of thomas [rade?] off [...] xxti bag'. His name could refer to one of the villages of Alburgh, Aldborough or Aldbrough in Norfolk and Yorkshire.2 The same hand may have written: 'In nomine patris & filij & speritus sancti amen ad rober' on fol. 75v. Just above this, the same hand wrote: 'In nomyne patrys et fyllyy et speritus sancty amen sayd robt stotterd'. 'This is Thomas Allottes book' is written upside down in the bottom margin of fol. 75v in a sixteenth-century hand and again on fol. 42r. The names Thomas Taylur and Thomas Smyth also appear on fol. 16r.

Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the R translation of the 
Quadriologue Invectif

Class-mark Chicago, Newberry Library, MS f.36, Ry 20.3

Date 6.xv  

Seundo folio 'vertu and lett'.

Scribe(s) Items 1-3 at written in at least two hands. Item 5 written by J. Clynton: 'Per dominum J. Clynton priorem scriptum 148(?).'

Script Items 1-3 in secretary media incorporating many anglicana traits.

Decoration Items 1-3 — red initials historiated with human faces, acorn and oak leaves. Red initials and paraphs throughout.

Measurements page trimmed to 305x241mm. writing 200x150mm.

Lines per page 38-40 long lines

Pagination Modern.

Catchwords Yes

Material Parchment.

Ruling Prickings visible. Frame ruled in pen.

Number of leaves i+243.

Number of quires 26.

Collation 110 (wants 1), 2-510, 612, 710, 8-118, 12-1712, 1810, 19-258, 268 (2-7 stubs).

Binding 17th century.

Contents

1. The R translation of the Quadriologue Invectif (fol. 1r-23r), without title.4

Incipit 'The ryght high and excellent'.

Explicit 'than for reprefe to any persone'.


Title 'A famylyer dialoge of the ffsrende and ffelawe vppon the lamentacyon of the miserable calamyte of ffraunce'.

Incipit 'what is it my most trusty frende'.

Explicit 'here endeth the ffamylyer dialogue of the ffsrende and the ffelawe vppon the lamentable compleynt of the calamyte of ffraunce'.

3. The English translation of Chartier's Treatise of Hope (fol. 33r-78), without title.

Incipit 'In the xth yere of my sorofowlc exile'.

Explicit 'yet for to come'.

4. English translation of Boethius' De consolatione philosophiae (fol. 78r-204r), without title.

Incipit 'The whyle that rome regnyng'.

Explicit 'do be holde plenly.'

---

Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the R translation of the *Quadrilogue Invectif*

5. '[R]capitulacio quinque librorum Boecii de consolacione philosophie’ (fols. 205v-207v).

**Incipit** 'Tempore theodorici regis’.

**Explicit**
‘Explicit recapitulacio humn librorum boecii de consolacione philosophie’.

6. Woodville’s *Dicts and Sayings* (fols. 207v-241r), without title.

**Incipit**
‘Incipit prologus de dictis philosophorum’.

**Explicit** ‘Explicit de dictis philosophorum’.

**Owner(s)**
‘Christoforus Lincolne Monachus’ is written in red on the front pastedown – in fifteenth-century textualis. The final letter is historiated with the face of a monk – perhaps representing the scribe or the rubricator.

Owned by Thomas Sowthen – an indenture between him and John Craven dated 1574 can be found on fol. 98r.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the R translation of the *Quadrilogue Invectif*

Class-mark  London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS Arc.L.40.2/E.43.

Date  s.xv³

Secundo folio 'the grete pottis yf they like hym'.

Scribe(s)  One.

Script  Cursive hand of the mid-fifteenth century.

Decoration  The occasional red rope design.

Measurements

page  200x270mm.
writing  140x205mm.

Material  Parchment.

Ruling  No. No prickings visible.

Frame  2 verticals and 2 horizontals.

Lines per page  26-30.

Pagination  Modern.

Number of leaves  ii+90+ii.

Number of quires  8.

Collation  1-412, 512 (wants 11, 12), 610, 712, 810 (wants 9, 10).

Catchwords  No.

Signatures  Yes.

Binding  Post-medieval.

Contents

1. The R translation of *Quadrilogue Invectif* (fols. 1r-39r), without title.

Incipit 'to the right high and excellent mageste'.

Explicit 'enhaunce the'.


Title  'A Famylyer Dyaloge of the Freende and the Felaw vppon the Lamentacion of the Myserable Calamyte of Fraunce'.

Incipit  'What ys yt, my moste trusty frende'.

Explicit  'Here endeth the famylyer dialogue of the frende and the fellow vppon the lamentable compleynt of the calamyte of Fraunce'.


Incipit  'Inn the tenthe yere of my sorrowfull exile'.

Explicit  'did due sacrifice to the dyvinite'.

Early Owner(s)

'Explicit Peter IdyU' on the flyleaf.
'Ihon Smythe of Sussex' on fol. 53v in a sixteenth-century hand.
Class-mark Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson A 338.

Date s.XV3.

Secundo folio 'of masonry'.

Scribe(s) One, but very irregular for the first nine folios or so. Fol. 111r-v contains the scribal note 'qui scripsit monumen sit benedictus Amen/ Nomen scriptoris dei gracia plenus amoris/ Careat meroris deus det sibi omnibus horis/ A tetras grece Tetralogus sit tibi dictus/ Est tetras quatuor grece, logos est quoque sermo/ A quibus dictis opus hoc trahit sibi nomen/ Quod patet in capite horum versuum tibi certe'. There are corrections throughout the text, made by the same hand.

Script Anglicana. Elongated ascenders.

Decoration Illuminated capitals at the beginning of each section, in pink and blue with white. Gold cones in sprays from capitals. Leaf and flower designs. Scribe has added decoration of his own — men and dog's face as extensions of certain letters.

Artists Scott thinks that the borders in Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 55 (calendar, diocese of Norwich), produced in Norfolk after 1471 and Oxford, Keble College, MS 32 (Walsingham Breviary), were produced in the same workshop as the borders in this manuscript and concludes that the border style 'certainly supports a regional location'.

Measurements page 350x280mm. writing 265x175mm.

Material Parchment.

Ruling In red. No prickings visible.

Contents 1. The R translation of Chartier's Quadrilogue Invectif (fol. 1r-33v), without title.

Incipit 'To the ryght high and excellent'.

Explicit 'thanne for any repref to any persone'.

2. An English translation of Chartier's Treatise of Hope (fol. 33v-111r), without title.

Incipit 'Inn the tenth yere of my sorrowfull exile'.

Explicit 'did due sacrifice to the dyvinite'.

Owner(s) The Heydon family.

Other comments Extensive notes on fol. 111v-12r in a late fifteenth/early sixteenth century hand.


6 See chapter three, p. 117.
Appendix D

Codicological descriptions of manuscripts containing the U translation of Chartier's Quadrilogue Invectif
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the U translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif

Class-mark  Oxford, University College, MS 85.

Date  s.xv

Secundo folio 'the lordshippis'.

Scribe(s)  One. Ricardus Franciscus. He wrote phrases in his ascenders 'prenes en gre', 'Belle la vigne' and 'ave maria gratia plena'.

Franciscus has been identified in twelve other manuscripts: 1 Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc 570 (Christine de Pizan's Œuvre de Othea and the Livre des quatre vertus belonging to Sir John Fastol); 2 San Marino, Huntington Library, MS HM 932 (Statutes of the Archdeaconry of London); London Tallow Chandler's Company, Grant of Arms, dated 1456; 3 BL, MS Harley 4775 (Legenda Aurea); Philadelphia, Rosenbach Museum, MS 439/16 (Lydgate's Fall of Princes); PML, MS M 126 (Gower's Confessio Amantis); Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 789, fols. 1r-5r (Exercitita notaria); 4 CSJC, MS H.5 (Scrope's translation of the Œuvre d'Othea); 5

1 The most recent list of his productions can be found in K.L. Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts: 1390-1490 (London, 1997), 2: 318-19.
2 Kathleen Scott listed Bodl. Lib, MS Laud Misc 570; San Marino, Huntington Library, MS HM 932; OUC, MS 85; Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 764 in 'A Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Illuminating Shop and its Customers', Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institute 31 (1968): 170.

Script  French batarde.

Decoration  Scott describes the decoration as follows: 'Broad margins; pink ruling; titles in red; catchwords in scrolls; calligraphic ascenders on first letters of titles and explicits; three-line gold letters on rose/blue ground with two short sprays of green feathering ending in a gold pine cone and a small spray of greenery with a gold ball with stacked lobes half-tinted in green, two full bar borders with fantastic aroids at corners and midpoints, with densely drawn feathering between, filled with smaller painted and gold motifs'.

Illumination  Preceding the treatise is miniature illustrating the characters of the Quadrilogue Invectif. It shows the lady symbolic of France (called only the Land in this translation), who has a falling crown. Her three sons represent the three estates: the Knight leaning on his axe; the Clergy...

Nancy, Archives Départementales de Meurthe et Moselle, MS H. 80 (a copy of the Statutes of the Order of the Garter) dated 1467; Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 764, (a heraldic miscellany, which contained extracts from Honoré Bouvet's Arbre des Batailles); 7 BL, MS Harley 2915, (Book of Hours); 8 I have identified Ricardus Franciscus in CUL, MS Add. 7870 (an anonymous French translation of John of Wales' Bruevloquium de virtuibus antiquorum principum et philosophorum (fols. 5r-30v); Jean Courteauisse's French translation and gloss of Des quatre vertus cardinaux ascribed to Seneca (fols. 32r-71v) and an unidentified French text (fols. 72r-75r).

---

7 Identified in Pächt and Alexander, Illuminated Manuscripts, 1: 57.
9 Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, 2: 318.
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the U translation of the Quadrilogue Invectif

carrying a scroll and the People holding a shovel. The background bands of the miniature are decorated with the motto 'Oublier ne doy'; this same motto is in the coat of arms, which appears at the top and bottom on fol. 1r and again on fol. 35v at the beginning of the Secreta secretorum. The motto occurs twice in the decorated edges on fol. 1r. Frequent illuminated capitals. Ruled in red with names and speakers also in red. The second miniature is on fol. 35r and depicts Aristotle instructing a king who is seated on a canopied throne.

Artist(s) The 'Quadrilogue Master'. According to Scott, the 'Quadrilogue Master' was probably responsible for the first miniature of the Lydgate text in Philadelphia, Rosenbach Museum, MS 439/16 and two fifteenth-century miniatures in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.4.16 (thirteenth-century psalter and same decorator). His style is also comparable to that of Illustrator A of Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 56, and to that of the frontispiece page of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 0.9.1 (scenes from the life of Edward the Confessor and same decorator), and a group of genealogical chronicles datable between 1467-1475.10

Scott has also identified the border artist with a further thirteen manuscripts. Significantly, some of these were also written by Ricardus Franciscus: BL, MS Harley 4775 (Legenda Aurea); PML, MS M 126 (Gower’s Confessio Amantis), Philadelphia, Rosenbach Museum, MS 439/16.11

The gold two line initials in this manuscript are probably by the same hand of BL, MS Harley 4775 and Bodl. Lib, MS Ashmole 764 (both written by Ricardus Franciscus).12

Measurements
page 348x253mm.
writing 208 x 140mm.

Material Parchment.
Ruling Yes. In pink.

Lines per page 28.

Pagination Modern. Paginated as pages.

Frame 4 horizontals and 2 verticals.

Number of leaves 90.
Number of quires 11.

Collation In eights.

Catchwords Yes. In scrolls.
Signatures Yes.

Binding Post-medieval.

Contents

1. The U translation of Chartier’s Quadrilogue Invectif (fols. 1r-35r).

Title ‘The prologue of the treyte folowing entitle and called the quadriloge of Aleyn Charietere secretarie somtyme to the Kynge of Fraunce’.

Incipit ‘To the moost high and excellent’.

Explicit ‘by good exhortacion more than for any repreef. Explicit’.

2. The Secret of Secretes - English translation of the Secreta secretorum (fols. 35v-68r), without title.13

10 Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, 2: 319.
12 Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, 2: 319.
13 Hamer argues that the spellings of the first two texts are so similar that they may have been copied from the same exemplar; R. Hamer, ‘Spellings of the Fifteenth-Century Scribe Ricardus Franciscus’, in E.G. Stanley and D. Gray (eds.), Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A
Descriptions of Manuscripts containing the U translation of the
Quadrilogue Invectif

Incipit 'Here begynneth the Booke of the
Gouernaunce of kinges and princes called
the Secret of Secreetes whiche was first
made by Aristotle to kyng Alexander'.

Explicit 'and than holde the on the parte
and moost profitable Explicit'.

3. 'These iij consideracions' (fols. 68v-90r).

Title 'These iij consideracions beth
Right necessarie to the good gouernaunce
of a prince'.

Incipit 'This is conuenient and Reson
requirith that euery prince estate or greete lord'.

Explicit 'which more largely and pleneurly
entretith of this matiere. Explicit'.

Early owner(s)
The manuscript contains a badge on fol. 1r
showing 'a man's arms embowed, clothed,
azure, supporting between the hands a
wheatsheaf, proper, above a green mound'
with a motto on scroll below.14 It has been
suggested that this manuscript was owned
by the Wheatley family of Echingfield,
Sussex, or a member of the Garneys family
but, given the form of the badge, the
Whetehill family seems more likely.15

In the mid-sixteenth century the
manuscript was in the possession of
Michael Otthew, whose French and Latin
verses appear on fol. 90v: 'Maximilianii
secundi, Caesaris semper Augusti, Mediecus
et Chirurgus ordinarius, Artium et physice
Medicine Doctor'. On fol. 1v his French

Festschrift for Eric Dobson (Cambridge, 1983),
pp. 63-73.

14 M. Blayney (ed.), Fifteenth-Century English
Translations of Alain Chartier's Le Traité de
l'Esperance and Le Quadrilogue Invectif, 2 vols,
EETS, original series 270, 281 (1974, 1980),
2: 40.

15 Blayney (ed.), English Translations of Le
Quadrilogue Invectif, 2: 40; K.L. Scott, Later
Gothic Manuscripts: 1390-1490 (London,
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Codicological description of the manuscript containing the English translation of Pizan's *Livre du corps de policie*
Description of the English translation of Pizan's
Livre du corps de policie

Classmark Cambridge, University
Library, MS Kk. 1.5.

Date s. xv

Secundo folio 'shall be'.

Scribe(s) One, localisable to the southeast Midlands.¹

Script Secretary. The first few words of each chapter are in fere-textura script, with some letters of secretary i.e. elongated ascenders.

Decoration fol. 1r, 12-line blue initial with white cut-out highlights, on gold ground, with coat of arms inside letter; sprays from corners; 6-line gold initial below on parti-coloured ground of blue and purple-red with white highlights, sprays into margins to form a full border. Blue and red line initials.

Measurements
page 270-198mm.
writing 190-130mm.

Material Paper.

Ruling Ink. No prickholes visible.

Frame Square in brown crayon.

Lines per page 37-41.

Pagination Modern.

Number of leaves 81 (last two blank but ruled).

Number of quires 8.

Collation 1¹⁰, 2-7¹², 8¹⁰.

Catchwords No.

Signatures Yes - signed a-g.

Binding medieval brown leather over boards.

Contents

1. English translation of the Livre du corps de policie (fols. 1r-81r), without title.

Incipit 'Here begynneth the boke whiche is called the body of polycye'.

Explicit 'Here endyth the boke of the body of polocye'.

Other comments

A reader has added notes in the margins in English and three dots as trefoil with 'stem' extending below them in margins. There are two annotators – the most prolific dates from the late fifteenth/ early sixteenth century.

The codex as a whole seems to have been rushed– the colours bleed and the signatures were done incorrectly though corrected.

Owner(s) A member of the Haute family. The incipit begins with a large blue initial H, set on gold and enclosing a shield. The first and third quarters contain the coat of arms of the Kentish family of Haute, whereas the second and fourth quarters contain the coat of arms of the Shelving family also of Kent.

Appendix F

Codicological descriptions of the manuscript containing
William Worcester's Boke of Noblesse
Description of *The Boke of Noblesse*

Class-mark London, British Library, MS Royal 18.B.XXII.

Date s. xv\(^3\). After 1461.

Secundo folio 'lamentacions of youre'.

Scribe(s) One.

Script Cursive – an 's' like an uppercase modern 'b'; ascenders on 'h', 'b' curve to the right.

Decoration Paraphs in red and black. A four line-line initial 'H' with green penwork at the beginning of the text and two-line red initials. Chapter headings are underlined and written in a larger script.

Measurements page 283x205mm. writing 175x125mm.

Material Paper.

Ruling No visible prickings.

Frame 2 verticals and 2 horizontals.

Lines per page 31.

Pagination Modern.

Number of leaves iii (vellum)+43+ii (vellum)

Number of quires 4.

Collation 1\(^{12}\), 2\(^{12}\), 3\(^{12}\) (wants 2, 11, 12), 4\(^{12}\) (wants 10, 11, 12). Leaves are missing after fols. 25r, 33r.

Catchwords No.

Signatures Two types of quire signatures. The first quire signatures were made in red starting with ‘+i’, the second set are in black, signed ‘a-g’. Then the second hand took over and continued the first method of signing.

Binding Eighteenth-century.

Contents

1. William Worcester’s *Boke of Noblesse* (fol. 1r-42r).

Title 'The boke of noblesse compiled to the most hygh and myghty prince kyng Edward [harry crossed out, written in brown] the ivth [the vith had been written in red and was crossed out] for the avauncing and preferring the comun publique of the royaumes of England and of Fraunce'.

Incipit 'first in the worship'.

Explicit 'Here endyth thys epistle undre correcccion the xv day of june the yeere of crist iiiiiixxv and of the noble regne of kyng Edward the iii the xv'.

Owner(s) Long marginal additions are made in the hand of William Worcester.

On the flyleaf, in a late fifteenth/early sixteenth-century hand, is the name Symond Samson; on fol. 35r, in a sixteenth-century hand, is the name Robert Savyle. On fol. 42v notes contain the names 'Symeon Samson', 'Richard Dyconson', 'Edward Jones of Clementes in' and the verse John Twychener ys boke/ he that stellys thys booke/ he shall be hangid a pon a hoke/ that wyll macke ys necke to bmk-e/ and that wyll macke ys neck awryc', and 'A nyes wyffe and a backe dore/ majythe outoun tymys a rychc man pore'.

Belonged also, according to the note on fol. 42v, to Edward Banyster and to John, Lord Lumley.
Description of *The Boke of Noblesse*

Other comments
Two paper leaves from an old binding contain: 1) Original letter of John Appulton, captain of Le Pontdonné and La Haye du Puits to Sir John Fastolf, asking for a grant of one of his seigneuries in Normandy. Reference is made to the recent loss of Granville [1450]. Dated La Haye du Puits, 31 May; 2) A letter from the bailiffs of Winchester asking for a writ to compel the farmers of awnage duties to pay their dues.¹

¹ Both of these letters are printed in [William Worcester], *The Boke of Noblesse*, ed. J.G. Nichols (London, 1860), p. lvi.
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