Chivalry and Courtly Love: Cultural Shifts, Gender Relations, and Politics in early Tudor Court Culture

Hilary Jane Locke

M.Phil Candidate

The University of Adelaide

Department of History, School of Humanities

February 2019

Contents

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to explore and uncover the strong presence chivalry had during the development of the early Tudor dynasty, particularly following the end of the Wars of the Roses and into the early modern era. It seeks to answer the questions of how prevalent the phenomena of chivalry and courtly love were during the transition from the medieval to the early modern period, as well as their importance in the political and dynastic foundations of the Tudor dynasty. Further, the work aims to examine what chivalry and courtly love reveals about gender, politics, and social dynamics during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. In the foundations of his reign, Henry VII craved dynastic stability, legitimacy, and monarchical power. In establishing his dynasty, Henry attempted to create a legacy that emphasised the conceptual ideals of chivalry, and courtly love, as critical for strength, courtly performance and politics. The thesis will argue that the early Tudor kings sought to drive cultural chivalric elements into the political, and dynastic foundations of the early Tudor public sphere. It will explore how chivalric and courtly love ideals created a framework for conversation and behaviour, gauging how gender roles were perceived and performed by courtiers during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Chivalry's place in Tudor court culture has been considerably understated, discussed as a cultural undertone, and not properly contextualised. By focussing on this cultural ideal in early Tudor court life, the thesis will argue chivalric discourse was crucial to both kings and courtly performance.

Thesis Statement

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

SIGNED: __ _____DATE: _____ 21/02/2019 _____

For:

My Mum, Jane Locke

My Grandma, Kath Edgecombe (1935-2014),

My Dad, John Robert Locke (1954-2015),

My Co-supervisor, Heather Kerr (1957-2019)

and Logan Niblock

Acknowledgements

There have been many challenges and hard times throughout the writing of this thesis and there are many people that deserve recognition for the help and support extended to me. First of all, my supervision team, Professor David Lemmings and Dr. Heather Kerr, have dedicated with their time, advice, editing skills and help. Most importantly, they have been incredibly patient as I have dealt with struggles (both personal and academic) and multi-tasking over the length of my candidature. I would also like to thank Dr. Claire Walker, who's conversations directed my research interests, and her dedication as the postgraduate coordinator (for most of my candidature) was grounding and a constant reassurance. Professor Robin Prior has been wonderfully supportive and encouraging, reading drafts and engaging enthusiastically with my topic — also establishing a postgraduate seminar group which has given me, and everyone that participated in these evenings, such a sense of community and a renewal of motivation and purpose as we go forward in our careers. Dr. Gareth Pritchard and Dr. Tom Buchanan were also invaluable, for their commitment to student wellbeing, dedication, passion and checking up periodically with conversations and laughs along the way.

To my mother Jane Locke, thank you for the support over this on-going and long process, my grandfather Mike Edgecombe, for getting me to conferences and getting on my professional feet, Marg Edgecombe and George Popplewell for your undivided attention and interest in my research, Robert, Liam and Clare Edgecombe, and the rest of my extended family, for always asking, and taking great interest in what I am doing and where I am going. The wider history and politics postgraduate community at the University of Adelaide have been warm and friendly, all understanding the trials and problems with researching and writing a thesis. In particular, however, I have my small bunch of postgraduate colleagues and friends that I owe my warmest thanks to. The lovely people in my office, William Prescott, Justin Anthony Madden, and Astrid Lane (especially for getting me singing again), for all the times we laughed, drank, had fun, and stressed together. This is extended to Stephanie Thomson and David Milazzo. You have all been my collective rock, and I will always hold you dear to my heart. I whole-heartedly reserve a very special mention for my best and dearest friend Dr. Thomas A. Mackay: words cannot adequately express just how much your support, love, friendship, and silliness has meant to me over the last few years, in both everyday and thesis life. Further thanks goes to Dr. Kylie Galbraith, Dr. Mark Neuendorf, Daniel Ashdown, Dr. Steven Anderson, Dr. Bodie Alexander Ashton, Dr. Marina Gerzić, Yvette Wijnatis, Karina Burns, Jessica McCandless, Margaret Galbraith, Siobhan Finney, and Andi Tran. You all have my sincere thanks for the support, coffees, brunches, fun times, and chats.

Lastly, and above all, to Logan Niblock, who came into my life unexpectedly, and changed it in surprising and beautiful ways. Your kindness, support, humour, encouragement, and love has given me all that I needed to get this project finished. Thank you, I love you.

I would like to acknowledge that while this thesis was under examination my co-supervisor Heather Kerr passed away. I was deeply saddened by her passing, but extremely grateful for her influence, support, friendship, and the time I had getting to know her better during this thesis. She will be sadly missed by everyone at the University of Adelaide, and her colleagues around the world. Vale, Heather, the best co-supervisor I could have hoped for.

A Note on the Source Material

As a large number of the primary sources used in this thesis come from online databases, there has been an effort to treat them as close to the original document where possible. Therefore in the footnotes, books, pamphlets, and letters have been referenced with as much information as possible and the databased they were accessed from and the place of their original collection. The URL of used databases are within the references in the introductions and the bibliography only. Similarly, all documents from *Letters and Papers* volumes have volume notes, with the full editions listed in the Primary Sources section of the bibliography. The work, as possible, also utilises as much of the original Middle English and spelling. However, there has been some texts that needed modern translations and consequently new editions have been used.

Introduction

In 2009, to mark the 500th anniversary of Henry VIII's succession to the throne, several exhibitions opened across the United Kingdom to celebrate the life and times of this controversial king. One of these included the Henry VIII: Dressed to Kill exhibit, filled with collections of the king's personal armour, hosted by the Tower of London. Displaying the evolving styles, and figure, of Henry VIII, the exhibition included several suits made for and worn by the king from his early kingship through to his death; most notably, the armour commissioned for celebration events such as The Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520, and the field armour the king probably wore during the 1544 conflict with France.[1] The display of the suits provided clear visual evidence of how Henry VIII would have appeared and, crucially, how his body developed and changed throughout his life. His last suits, made in the 1540s, had to match his massive weight gain, making for a large and intimidating figure — the armour used for the king's May Day celebrations in 1540 measured 129 centimetres at the waist and 136 centimetres at the chest.[2]

As the exhibit showed, this armour evolved to become highly decorative and, as time progressed, largely impractical. This transition, from function to decoration, highlights the evolution of chivalry within Henry VIII's reign: the utilisation of the cultural ideal for representational employment, and a powerful tool for political and personal ends. Ironically, by the 1540s the king was bulking in his armour and weight, and could not fight on a battlefield. But the armour was continually commissioned throughout Henry VIII's reign because it formed an important political function during his kingship. Strategically, the pure power conveyed by wearing the armour was enough to keep Henry VIII commissioning these suits, regardless of the intention or ability to use them on the battlefield or jousting arena. Moreover, compacted into this one exhibition was a clear representation of the ideals of the early Tudor dynasty. The provocative nature of the armour, which aimed to project an image of magnificence, wealth and power, connects to the underlying chivalric narrative of the early Tudor dynasty. The suits were intrinsically linked with the chivalric arts of warfare, jousting and swordplay, the masculine sports of the medieval and early modern aristocratic man. Chivalry, its impact on performance and courtly life, was a powerful and effective representative tool for personal, political and masculine strength during the early Tudor period.

The aim of this thesis is to explore and uncover the strong presence chivalry had during the development of the early Tudor dynasty, particularly following the end of the Wars of the Roses and into the early modern era. It seeks to answer the questions of how prevalent the phenomena of chivalry and courtly love were during the transition from the medieval to the early modern period, as well as their importance in the political and dynastic foundations of the Tudor dynasty. Further, the work aims to examine what chivalry and courtly love reveals about gender, politics, identity, and social dynamics during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. In the foundations of his reign, Henry VII craved dynastic stability, legitimacy, and monarchical power. In establishing his dynasty, Henry attempted to create a legacy that emphasised the conceptual ideals of chivalry, and courtly love, as critical for strength, courtly performance and politics. The

---

[1] Mark Brown, 'A life in armour: how Henry VIII grew from L to XXXL: Close-fitting combat dress at Tower of London anniversary display shows Henry VIII's ballooning figure', The Guardian, April 1, 2009, https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2009/apr/01/heritage-monarchy-henry-viii

[2] Conversion from waist 51 inches, chest 54.5 inches. Brown, 'A life in armour', The Guardian.

thesis will argue that the early Tudor kings sought to drive cultural chivalric elements into the political, and dynastic foundations of the early Tudor public sphere. It will explore how chivalric and courtly love ideals created a framework for conversation and behaviour gaging how gender roles were perceived and performed by courtiers during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Chivalry's place in Tudor court culture has been considerably understated, discussed as a cultural undertone, and not properly contextualised. By focussing on this cultural ideal in early Tudor court life, the thesis will argue chivalric discourse was crucial to both kings and courtly performance.

Literature Review

Chivalry, the 'Evocative Word': Ambiguities and Definitions

It is the aim of this thesis to fill the gaps within the literature that explore chivalry in the late medieval through to the early modern period. Rejecting the idea that chivalry made a rapid decline and ended around the beginning of the sixteenth century, a frequent conclusion by historians, the work will build upon the alternative suggestion that chivalric ideals were essential to court life and cultural existence in early Tudor England, and, when explored in particular contexts, courtly love facilitated gendered interaction and performance. By taking this approach, this thesis will provide an avenue for exploring and refreshing a much-studied period of British history. As will be shown, the revival of chivalric ideals that occurred throughout the reigns of the early Tudor kings was a result of the cultural crossover alluded to in the works written by Maurice Keen, Malcolm Vale, and many others. The thesis will build upon the foundations of these suggestions, exploring with focused analysis and in-depth discussion, the anatomy of chivalry as a cultural ideal through the period from *c.*1480 through to the death of Henry VIII in 1547.

In order to understand chivalric discourse as it came to be by 1485, when Henry VII came to the throne, it is necessary to discuss the previous historical exploration of chivalry and their contexts within the literature. Broadly speaking, chivalric conduct, as it came to be recognised, represented soldierly, manly, and courtly behaviours, as they were understood amongst the upper classes throughout the medieval period. Chivalry and courtly love were crucial to the perception of masculine and feminine roles in the aristocracy, military classes, and the rising middle class. Or in other words, in medieval life chivalry informed the conceptualisation of an honourable and virtuous person throughout various areas of society. The persistence of the ideal also informed the development of certain chivalric practices in literature and society. Through romantic stories, which recalled medieval victories and tales, mostly chivalric in character, these ideals emphasised the model of chivalry and courtly love for both men and women. Indeed, the chivalric knight and the courtly lady persist in the cultural understanding and representations of the medieval period. But, chivalry, as a whole, is a problematic concept.

Consequently, chivalry is a subject often studied with awareness of ambiguity at the forefront. As Maurice Keen states in his seminal text *Chivalry*: 'chivalry is an evocative word, conjuring up images in the mind [of …] the knight fully armed […] of castles with tall towers and of the fair women who dwelt in

them'.[3] Here, Keen rightly argues that the application of stereotypical knights and common romanticism that appears in medieval texts, proves problematic for researchers and subsequent histories. Revisionist chivalric histories attempt to reappraise the romanticised concepts of chivalric ideologies from the medieval period. As Keen demonstrates, chivalry was institutionalised, as it appeared through heraldry, knighthood, and the military, these being essential structures in society. But it was also cultural, thereby influencing literature and art, which reflects the imagined idealism attached to chivalry.[4] Keen succinctly describes chivalry as 'a way of life in which we can discern these three essential facets, the military, the noble and the religious; but a way of life is a complex thing, like a living organism'.[5]

This complexity is expanded upon in the works of historians, such as Richard Kaeuper, Nigel Saul, Craig Taylor, and Malcolm Vale, who provide in-depth analysis of chivalry and explore its layered connection to broader medieval society, warfare, and violence.[6] These historians emphasise the fluid nature of chivalric concepts and their arguments represent chivalry as an adaptable concept, one that is often ambiguous, whether in the medieval context or in historical interpretation. For example, Kaeuper suggests that late medieval representations of chivalry were often sourced from chivalric handbook literature, written by those who were seeking reform.[7] This is problematic for understanding how the concept was applied to various areas of society, and there is some difficulty in assessing chivalry as a lived ideal. As Taylor explains, particularly from the researchers perspective, those wishing to investigate chivalry must be aware that the term is convoluted, heavy with inflection and personal idealism. Crucially, he goes onto argues in his work that he considers the term chivalry as 'a proper noun, to refer to the people who formed the knightly or aristocratic class, rather than to chivalric culture in its broadest sense of the ideals, norms or ethos'.[8]

Jennifer Wollock, whose work this thesis also will draw upon, assesses courtly love and chivalry together in her work *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love*.[9] Wollock has similar observations about the ambiguous nature of both concepts. She states that chivalry is flexible, whether as a standalone concept or alongside courtly love, with a legacy that is more far-reaching and complex than a study of strictly medieval chivalry can do credit.[10] Consequently, chivalry needs to be contextualised appropriately in relation to things such as cultural materials, institutions, politics, or pageantry. Wollock also asserts that, even if chivalry was a purely imagined concept, chivalry (and courtly love) should not be discredited: 'it is simply wrong to deny [chivalry and courtly love's] importance in world history and culture. Even if they are no more than mass delusions, they have to be recognised as persistent, influential, inspirational delusions, vital to the

---

[3] Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 1.

[4] Keen, *Chivalry*, 2-17.

[5] Keen, *Chivalry*, 17.

[6] Richard Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Nigel Saul, *Chivalry in Medieval England* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011); Craig Taylor, *Chivalry and the Ideals of Knighthood in France During the Hundred Years War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Malcolm Vale, *War and Chivalry: Warfare and Aristocratic Culture in England, France and Burgundy and the End of the Middle Ages* (Athen, Ga.: The University Press of Georgia, 1981).

[7] Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence,* 2.

[8] Taylor, *Chivalry and the Ideals of Knighthood*, 5.

[9] Courtly love historiography will be further examined in the Tudor literature review section and in the introduction to chapter three.

[10] Jennifer Wollock, *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love* (Santa Barbara, Cali.: Praeger, 2011), 5-12.

understanding of human psychology'.[11] Furthermore, Wollock states there is a tendency to remove one from the other: 'historians of chivalry, as a general rule, tend to shy away from courtly love. Other scholars, concentrating on courtly love, tend to leave chivalry out of the equation'.[12] It is important to consider here the consistent interplay and mutual influence of both concepts upon each other, and this work will discuss both concepts, separately and together. Indeed, this thesis insists upon the necessity of chivalry and courtly love being related to each other, and also promotes the idea of these concepts being defined in the context of cultural and historical circumstances. Overall, Wollock's discussion of the concepts informs the argument within this thesis by placing chivalric discourse, and the interplay with courtly love, at the forefront of discussion, and demonstrating how pliable the concepts were.

Moreover, as this thesis will attend to the period when historians frequently consider chivalry in decline, it is important to discuss how some texts handle the chronology of chivalry. The chivalric ideal, and the courtly love model alongside, are often discussed wholly within the Middle Ages, ending at *c.*1500. Consequently, there are usually two discussions that occur in the historiography. One includes the perspective taken by John A. Lynn in his work, *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture*, where he states: 'strictly speaking, chivalry *belongs only* to the latter eleventh through to the fifteenth centuries'.[13] Others have argued that the decline of chivalry was a result of the progressive professionalisation of the military, shifting from a heroic code to one of indirect chivalric ethos, accompanying the collapse of feudalism and the rise of reformist religion.[14] It is as a fundamentally militarised ideal that chivalry is often declared dead by the beginning of the early modern period.

Other works counter this narrow approach by promoting the idea of cultural crossover. In an approach which is this thesis will build upon, some texts assess the decline of chivalry as more of a cultural change rather than a disappearance. As suggested by Keen, the beginning of the early modern era brought fresh development to the chivalric ideal in the military and in a cultural sense, and he emphasises its change and progress rather than its demise.[15] Keen also notes that chivalry was increasingly important to the foundations of honour, gentlemanly conduct, and individualism which developed throughout European culture during the following centuries.[16] Like those who survey the history of chivalry towards the end of the medieval period, other historians usually emphasise the continuity of chivalric culture tropes. Malcolm Vale, for example, states in his concluding remarks, the 'Renaissance cult of honour and fame owed more than it was prepared to acknowledge to the medieval cult of chivalry'.[17]

---

[11] Wollock, *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love*, 5.

[12] Wollock, *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love*, 2.

[13] John A. Lynn, *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture* (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 2003), 78. Emphasis my own.

[14] See: D. B. J. Trim, 'Introduction' in *Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism*, ed. D. J. B. Trim (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003), 1-38; Luke MacMahon, 'Chivalry, Military Professionalism and the Early Tudor Army in Renaissance Europe: A Reassessment', in *Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism*, ed. D. J. B. Trim (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003), 183-212; Matthew Strickland, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 330-340.

[15] Keen, *Chivalry*, 239.

[16] Keen, *Chivalry*, 249-250.

[17] Vale, *War and Chivalry*, 174.

The aforementioned studies of chivalry create part of the conceptual framework which will be utilised in this thesis. Wollock and Taylor's arguments, for instance, highlights the need for chivalry to be placed and understood in its appropriate context. Furthermore, in order for chivalric and courtly love meanings and readings to be applied, it is important to note that the word, chivalry, itself as convoluted and problematic as it is, incorporates a range of concepts, ideals, ideologies and socio-political structures that rely on chivalric discourse. Ultimately, in this thesis, chivalry will be considered as a multi-layered concept, the medieval foundations of which rest in the ideal of knightly life. This culture involved being honourable, and in particular fighting for a feudal lord and the king with passionate loyalty as exemplified in contemporary handbooks and literary romances. It was expected that a knight would go to war or, in peacetimes, show his prowess and skills in jousting and swordplay tournaments, activities which developed a chivalric brand of masculine culture of male-bonding rituals and knightly institutions like the Order of the Garter and political courtliness. Like chivalry, courtly love also had its own tropes, idealised roles and models of behaviour which stemmed from the literary tradition.

Chivalry and Courtly Love in early Tudor England: Real or Romance?

Of course, in order to explore chivalry and courtly love in this work, it is crucial to assess how they have been examined in the extensive literature that covers the early Tudor period. The thesis will address and explore the place that chivalry and courtly love held within the courts of Henry VII and Henry VIII and in doing so, seeks to redress the understated role that chivalry and courtly love have within the literature. More broadly, Henry VII, Henry VIII, and the wider political and cultural contexts of their times, have been explored through extensive works over the last seven decades. But chivalry and courtly love as concepts are often mentioned only briefly. For example, the foundational biography of Henry VIII by J.J. Scarisbrick describes Henry as a man and monarch with chivalric desires, chasing honour and glory and seeking eternal chivalric fame.[18] Other subsequent works employ chivalry in a similar vein. Problematically, this larger than life representation of Henry VIII means that Henry VII is often under-represented, a historical character who often falls into the shadows of his son, lacking adequate sources. Most recently there have been several texts which reiterate these ideas, addressing the general characters and political circumstances in the reigns of both these monarchs. The most notable on Henry VII are *The Winter King* by Thomas Penn, *Henry VII* by Sean Cunningham, and *Bosworth: the Birth of the Tudors* by Chris Skidmore, all of which seek to analyse Henry VII's reign and the establishment of the Tudor dynasty.[19] Further to these works, the more recent biographies on Henry VIII, including *Henry VIII* by David Loades, *Henry VIII: The Quest for Fame* by John Guy, *So Great a Prince: England and the Accession of Henry VIII* by Lauren Johnson, *Henry VIII: The Life and Rule of England's Nero* by John Matusiak, and *Henry: Virtuous Prince* by David Starkey, explore similar

---

[18] J.J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (London: Methuen Paperbacks, 1976), pages.

[19] Thomas Penn, *The Winter King: The Dawn of Tudor England* (London: Allen Lane, 2011); Sean Cunningham, *Henry VII* (Abington: Routledge, 2007); Chris Skidmore, *Bosworth: The Birth of the Tudors* (London: Phoenix, 2014).

narratives and develop a superficial picture of Henry VIII's life and reign influenced by chivalric principles.[20]

The thesis seeks to revisit the mostly unsubstantiated, and understated, representation of chivalry and courtly love in the existing historiography. Texts frequently do not acknowledge how these ideals came to be celebrated and utilised by the time Henry VII took the throne, or how they were further employed by Henry VIII. As stated, the existing historiography on the early Tudor court actively reiterates and recycles the chivalric narrative of Henry's character, leaving the cultural context largely unexplored; often chivalry and courtly love are mentioned in throw-away statements, and recognised as culturally persistent ideals that were revealed at moments of courtly celebration. A clear example of this comes from Eric Ives' biography of Anne Boleyn. Ives portrays both chivalry and courtly love and does attempt to situate courtly love in the context of Henry VIII's court.[21] Like Wollock, Ives argues that the code of conduct affected the psychology of lovers in the early Tudor court, fully acknowledging the 'game of courtly love' was a genuinely effective way to 'regulate gender relations' acceptably.[22] However, the application of chivalry and courtly love in this context adds a sensationalised twist to the tales of love at Henry VIII's court. Another example is David Starkey's scattered references to these concepts in his work *Six Wives*, which echo the superficial tone of representation in the general histories. Starkey states that it was the 'realm of Courtly Love, with its conventions, its artefacts and its elaborate games with words' in which Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn fell in love, and he uses this to characterise Boleyn's position in Henry's eyes.[23] Chivalry and courtly love act as self-explanatory statements. Both Ives and Starkey, despite variations in their applications, convey the problematic trends regarding chivalry and courtly love in the literature: understated, misrepresented and mistreated.

There are a selection of works that examine chivalry and courtly love with a more specific focus. Steven Gunn's essay in *Chivalry in the Renaissance* covers the notion of the chivalric in political contexts.[24] This work offers a comprehensive overview of the politicisation of chivalry during the early reign of Henry VIII and how that affected the development of relationships in the intimate courtly environment. However, it is only an overview. Importantly, Gunn's chapter leaves space for further exploration of the topic, even stating: 'the relationship between chivalry and politics seems worthy of investigation'.[25] More substantially, Arthur B. Ferguson, an historian publishing throughout the latter twentieth century, placed heavy emphasis on the chivalric ideals and the romances in early modern England. Both his works, *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry* and *The Chivalric Tradition in the English Renaissance*, analyse and critically assess the importance and effect of the concept of chivalry to the courtier, society, and the idea of Englishness.[26] Ferguson's work is foundational to the ideas in this thesis, as he situates the chivalric and romantic (courtly

---

[20] David Loades, *Henry VIII* (Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2001); John Guy, *Henry VIII: The Quest for Fame* (London: Allen Lane, 2015); Lauren Johnson, *So Great a Prince: England and the Accession of Henry VIII* (London: Head of Zeus, 2016); John Matusiak, *Henry VIII: The Life and Rule of England's Nero* (Stroud: The History Press, 2015); David Starkey, *Henry: Virtuous Prince* (London: HarperPress, 2008).

[21] Eric Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 69.

[22] Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, 60-70.

[23] David Starkey, *Six Wives: The Queens of Henry VIII* (London: Vintage, 2003), 279.

[24] Steven Gunn, 'Chivalry and the Politics of the Early Tudor Court' in *Chivalry in the Renaissance* ed. Sydney Anglo (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1990): 107-128.

[25] Gunn, 'Chivalry and the Politics', 107.

[26] Arthur B. Ferguson, *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1960); Arthur B. Ferguson, *The Chivalric Tradition in the English Renaissance* (Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1986).

love) discourse within the politicised contexts of the Tudor court. He clearly presents an argument that outlines the application chivalric discourse had as an overarching cultural ideal, situating it in the historical contexts and exploring its evolution, rather than bypassing or taking it for granted. The thesis will build upon this interpretation, by exploring in-depth elements of Henry VII's and Henry VIII's reign, uncovering the significance of the ideals and shifting emphasis placed upon these concepts, unlike the histories previously mentioned.

Some historians have also questioned how exploring chivalry and courtly love constitutes a productive lens for analysing Tudor court history. This is the approach in an essay written by Retha M. Warnicke, who expands upon these notions simply to deny their place within Tudor court culture. Indeed, Warnicke states that courtly love has resulted in an unfortunate, puzzling, and archaic interpretation for gender history in the Tudor court.[27] This thesis contests her argument, stating that these ideals are extremely useful cultural contexts for exploring the early Tudor court. Moreover, these ideals are often appear to be culturally elusive to historians, as they are often ambiguous or flexible concepts, and some scholars argue there is a problem with employing them. Consequently, chivalry in particular is often referred to as a dream of Henry VIII's, something that the king chased and attempted to embody, but with little or no evidence or context to support the illusion idea.[28] Moreover, in analysis of political life, these concepts are sometimes marginalised by what is regarded as the bigger picture, being the progress towards what represents modernity. As Ferguson importantly notes: '[h]owever irrelevant the chivalric ideal may have been to those forces the historian sees at work remodeling English society in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, there is no question that it still meant something to the men of that day and that it was capable of evoking more than a romantic response'.[29] This thesis suggests how valuable and crucial these concepts were to the evolution of Tudor politics and the lives of both Henry VII and Henry VIII.

Arguably, then, there is still more to be explored: emphasising chivalry and courtly love can reveal much of the cultural life of the Tudor court. Most recently, these concepts have been employed by Suzannah Lipscomb in her essay about the gender relation crisis that saw the execution of Anne Boleyn in 1536.[30] Her essay criticises Warnicke's argument made twenty years earlier, stating rather that courtly love offers much to the interpretation of Tudor court politics. In the Tudor period, the dynamics between gender roles, particularly women's social relationships with men, were so intertwined with the concept of honour that the insulting or offending them had harsh consequences. Lipscomb's argument is the basis for extending the courtly love paradigm further to understand Tudor gender and courtly relations by asserting that these phenomena were utilised in a *political* manner. Lipscomb's analysis is comprehensive in regard to the Anne Boleyn example, although the essay is unfortunately limited by length. However, this work does provide a platform which is important to this thesis. By viewing the Boleyn case and other examples in the light of the

---

[27] See: Retha M. Warnicke, 'The Conventions of Courtly Love and Anne Boleyn' in *State, Sovereigns and Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honours of A. J. Slavin* ed. Charles Carlton, Robert L. Woods, Mary L. Robertson, and Joseph S. Block,(New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998): 103-118.

[28] See: Starkey, *Virtuous Prince*, 353; Richard Rex, *The Tudors* (Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2012), 39-44. Rex explores Henry VIII's attitude to War and Peace, drawing upon the often made link between Henry VIII wish to emulate Henry V and his victory at Agincourt.

[29] Ferguson, *Indian Summer*, 75.

[30] Suzannah Lipscomb, 'The Fall of Anne Boleyn: A Crisis in Gender Relations?' in *Henry VIII and the Court: Art, Politics and Performance* ed. Thomas Betteridge and Suzannah Lipscomb (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), 287-308.

courtly love model, like Lipscomb, the political boundaries can be examined and a fresh perspective taken on gender and gendered behaviour. And ultimately, Lipscomb's work raises further questions about how the delicate notions regarding masculine and feminine honour worked in relation to courtly love and chivalry, and what they offered men and women living at the Henrician courts at this time. This thesis will address such questions further.

Methodology, Sources & Research Questions

Theoretical Approaches: Homosociality, Gender, and Masculinity

To assist the unpacking of these often complex and ingrained ideals, the concepts of masculinity and homosociality will be employed. The thesis will explore masculinity and chivalric discourse in relation to the politically active men in the early Tudor political sphere, and consider the ways in which chivalry, and its instilled ethos, assisted the development of masculine and homosocial relationships and networks. Both masculinity and homosociality offer further layers and frameworks for assessing the relationships around chivalry and courtly love in the space created by gendered relationships. Also, in turn, they illuminate the direct effect these conventions had on contemporary behaviour. Using masculinity as a framework to assess chivalry, and the effects on political relationships and male bonding in particular, means utilising theoretical approaches from social science disciplines. Applying the approach for a history thesis, therefore, entails examining the relationship to chivalry and its applicability to the political and social spheres in contemporary court life and historical contexts. In this way, this work will show that these ingrained cultural perceptions of gender had a dramatic impact on the choices made by Henry VII when he ascended the throne.

Homosociality is defined as the relationships between men that are non-sexual or non-romantic, and which create space for meaning and bonding to take place. Simply put, masculinity is defined as the projected ideals of manhood.[31] Chivalry had a role in both of these concepts as they developed in our period. For elite medieval men, for example, masculinity manifested itself in the shared experience during battle, being away at war, or in the more formal competition of jousting tournaments. Applying the homosocial framework in relation to late medieval and early modern masculine identity can reveal how men forged their relationships and interacted with each other under the guise of chivalry. As Derek G. Neal states: 'being a man meant being present, visible, accepted among and interacting with a community of other males in the formal and informal structures of a man's immediate community: the marketplace, the guild hall, the manor court, the vestry meeting'.[32] Whilst Neal's overall analysis of masculine identity in the medieval period focuses on the chivalric only in passing, it suggests that chivalric identity filtered through into various aspects of society and being masculine was to be knightly, as well as to be actively engaged in society.

Masculinity is common in recent historical scholarship examining the late medieval and early modern period. In this thesis, a combination of social and cultural historical approaches has been used when it comes

---

[31] See: Sharon R. Bird, 'Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociality and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity', *Gender and Society* 10, no. 120 (1996): 120-132; Michael Flood, 'Men, Sex, and Homosociality: How Bonds Between Men Shape Their Sexual Relations with Women', *Men and Masculinities* 10, no. 399 (2007): 355.

[32] Derek G. Neal, *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008), 7.

to masculinity and chivalry, as the feedback between cultural material and behaviour is difficult to ignore. Examining the social behaviours of their courtiers and Henry VIII, for example, relies on understanding the cultural foundations and backgrounds to explain social interaction and expectations. The combination of social and cultural methods is a common trend in recent historical studies, particularly regarding gender. Furthermore, cultural material that mandates analysis of the performative, an outward presentation of behavioural expectations according to social circumstances, becomes poignant. As Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard state: '[h]ow historians perceive the relationship between masculinity and continuity or change depends not only on whether the emphasis is cultural or social, but on the unit of analysis itself — whether individuals, communities or groups, or the state'.[33] Also, works such as *Governing Masculinities in the Early Modern Period,* edited by Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent, offer readers a view of how focused usage of masculinity can reveal its effects on performative and political functions, as well as the nature of gender relationships in certain spheres.[34] These texts also pose the question of how masculinity shapes femininity and utilise the interlinked scholarship on both men and women's histories in cultural, political and social ways. Historical studies that focus on gender often take an approach that considers various disciplinary methods, and are therefore, more inclusive and creative than traditional studies. For example, in the introduction to *Regarding Men in the Middle Ages,* Clare A. Lees suggests that interdisciplinary perspectives build greater complexity into historical debate, particularly in the examination of gender history.[35] Interdisciplinarity will therefore be utilised in the thesis by engaging with sociological approaches to understand historical situations and settings.

Louis-Georges Tin, who explores the development of heterosexual culture from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century, uses masculinity and sexuality theories to situate chivalric culture at the heart of male friendship, or manly love, during the early medieval period. Tin argues that, as a consequence of the rise of heterosexual culture over the Middle Ages, homosocial groups were condemned, even though they remained prevalent within the literary works of the time.[36] Heterosexual culture, which slowly began to emerge from the twelfth century, 'replaced an earlier homosocial culture whose influence nonetheless endured in one form or other for several centuries to come'.[37] Tin also places strong emphasis on the same-gender relationships or spheres that were the norm for most of the medieval period: 'Men — and above all, men of action — frequently lived in a world far removed from that of womankind [and] were trained to exhibit individual courage and integrity as loyal servants and vassals of a rigid feudal order'.[38] The interdisciplinary nature of Tin's approach to describe the development of hegemonic gender cultures relates is effective, and again, this approach something this work intends to engage with throughout.

Moreover, masculinity and homosociality are also of interest when considering the chivalric model in relation to the courtly love ideals. Whether directly or indirectly, the chivalric ideal was influential on how

---

[33] Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, 'What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500-1950', *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 280

[34] Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent, 'Introduction' in *Governing Masculinities in the Early Modern Period: Regulating Selves and Others,* ed. Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent (Farnham: Routledge, 2016), 1-22.

[35] Clare A. Lees, *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages,* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), xv-xxv.

[36] Louis-Georges Tin, *The Invention of Heterosexual Culture* (Cambridge, M.A.: The MIT Press, 2012), 1.

[37] Tin, *Heterosexual Culture*, 32.

[38] Tin, *Heterosexual Culture,* 1.

men behaved to each other, to women and, in certain stations, in public life. Courtly love provides an interesting platform from which to examine both gendered responses. This model, from the male perspective, represents the courtship 'arena' where men compete to win the affections of an objectified women (exemplified by the giving of favours to women during jousting tournaments). In turn, as will be shown, women utilised courtly love to subvert their objectification by manipulating or subverting their social surroundings, although not without boundaries or consequences. The courtly love cultural convention offered men and women a safe place to converse and engage, simply through the rhetoric and practices of the courtly love ideal. Simultaneously, this often meant men indulging in conventionally feminine behaviours, such as displaying lovesickness, thereby subverting masculine expectations.[39]

Using this interdisciplinary methodology, particularly when engaging with masculinity and gender, facilitates a deeper understanding of the historical and sociological contexts of the early Tudor period. In doing so, and by attempting to emphasise chivalric and courtly love culture, this work bridges another gap within the literature through highlighting masculinity. The period the thesis focuses on (1485-1547) is often skipped over by a preference for studies of medieval concepts of masculinity or Elizabethan courtly masculinity. Indeed, the early Tudors sit in an awkward time, not quite medieval, not *completely* early modern. Yet the reigns of these particular kings have an interesting place in the cultural continuity and development of masculinity and the influences of chivalry had on it during the latter sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. By using these different approaches highlighted above, this thesis seeks to explore and understand not only the impacts of these ideals, but also the functions and roles they had in both idealised and practical ways.

'Written by the Hand of Your Servant': Sources and Primary Material

A variety of sources from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries will be examined to uncover the presence of chivalry and courtly love ranging from State Papers through to literary texts. The range of sources used indicates how widespread the discussions of chivalry and courtly love were in this period. From handbook literature to Henry VIII's self-penned letters, the broad influence of these cultural ideals, and how they functioned at various levels of society and culture, will be illuminated by the sources used in this thesis.

The thesis utilises newly digitised content and extensive databases. In particular, it deploys the British Library's Manuscript and Illumination collection, Early English Books Online and other collections available in British History Online. As well as these databases, the thesis will make use of the State Papers Online, an invaluable resource from the UK National Archives, contains digitised documents ranging from parliamentary debates to personal letters.[40] The ability to view and contextualise certain tropes and threads of discussion over a period of a half a century allows some significant conclusions to be drawn. Having access to these digitised primary sources also allows for a broader range of analysis, providing more context and

---

[39] Vern L. Bullough, 'On Being a Male in the Middle Ages', in *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages,* ed. Clare A. Lees (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 38-40.

[40] 'Digitised Manuscripts', The British Library, https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/;'Early English Books Online', Bell and Howell Information and Learning, ProQuest Information and Learning Company, http://eebo.chadwyck.com.proxy.library.adelaide.edu.au/search; 'British History Online', Institute of Historical Research, School of Advanced Study University of London, https://www.british-history.ac.uk; 'State Papers Online, 1509-1714', Gale, A Centage Company, https://www.gale.com/uk/primary-sources/state-papers-online.

material for this project. The inclusion of the manuscript materials, for example, provides evidence for the visual representation, through illuminations, of the Tudor monarchy and chivalric culture. Moreover, access to the state papers provides evidence of the wider discussions of events at court during the reign of Henry VIII. This is useful particularly for the debates about warfare and peace, the trial records of both Anne Boleyn and Katherine Howard, the divorce of Henry VIII from Anne of Cleves, and the correspondence and diplomatic conversations regarding Henry VIII and his kingship.

The content within some sources, such as the letters and manuscripts examined, needs some contextualisation. Scholarly literature that focuses on the study of letters as devices of communication and conversation, has placed emphasis on the shifts that took place in the process of letter writing.[41] One of these shifts was a change in what the letter represented as an artefact, for both the reader and writer. Accordingly, the hand-written letter is positioned as proxy for the writer's physical presence. The influence of humanist thought shaped how the letter included the personality and presence of the writer, as well as representing the writer's own ability to express oneself eloquently and elegantly.[42] Moreover, letters created an intimate space for social exchange, which during this period focused on the epistolary function, in the creation of a conversation between reader and writer. Within this context, using the letters of Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn adds another layer to Henry as a figure who is often portrayed only through formal diplomatic documents. These letters, along with contemporary poems and lyrics, allow for analysis of contextualised rhetorical instances of courtly love and chivalry. Furthermore, other types of source material provoke other considerations. Manuscript material, for example, often varied in circulation or readership. For example, the manuscript BL Royal 16 Fii, examined throughout the thesis, has an indeterminable readership and intended audience yet provides valuable visual and literary material for historical analysis. Similarly, in the case of some printed works, such as those by William Caxton, his direct readership is unknown. However, they provide crucial examples of cultural ideas during this period. Others, like the 'Devonshire Manuscript' (Add MS 17492) have a known intimate readership, designed for 'social intercourse'.[43] Significantly important to the analysis, the manuscript holds evidence of the performative elements of contemporary courtship, highlighted among the small readership, circulating in a small group of courtiers connected by Thomas Howard and Margaret Douglas.[44]

Finally, the thesis will examine literary sources for contextual purposes. That is, the works used will be viewed as works written and reflective of the period and the context in which they were created.[45] This approach emulates other successful studies, such as Greg Walker's *Writing Under Tyranny,* which uses

---

[41] See: Seth Lerer, *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII: Literary Cultures and Arts of Deceit* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Gary Schneider, *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005).

[42] Giles Burton, 'From *ars dictaminis* to *Ars conscribendi epistolis:* Renaissance Letter-Writing Manuals in the Context of Humanism" in *Letter Writing Manual and Instructions from Antiquity to Present* ed. Carol Poster and Linda C. Mitchell (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2007), 88-91.

[43] Harold Love and Arthur F. Marotti, 'Manuscript Transmission and Circulation', in *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, ed. by David Lowenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 63.

[44] Love and Marotti, 'Manuscript Transmission', 63.

[45] See: Greg Walker, *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

writings of those under royal patronage, as well as outsiders, to trace the sentiments and discussions about the increasing tyranny of Henry VIII's reign. In this manner, the texts are used as representative of a period of time and place. The literary sources that apply to this thesis include mostly lyrics (appearing in previously mentioned manuscripts), romances and handbooks, especially those published and printed by Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde throughout the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The thesis will also focus upon *The Book of the Ordere of Chiyvalry* (printed 1484), *Le Morte D'Arthur* (printed 1485), *The Book of Fayttes of Arms and of Chyualry* (printed and commissioned by Henry VII 1489), *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry* (written during the 1350s), and *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* (printed and commission by Margaret Beaufort 1489). Caxton's accompanying prologues and epilogues also provide excellent contemporary commentary on both the political climate and the state of society; he often places great emphasis on the culture of chivalry and courtly love, and their potential as a socialising force at the turn of the fifteenth to the sixteenth century. Ultimately, these texts and sources will be used to understand the discourse, the implications, and representations of chivalry and courtly love, providing a wide selection of cultural materials from the late medieval period through to the death of Henry VIII.

Research Questions and Thesis Outline

The overriding research questions that will be addressed in this thesis are as follows: how prevalent were the phenomena of chivalry and courtly love in the transition from the medieval to the early modern period? In particular, how important were they to the political and dynastic foundations of the Tudor dynasty? What can they reveal about gender, politics, identity and social dynamics during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII? In order to answer these proposed questions, the work will use a thematic structure, which also tackles the topic in chronological order, the main focus beginning with post-Bosworth succession of Henry VII in 1485 and ending with the death of Henry VIII in 1547. In three chapters, evidence from across the period will be discussed to highlight continuity, development and contexts. Chapter One will cover the necessary background and the reign of Henry VII. Throughout the chapter there will be a discussion of the role that chivalry played in the foundations of the Tudor dynasty and the implementation of Henry VII's kingship, emphasising the influence of chivalric ideals and their place in the development of courtly masculinity. The chapter also explores themes of dynastic legitimacy and legacy, and the early transitions of the medieval into the early modern. These themes are developed further in Chapter Two, which studies the role that chivalry played in the life of Arthur Tudor and Henry VIII's early kingship. This chapter probes deeper into the notions and influence of chivalric discourse and masculinity, the influence and development of humanist thought in politics and diplomacy, and the entwined role of warfare and in political identity during the years of 1509 to 1525. Finally, Chapter Three discusses courtly love and court culture, contextualising the role of women in court life and bridging these two concepts together by examining their presence in contemporary events, relationships, and gendered performance. Overall, while the thesis cannot cover the entirety of the early Tudor era, it aims to highlight the crucial influence of chivalry and courtly love ideals on elite culture; examining not just the political, but the personal and the behavioural stories constituting the reigns of these two kings.

Hilary Jane Locke

Chapter One

'There Shalle Ye See Manhode':

Chivalric Culture and the Foundations of the Tudor Dynasty 1485-1509

> Britain had reached such a standard of sophistication that it excelled all other kingdoms in its general affluence, the richness of its decorations, and the courteous behaviour of its inhabitants. Every knight in the country who was in any way famed for his bravery wore livery and arms showing his own distinctive colour; and women of fashion often displayed the same colours. They scorned to give their love to any other man who had not proved himself three times in battle.
>
> — Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, Book ix, 14.[1]

Whilst the writing of Geoffrey of Monmouth's text, completed in the twelfth century, and the establishment of the Tudor dynasty happened centuries apart, the chivalric traditions that *The Kings of Britain* was steeped in ultimately appeared to assist Henry VII to strengthen his dynasty. The above quotation captures the essence of an idealised medieval chivalric society, representing gendered characteristics, experiences, and grandiose displays of wealth, all expectations of a chivalric society. Here, men were to fight for their kingdom, be courteous and to prove themselves in battle. Women, in return, were to reward the victorious with their love, and save their desires for the brave knights. In celebration, both the people and the kingdom were to be richly adorned to represent the wealth of the nation and the overall importance of victory to the people. At times Henry VII's kingdom resembled Monmouth's ideal of a chivalric society at its peak; as David Loades argues, 'chivalry was a potent force in the symbolism of monarchy, and in the intense competitiveness of dynasties of western Europe'.[2] This chapter seeks to show just how potent chivalric ideology was throughout the reign of Henry VII and to discuss the functioning of chivalric discourse as a political tool.

By analysing the engagement with chivalry in the courtly sphere during the reign of Henry VII, this chapter will argue that chivalric values, discourse, and traditions facilitated the growth of dynastic stability and political networks. It was achieved through the clear value and adoption of chivalric culture by the king. The conjunction between courtly culture and the experience of those who lived and fought in the Wars of the Roses emerged in a meeting of chivalry, politics, and masculine identity within the early Tudor dynasty. This chapter will trace some of these cultural foundations and the nature of the reign of Henry VII after he took the throne at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485. In doing so, it will examine the ways in which the king related to men in his court, utilising clear chivalric frameworks, hierarchies, and connections to chivalric traditions to solidify his unstable claim to the throne. By first examining historical chivalric culture, the chapter will look at literary materials circulating during the late fifteenth century to see how they engaged and promoted

---

[1] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain* trans. Lewis Thorpe (London: Penguin, 1966), 229.

[2] David Loades, *The Tudor Court* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1986), 2.

Hilary Jane Locke

chivalric frameworks as a socialising ideal. Following this, there will be a section on how chivalric discourse functioned in the early stages of dynastic and political development in the early Henrician court, looking specifically at the engagement with institutions such as knighthood and the Order of the Garter. Lastly, this chapter will explore the chivalric cultural elements that further assisted Henry VII to develop monarchical security, looking at Burgundian Chivalry, masculinity, and the continuation and development of chivalric culture throughout the king's reign.

'Rede the nobel volumes': Chivalric Culture at the end of the Wars of the Roses

By the time Henry VII took the English throne on the battlefield, England's political environment was chaotic. Struggling after almost a century of warfare, on top of political instability caused by leadership changes and weak kingship, England was in a precarious position. The fifteenth century had been an increasingly problematic period, during which chivalric culture as a whole experienced several challenges and shifts. Overall, chivalry remained a popular frame of reference for battlefield and soldierly behaviour, and a cultural model for masculinity and the gentry; warfare was the easiest place for expression of chivalric behaviour and values. The heights of chivalric victory were celebrated in song and poetry, such as that relating to Henry V's famous performance at Agincourt: 'Owre kynge wit forth to Normandy / with grace and myght of chyvalry'.[3] However, these celebrations were often undermined by increasingly violent battlefield experiences, with changes to warfare practices, such as the introduction of artillery, changing how wars were fought and won. When the dynastic battles known as the Wars of the Roses (1460-1485) broke out, the complexities of battlefield and combat related chivalry became even more problematic. The Battle of Towton (March 1461), for example, which won Edward IV the throne from Henry VI, saw 20,000 to 28,000 men killed in a single day, and the dead buried in a pit nearby.[4] Some have also suggested that this experience of slaughter led to a spike in violence across England following these conflicts, increasing unchivalric behaviour.[5] Moreover, the relationship between warfare and chivalric culture was thoroughly cemented in the discourse surrounding war practice. However, it was a complex relationship. As Arthur B. Ferguson states, 'warfare in this world of dynastic rivalry was […] becoming more and more non-chivalric in the sense that it ran increasingly counter to the essential individualism of the chivalric tradition'.[6] This did not ultimately stop reliance on chivalry as a cultural touchstone for leaders and kings. During the Wars of the Roses, both Edward IV and Richard III attempted to embody the principles of chivalric glory in symbolic ways, which will be discussed later. However, the stark contradiction between battlefield mentality and behaviours off the field drastically affected the stability of the position of king in England and also led to a shifting of perceptions as to how chivalric culture served society, and the functions it could play overall.

---

[3] 'The Agincourt Carol (Middle English) from Bodleian Library, MS 3340 (previously Arch. Selden B.26) fols. 17v-18r.' in *The Battle of Agincourt: Sources and Interpretations* ed. Anne Curry (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 283-284.

[4] Veronica Fiorato, Anthea Boylston and Christopher Knüsel, *Blood Red Roses: The Archaeology of a Mass Grave from the Battle of Towton AD 1461,* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2007).

[5] M. L. Bohna, 'Political and Criminal Violence in Fifteenth-Century England' in *Violence in Medieval Society* ed. Richard W. Kaeuper (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 96.

[6] Arthur B. Ferguson, *The Chivalric Tradition in Renaissance England* (Washington, D.C: Fogler Shakespeare Library, 1986)*,* 39.

Consequently, the end of the fifteenth century and its dynastic crisis provided an opportunity for Henry Tudor to establish his dynasty by creatively engaging with this existing and shifting chivalric discourse.

Throughout the Middle Ages, and into the fifteenth century, chivalric handbook literature was an extremely common way for these ideals to circulate. Two such examples, frequently reproduced, were Ramon Llull's *The Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry or Knyghthode* (written 1279-1283) and Geoffrio de Charny's (*c*.1304-1356) *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry.* Both of these texts identify contexts and applications for chivalric ideology. They were directed at men-at-arms, explaining how to instruct practical soldiers and warring forces. Furthermore, both texts assert that chivalry assisted civility and manners. Yet, what is most crucial about these texts is what the authors considered chivalry to be as an ideal, rather than what existed in reality, for this ideal informed and developed the cultural legacy of chivalry in the centuries to follow.

Ramon Llull's idea of chivalry covered all areas of society, specially identifying men-at-arms as being the most important carriers of the chivalric message. Above all, *Ordre of Chyvalry* considers the social ideal of chivalry, and how that worked for the individual knight and those within society under a king. After showering the reader how chivalry originated, Llull's concern is the continual presence of chivalry in everyday existence, considering knighthood and how to be a perfect knight.[7] At the beginning of the second chapter he states: 'Whan charyte, loyaulte, trouthe, justyce and veryte fayllen in the world, thenne begynneth cruelte, iniurye, desloyalte and falsenes and therefore was error and trouble in the world'.[8] Chivalry kept the world safe from evil doings, therefore being a knight was not simply a personal pursuit, but a selfless act to help maintain a peaceful realm. Chivalry was also crucial to the structure of government, for Llull insisted that the emperor or king 'ought to be a knyght [and] lord of al knyghtes'.[9] The systems in place ensured justice and correct governance of the realm could only be carried out by those who adhered to the concept of 'knighthood' and were subject to the ultimate knight, the emperor or king. Those who were knights defended the vulnerable in society, being women and children, the clergy and those weaker than them, and saw that justice was served. For Llull, chivalry simply meant those in the order of knighthood were to be honourable at all times, displaying their prowess in knightly skills, using those skills to protect society, and being dedicated to serving their lord and ultimate knightly figure, the king. Consequently, those who were within the institution of knighthood should feel their place within society as the highest and most valuable members.[10]

Geoffrio de Charny describes a more practical version of the structure of chivalry. De Charny was a soldier and renowned knight from Burgundy, born in the early 1300s, who fought and died in the Hundred Years' War.[11] This experience gained on the battlefield, in addition to his noble birth, gave him the means necessary to write and expand upon the ideals of chivalric practice and discourse. De Charny also considered men-at-arms in their various stations and deemed overall that fighting for a 'greater' cause or task of more

---

[7] Ramon Llull, *The Book of the Order of Chivalry/Llibre de l'order de Cavallena/Libro de la Orden de Cabellaría* trans. Antonio Cartijo Ocaña (Amersterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2015), 8.

[8] Llull, *Order of Chivalry*, 55

[9] Llull, *Order of Chivalry,* 71.

[10] Llull, *Order of Chivalry,* 55-81.

[11] Richard W. Kaeuper, 'Historical Introduction to the Text' in Geoffrio de Charny *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry* trans. Elspeth Kennedy (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2005), 1-46.

'worth' reflected the chivalric character of the man. For example, de Charny asserts that 'there are no small feats of arms, but only good and great ones, although some feats of arms are greater worth than others'.[12] At the beginning, de Charny's work focuses on a hierarchy of what is involved in a chivalric lifestyle at home and abroad. However, the overriding ideal of de Charny's work prescribed the manners and courteousness required of the chivalrous male, being 'courteous and well mannered towards others', and having 'no desire to engage in any evil undertaking'.[13]

There are clear differences between how these texts consider behaviours and what Llull and de Charny consider to be chivalry and chivalric characteristics. The most crucial difference is the performance of the chivalric ideal towards others, and as an individual. For example, de Charny, repeats the idea that possessing certain attributes to promote individual chivalric worth, and choosing tasks which uphold and communicate that worth to others, was of prime importance. Establishing a hierarchy of the chivalric tasks that represent what was expected in a noble fight, or one which would attract the most respect to the individual, is perhaps de Charny's strength in seeking a definition of chivalry. There were small ways in which one could earn chivalric respect, but undertaking a task deemed the *most* chivalric and one more worthy, was a way to instantaneously earn chivalric creditability. Both authors consider chivalry masculine perfection, serving not only the collective meaning of chivalry as a community of knights, but also on an individual level, displaying skills for the sake of justice and prowess. As de Charny comments: 'those who are physically strong and skilful (agile)', are the greatest knights, but according to Llull's arguments about chivalry, it is how precisely knights employed those skills that defined their individual, masculine, and chivalric worth.

Therefore, investment in chivalry had value beyond knighthood, pageantry, and swords. Culturally, it influenced social interaction it offered both kings and men ways to navigate conversations and facilitated peaceful interaction. Chivalry had an underlying morality at its core that served political and powerful ends. During the Wars of the Roses contemporaries did not miss the opportunity to make a point of this. For example, in one of the worst instances of battle in Sir Thomas Malory's *Le Morte Darthur,* itself written during the Wars of the Roses, Malory remarks that one particular battle did not end until 'the floure of chyvalry of alle the worlde was destroyed and slayne'.[14] This suggests that the total destruction of chivalry on the battlefield was somehow an abandonment of morality by the soldiers, or an end to the perfection of knighthood that Llull discussed. The allusion to actual events like the Battle of Towton seems to further emphasise the idea that chivalry was declining in contemporary culture, particularly in the aftermath of such large-scale battles. Indeed P. J. C. Field has written an essay that demonstrates how Malory's work 'has a surprising amount in common with one of the decisive engagements of the Wars of the Roses'.[15] This is an example could be what Field refers to as 'chivalric nostalgia', a common device used by medieval writers in romances.[16] Alternatively, however, the enduring ideals of chivalry, and the crisis it was facing, offered contemporaries a saving grace for restoring its moral culture to wider society.

---

[12] Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry,* trans. Elspeth Kennedy (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2005).

[13] de Charny, *Book of Chivalry*, 47

[14] Thomas Malory, *Le Morte Darthur, Volume 1.,* ed. P.J.C Field (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2013), 203.

[15] P. J. C. Field, 'Malory and the Battle of Towton' in *The Social and Literary Context of Malory's Morte DArthur* ed. D. Thomas Hanks Jr. (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000), 69.

[16] Field, 'Malory and the Battle of Towton', 71

This is a theme that William Caxton wove throughout his printed works. Patronised by Edward IV initially, and later by Richard III and Henry VII, Caxton's printing catalogue reveals a range of thematic pieces that ruminate on and explore chivalric values for their socialising potential. His prologues and epilogues do this in an even more explicit fashion. Caxton himself was closely connected with Edward IV and his family, having worked in Bruges as a Merchant and with Edward's sister Margaret of York, who became Duchess of Burgundy. This relationship connected him with Edward IV when the king fled upon the reinstallation of Henry VI to the English throne, and gave him great influence when he returned to England and established his printing press.[17] Alongside Ramon Llull's aforementioned *The Book of the Order of Chivalry,* texts printed by Caxton included Malroy's *Le Morte D'Arthur* (*Kyng Arthur*)*, The Knight in the Tower, The Canterbury Tales, Blanchardyn and Eglantine,* and Cristina de Pisan's *The Book of Fayttes of Arms and of Chyualry*. Caxton used these texts to build on the existing idea of chivalry as a civilising and socialising force, an opinion possibly influenced by his time at the court at Burgundy; Burgundian chivalry will be explored later in this chapter. Caxton constructed arguments in his prologues and epilogues stating that these texts held fundamental ideas for a better society and higher quality of men (and women). In his prologue for *Kyng Arthur,* Caxton states that he 'doon sette [Kyng Arthur] in enprynte [so] that noble men may see and learn the noble acts of chiualrye the Jentyl and vertous dedes that somme knights used in those dayes'.[18] Following this, he says he 'humbly [beseeches] al noble lordes and ladyes and al other estates […] [to] rede in this sayd book and were that they take the good and honest acted in their remembrance and to follow the same […] noble renoned actes of human tyre gentleness and chyualryes'.[19] This was a plea for all of society to hold onto the moralising force that chivalry constituted in these stories, and to restore what these commentators saw as missing. Considering he felt that society was all 'disorder fro chyaulry', it seems logical Caxton focussed his efforts on printing highly chivalric texts to encourage readers and buyers to engage with the content[20]. When he published *Order of Chivalry*, Caxton pertinently pointed to the work as a guide to chivalric behaviour, encouraging men to 'rede the noble volumes […] There shalle ye see manhode'.[21]

This emphasis upon chivalry as an effective and positive social force stresses two important elements preceding Henry VII's accession. Firstly, and essentially, if England was to recover from the problems created by the Wars of the Roses, there needed to be a resurgence of the chivalric ideals that were present in these texts. The death of chivalry, as reflected upon by Malory and Caxton, was not permanent; the key to its revival lay in the building upon existing cultural values that were easily accessible in these texts and held historical precedent. Secondly, as Caxton insinuated when he asked 'How Many Knyghtes ben there now in Englond?', the concept of chivalry which previously identified with men-at-arms and centred on the battlefield was no longer clearly relevant.[22] The Wars of the Roses, as highlighted in *Le Morte Darthur,* had

---

[17] Darcy Kern, 'Parliament in print: William Caxton and the history of political government in the fifteenth century', *Journal of Medieval History* 40, no. 2 (2014), 209-224.

[18] William Caxton, 'Prologue to Kyng Arthur (1485)' in *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton* edited by W. J. B. Crotch (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), 94.

[19] Caxton, 'Kyng Arthur', 94.

[20] Caxton, 'Epilogue to the Book of the Order of Chivalry (1484)', 83

[21] Caxton, 'Order of Chivalry', 83.

[22] Caxton, 'Order of Chivalry', 83.

facilitated the rapid destruction of chivalric performance and practical chivalry in the heat of warfare. As a result of the rapid changes in warfare practice, the emphasis shifted towards heavily performative, material, and symbolic representations of chivalric culture; and they became the avenue of its resurgence. Following Henry Tudor's seizure of the throne on the battlefield, his dynasty began responding to these ideas and practices, thereby securing dynastic stability and political strength through the employment of chivalric culture and values.

'Oure Trusty and WelBeloved Knight of Oure Body': Henry VII, Loyalty, and Knighthoods

Henry Tudor spent a substantial portion of his early life in exile in Brittany, away from Yorkist England, with his uncle Jasper Tudor, having fled from the intensity of the Wars of the Roses in 1471. Thereafter, the contact he had with other members of the English nobility was limited to those running from what appeared to be a Yorkist stronghold over the English throne. Henry had in his company men who had been in a militaristic civil war for most of their adult lives. Under the watch of his uncle, who was similarly battle-hardened and passionate for the Lancastrian cause, Henry was educated in the martial arts and 'it is probable that he received as normal a noble education as possible […] includ[ing] physically demanding training and tactics of warfare'.[23] Whilst the scarcity of source material from the early years of Henry Tudor means his youth is somewhat obscure, what he did after the Battle of Bosworth was fought and won, gives a sense that chivalric ethos formed an important part of his life and upbringing. Importantly, his victory was achieved alongside those men who had shown their loyalty to the Lancastrian and Tudor cause, and thus their ingrained chivalric ideals were relied upon for the establishment of the Tudor dynasty. Also, the implementation of chivalric discourse within a court context made historic sense. As James L. Gillespie argues: 'the way to [generate] support lay not in the abandonment of chivalric values, but in the renewed appeal to the traditional values of loyal and faithful service found in the chivalric ethos'.[24] The cultural context and need for political stability, as we have seen, seemed to be ripe for engaging with chivalric practices. One of the ways in which Henry VII did this was by cleverly engaging with existing chivalric hierarchies to rally support and numbers.

The reason it was imperative to garner strength in the early days of his kingship was based around the weak claim Henry VII had for taking the throne. While there were later attempts to define his family tree in the context of British myth and heritage, which will be explored in Chapter Two, the unavoidable fact about Henry's birth was that he was from bastard lines, with only a small connection to the father of the Lancastrians, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and through his mother's line. Margaret Beaufort, Henry's mother, was the great-granddaughter of Gaunt, and the Beaufort line was initially the consequence of Gaunt's relationships with his mistress Katherine Swynford, a woman he eventually married. Margaret was married to Henry's father, Edmund Tudor, in 1456. The Tudors were also a relatively new branch of the Lancastrian family tree. Edmund and his brother Jasper were recognised as half-brothers to Henry VI, resulting from the relationship between the king's mother Katherine of Valois and wardrobe clerk Owen Tudor. Henry Tudor was therefore a direct descendent of Edward III and had a complex mixture of royal blood. An indirect claim

---

[23] Sean Cunningham, *Henry VII* (Oxon: Routledge, 2007), 18.

[24] James L. Gillespie, 'Richard II's Knights: chivalry and patronage', *Journal of Medieval History* 13 (1987): 157.

Hilary Jane Locke

to the throne, and an arguable right to be king of England, was a difficult problem for the new king to negotiate.

It was an imperative during Henry's early reign to utilise those who had shown loyalty in order to prove support for his early kingship. As Steven Gunn states: 'if law provided most of the language for commitment to the crown, chivalry did the same fo service to the king'.[25] Granting knighthoods was a first and obvious step for Henry VII. As Cristina de Pisan stated in *The Boke of the Fayt of Armes and of Chyualrye*, 'yf [a king] had suche knyghtes / [he] shold conquere all the world'; this was a text that would later be published by William Caxton on Henry's request, suggesting he had knowledge of the content.[26] The wider distribution of knighthoods and the practice of knighting men who were loyal and offered support, had been a tactic of kings for centuries. This established process was an easy way to generate support when needed, and provided simple, functional ways to reward those who had shown loyalty to the king in times of strife. That the courtly political structure during the early Tudor period consisted of groups connected by kinship or favour also aided the spread of chivalric ideals throughout the court community.[27]

Knighthood in exchange for chivalry was certainly a theme within chivalric stories. Printed in 1485, after Henry became king, *Thystorye of the noble ryght valyaunt [and] worthy knight Parys,* by Pierre de la Cépède, shows that the protagonist Paris gained his favour and position by performing chivalric deeds: he was 'demened hym self so nobly [and] worthely in a maner dedes of chyualrye that wythin a shotre tyme after he was doubed knyght by the hande of the sayd lord dauphyn'.[28] Paris is rewarded for his performance, much like those who worked with Henry Tudor. Knighthood records indicate that even before his victory at Bosworth, Henry Tudor had knighted sixteen Lancastrian men on his arrival in Wales.[29] Following his victory, he further knighted members of the Stanley, Courteney, Guilford, Ap Tudor, Blount and Edgecomb families.[30] While these families belonged to the gentry, they received the title as a reward for being staunchly devoted to the Lancastrian cause, some of these families being those who faced exile like Henry himself. The act of knighting these groups also gave these men their political positions back in England, which they had been stripped of during the Yorkist reign. Thus they had good reason, particularly under the chivalric code, to remain loyal to their new king. Moreover, just after the first year of his reign Henry granted annuities for life to a large number of men for their 'good and faithful service'; this included fifteen knights and thirteen

---

[25] Steven Gunn, *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 22

[26] Cristina de Pisan, *The Boke of the Fayt of Artmes and of Chyualrye,* London: William Caxton, 1489, EEBO, The British Library, Fyrst Book, Capi. Vii, B ii.

[27] Steven Gunn, 'The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5 (1995): 77.

[28] Pierre de la Cépède, *Here beganneth thystorye of the noble ryght and worthy knyght Parys, and of the fayr Vyenne the daulphyns doughter of vuenneys the whyche sufferd many aduersytees bycause of theyr true loue or they coude enioye the effect therof of echo other,* London:William Caxton 1485, EBBO, The British Library, column 1**,** a ii.

[29] Wm. A. Shaw, *The Knights of England: A Complete Record from the Earliest Time to the Present Day of the Knights of all the Orders of Chivalry in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of Knights Bachelors*, *Vol. II* (London: Sherratt and Hughes, 1906), 22.

[30] Shaw, *Knights of England*, 22-23.

Hilary Jane Locke

esquires.[31] The various reasons cited included service to the previous king Henry VI through to the dedication shown to Henry VII and his armies.[32]

Besides allocating knighthoods, the more prestigious Order of the Garter offered the king further ways to unite and reward loyal men. When it was founded by Edward III in 1348, the Order of the Garter offered the king an organisation that upheld the wider chivalric ideals embedded in the feudal system: loyalty, access to support, men for defence, and the elements of pageantry. More than this, it also formed a stronghold around the king, and a regal representative force. As Hugh E. L. Collins states, 'Edward III had sought to harness the cult of chivalry as a means of galvanizing aristocratic support behind the war in France'.[33] By harnessing the power of this 'cult', Edward III engaged directly with the culture of chivalric traditions to emulate Arthurian camaraderie for its political potential, via celebratory, knightly role-play. Furthermore, the adoption and continuation of this tradition by Henry VII was an effective way to incorporate the valued chivalric heritage that English aristocratic culture had developed from.[34] By tapping into these preexisting structures linked with chivalry and kingship, Henry VII solidified his dynasty.

Henry VII utilised the Order for its representative potential throughout his twenty-three years as king. Over his reign he inducted thirty-seven members, two of whom were his sons, and six foreign aristocrats.[35] Comparatively, Edward IV reached a similar number over the duration of his two reigns (a total of twenty-one years), with thirty-six members, including seven foreign dignitaries, and a significant number of family members.[36] Richard III, who was only king for just over two years, made seven inductions, six of which were made in his first year as king. Moreover, when comparing the numbers of those who received knighthoods by all three kings, Richard III awarded far fewer knighthoods, with just eleven men in total recorded during his time as king, including an indeterminate group of knighthoods awarded that are simply listed as 'Many other Northern Gentlemen'.[37] Both Edward IV and Henry VII used knighting more readily, with huge numbers being awarded, particularly after battles, and political upheavals and often bestowed symbolically on or beside the battlefield itself. Thus in 1471, Edward VI knighted a large number of men after the 1471 battle of Tewkesbury 'in the field of Grafton […] beside Tewkesbury after the battle'.[38] Whilst Richard III did not face similar rebellious interruptions during his reign so as to warrant rewarding as many knighthoods as his brother or Henry VII, their different policy of using the Order and knighthoods for reward

---

[31] T. B. Puch 'Henry VII and the English Nobility' in *The Tudor Nobility* ed. G. W. Bernard (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), 87.

[32] *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII: From Original Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office Part 1,* ed. William Campbell (London: Longman and Company, 1873), 33-36.

[33] Hugh E. L. Collins, *The Order of the Garter 1348-1461: Chivalry and Politics in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 1.

[34] Stephanie Trigg, S*hame and Honor: A Vulgar History of the Order of the Garter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 11.

[35] The inclusion of foreign kings is a further aspect of the Order of the Garter to explore in terms of diplomacy and the cultural precedent chivalry had for Europeans. However, there is not enough space to explore this as thoroughly in this thesis.

[36] It has been argued that Edward IV was also attempting to reestablish a chivalric court, which rested on the promotion of the Order of the Garter as an intimate band of men, closely connected to the king and therefore stricter with his inductions. See: Richard Barber, 'Malory's Le Morte Darthur and Court Culture under Edward IV' in *Arthurian Literature XII,* ed. James P. Carley Felicity Riddy (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993), 141; Trigg, *Shame and Honor*, 166.

[37] Shaw, *Knights of England*, 21.

[38] Edward IV awarded six Knighthoods after the Battle of Towton and forty-eight after the Battle of Tewkesbury. Shaw, *Knights of England,* 13; 14-15.

indicates how effective engaging with the chivalric institutions was for maintaining power successfully. Those inducted at the hand of Richard III were mostly close confidants, friends, or those he needed support from during his usurpation in 1483. Consequently, as T. B. Pugh states, 'it is remarkable how little loyalty Richard III could inspire or compel amongst magnates, knights and gentry more than two years after usurpation'.[39] By using the Order merely as a quick return for the assistance given during his take over of the throne, Richard potentially squandered his support networks, and lost the throne.

Henry VII did not make quick decisions regarding who became members of the Garter throughout his reign. To Henry, the Order was not only useful for the power it held, but also necessary to guarantee of support from those who needed the power it gave them. Loyalty was not only achieved through the high number of men included over time, but also as a consequence of the type of men he chose to include. Although he did not shy away from the idea that the Order could be used for reward, this reward only came after a number of years of proven loyalty, not because of association or aristocratic right. Furthermore, as Stephanie Trigg states, 'the Order of the Garter, while undeniably an elite institution directly affecting only a handful of individuals at any given time, is symptomatic of the diverse, fluctuating, and ongoing medieval traditions in postmedieval culture'.[40] Even though the early Tudor era would not quite qualify as 'postmedieval', the valuable inclusion of these existing, highly medieval and chivalric institutions gave the king the potential to solidify his own position. The perpetuation of the Order represented the wider trend to treat chivalry as productive, an idea that helped early Tudor society thrive and generate large groups for support. By working with his close supporters, and those he had already validated by knighthood, the Order facilitated further growth and courtly moulding for its members by allowing networking and access to courtly environments.

Gilbert Talbot was inducted to the Order following the death of Sir Thomas Montgomery in 1495. He was one such knight who proved his loyalty to Henry VII on several occasions previous to induction. Being a member of the Talbot family, who had been supporters of the Lancastrians and Tudors, and uncle to the Earl of Shrewsbury, he had fought in conflicts that assisted Henry to power and helped maintain his kingship. Technically speaking, Talbot was not a high-ranking man, being only on the outer-branches of the Talbot family tree. His avenue to power was achieved through his own loyalty, the most desirable chivalric attribute. Initially, he raised a company of five hundred men-at-arms before the Battle of Bosworth. On the field, he also played the role of cavalry expert, helping to defend Henry's cause.[41] He assisted again in 1487 when a Yorkist faction arose to support the 'pretender' Lambert Simnel (who claimed to be Edward Plantangenent, Earl of Warwick, nephew of Edward IV and Richard III). Following the Battle of Stoke-on-Trent in 1487, he was named a Knight Banneret, a higher ranking than the typical Knight Bachelor.[42] Previous to his induction to the Order of the Garter, after the execution of Sir Humphrey Stafford in 1486, Gilbert was given Grafton Manor in Worchester, possibly as a reward for his participation at Bosworth.[43] He was also made Lord

---

[39] T. B. Puch 'Henry VII and the English Nobility', 51.

[40] Trigg, *Shame and Honor*, 10.

[41] Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth*, 90; 104.

[42] Shaw, *Knights of England*, 24

[43] 'Grant', in *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII*, 506.

Deputy of Calais by Henry VII, and reappointed by Henry VIII.[44] Henry refers to the 'special trust' the king had in Talbot when corresponding with him in his role as Deputy.[45]

Crucially, Talbot's career reveals part of this slowly emerging group within the Tudor courts that used loyalty in exchange for power and status at the court.[46] The king took the opportunity to promote Talbot to fill the 'voide' left by Montgomery. The induction into the Order is revealed in a letter written by the king to the Earl of Shrewsbury, George Talbot, which explores the key details about the intimate process of induction. The king details that he cannot attend the induction, but places full trust in the other members, particularly George Talbot, to proceed and act on the king's behalf: 'oure ful power and auctorite to doo the said Sir Gilbert […] to be enstalled by you into the said ordre, in suche maner and fourme as the statutes of the same doo require'.[47] Henry further states that he is 'charging and straitely commauding all suche othre knightes and officers of the said ordre as shalbe than and there present with [George Talbot], and all othre who it belongeth, than in and for due execution of the premisses you obeying, helping, and assissting, as they tendre the honor of us and the said ordre'.[48] The transmission of power via the ceremony of induction involving Henry or his proxy speaks volumes to the closeness of the relationship this Order had with the king.

Those who were a part of the Order took what the institution represented — chivalry, honour, heritage — as a serious commitment to their king. In return, the king valued this commitment to the extent that he was able to hand over the duties of induction to its members. John Cheney's induction is a further example of this. Cheney was created a knight of the Garter after lengthy service to Henry and his cause. Being a supporter of the Yorkists, he disowned them once Richard III took the throne, switching allegiance to Henry and joining him in exile in France. Cheney was amongst those whom Henry knighted upon landing in Wales, and he fought alongside Henry at Bosworth, and again at Stoke-on-Trent. He was then inducted as a member of the Garter as reward for service to the king.[49] When he died in 1499, he was buried in Salisbury Cathedral, his effigy dressed in Garter robes.[50] The Order's membership was filling with relatively low men those like John Cheney, men who fought with Henry for the Tudor and Lancastrian cause at the Battle of Bosworth, and who received an honourable reward for the knightly and chivalric pursuit of justice.

The valuable relationship is further conveyed through the language used to describe these members. To return to the letter from the king to George Talbot, Henry refers to Gilbert as 'oure trusty and welbeloved knight of our body'.[51] In further correspondence with Talbot, once he was made Deputy of Calais, the king

---

[44] 'Henry VII to Sir Gilbert Talbot [Shrewsbury MSS.] by the King' in *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII, Vol. 11,* ed. James Gairdner (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1863), 179-182.

[45] 'Henry VII to Sir Gilbert Talbot', 182.

[46] Over time this became more prominent, and as came to be seen during the early 1500s and 1510s, court members rose according to their attributes and contributions to the court environments. Thomas More, Cardinal Wolsey and John Skelton are good examples of this promotion policy, as was Thomas Cromwell

[47] 'Henry VII To the Earl of Shrewsbury (1495) [Shrewsbury MSS]' in *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard II and Henry VII, Vol. II,* ed.James Gairdner (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1863), 61.

[48] 'To the Earl of Shrewsbury ', 61.

[49] Shaw, *The Knights of England*, 22.

[50] Bennett, *Bosworth,* 48.

[51]'To the Earl of Shrewsbury', 61.

continually referred to him as 'trusty and welbiloved knight of our body'.[52] This formula is repeated in grant proclamations and documents throughout Henry VII's reign when referring to particular men within the court documentation and often in grants of land and office for life. 'Knights of Our Body' was a term used to describe certain groups of knights connected to the king; the phrase 'our body' represented the loyalty between these men owed both to the king's body as a political symbol and as a personal object. There was a correlation between the ideas written by de Charny regarding kingship, the king being the ultimate knight, and the political practice of Henry VII; a correlation which connected these men to his political body under existing chivalric discourse. Thus, knighthood promoted Henry's dynastic certainty, cementing networks and relationships throughout court. Symbolically, these men were united around the king as a physical strong-hold and barrier against protest or challenge. The inclusion of these men in the institution of knighthood, or further into the intimate environment of the Order of the Garter, allowed Henry to send a message about his right to be on the throne. Logically, the more knights he had at his disposal, the greater power and defence he had and the more men he had to display at events as a representation of the strength of the dynasty. Ultimately this use of patronage was maximised by initiatives such as the proclamation made in 1503 that 'all who possess 40 librates of land [to] come and take the ordre of knighthood'.[53] Essentially, the king was pushing for greater numbers to be inducted during his reign, increasing the representation for the dynasty and the number of men alongside him.

As we have seen, the process was not unprecedented. Just like Edward IV before him, Henry VII was in a similar position of having to establish, rather than inherit, kingship. However, he was a strong military leader, in contrast to some previous kings like Henry VI and Richard III. Henry VII was fit to be head of an institution that was founded by a militaristic king, and was surrounded by knights who provided protection in situations of threat. Having proven his chivalric worth himself, he received their offered loyalty as part of their adherence to the chivalric codes that increased their status. Henry VII came to power during a period of chivalric revival, which conveniently gave the king an opportunity to stabilise his kingship quickly. Ultimately, Henry VII's political court functioned and cemented itself over time, and during his son's reign after him, through the negotiation between existing chivalric hierarchies and adapting chivalric culture successfully for the political benefits it delivered.

'The Kyng Gerd His Swerde': Performance, Masculinity, and Chivalric Culture in Henry VII's Court

As we have seen, the adoption of chivalric hierarchies played a significant role in the foundation of the early Tudor dynasty and Henry VII's ability to solidify his kingship. These institutions were also a clear part of the existing medieval chivalric discourse which eased the building of networks and loyalty. However, court politics also relied on the performance of chivalric ethos in certain cases to gain favour and power. The chivalric culture that developed throughout Henry's reign was not achieved simply through the accumulation of knights and loyal supporters. It was built upon the highly performative, Burgundian influenced, gendered culture of chivalry, that had been developing throughout the latter fifteenth century. As medieval chivalry

---

[52] 'Henry VII to Sir Gilbert Talbot', 181.

[53] 'Appendix C. Notes from the Patent Rolls: Patent 14 Dec., 19 (1503)', in *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard II and Henry VII, Vol. II,* ed by James Gairdner (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1863)*,* 379.

acted in the best interest of the individual, intertwined with a circle of knights, soldiers and companion, this framework was easily transferred into the political and courtly setting. The chivalric model as political practice attempted to smooth over the gap between war and peace. Engagement with chivalric culture was also a way for the Tudor regime to outwardly declare its legitimacy, alongside rewarding individual achievement.

The masculine attributes of chivalry served a functional role within the courtly sphere. As Caxton's statement 'there ye shall see manhoode' suggests, chivalric texts were perceived to bring together masculinity and chivalric discourse, which functioned in the Tudor court in a number of ways. [54]As a performative ideal throughout the late fifteenth century, chivalry was an important element in the adaption of Burgundian culture in Henry VII's court. Formally introduced by Edward IV, who had close familial and personal links with the court of Burgundy, this cultural expression was emblematic of Edward's chivalric character, particularly regarding extravagant celebrations for public occasions. Focusing on the performance of chivalric characteristics, such as jousting prowess, masculine displays of strength, acts of courtship and literary achievement, this brand of chivalry also placed the court at the centre of cultural patronage and engaged with chivalric traditions for political power and the construction of gender roles. This resulted in a developing model of masculinity which was, in essence, non-militaristic and executed within the courtly setting. As stated by Marilynn Desmon and Pamela Sheingorn, '[t]he Burgundian court cultivated masculinity as a theatrical performance of chivalric values no longer responsive to the realities of combat, whether secular or religious'.[55] Furthermore, as Steven Gunn and Antheun Janse argue: 'to view the court as a stage is also to emphasise the essentially performative quality to court life, structured by ritual prescriptions and laden with symbolic value even in its everyday acts and material contexts'.[56] In Henry VII's court, the implementation and continuation of what Edward IV began had great potential.

Chivalry, and its long history, was an essential part of how the culture of court performance politics operated amongst the nobility, and chivalric culture was an effective method of social influence. The developing Tudor court, and its reliance on the socialising elements of chivalric culture, created a dialogue between the present need for peace and the chivalric past. This was an idea that had circulated during the previous centuries. As explained by Katie Stevenson, 'royal monopoly of chivalric culture [and] control of chivalry came to be a key strategy through which kings might demonstrate that they were *au fait* with current practices'.[57] This kind of performance also occurred following the mid-Tudor crisis, when Londoners of the Mercantile class showed an interest in the physical representation of chivalric artefacts, 'enabling Londoners to reflect with pride upon the origins of their city and its place in the history of culture [and] legitimising their standing in the realm'.[58] Whilst the reign of Henry VII came sixty years before the mid-Tudor crisis, the generation of cultural content that relied on the projected image of chivalry strongly grounded the Tudor

---

[54] Caxton, 'Order of Chivalry', 83.

[55] Marilynn Desmon and Pamela Sheingorn, *Myth, Montage and Visuality in Late Medieval Manuscript: Christine de Pizan's* Epistre Othea (Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press, 2006), 85.

[56] Steven Gunn and Antheun Janse, 'Introduction' in *Court as a Stage: England and the Low Countries in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 2.

[57] Katie Stevenson, 'Contesting Chivalry: James II and the Control of Chivalric Culture in the 1450s', *Journal of Medieval History* 22 no. 2 (2007); 198.

[58] Laurence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 186.

dynasty as part of the traditions of chivalric culture and began the process of producing a chivalric legacy. The emphasis on chivalric symbolism for its legitimising power, domestically and on the European stage, was gleaned from the promoting of the Order of the Garter previously explored, but also in the cultural links that lay in its traditions and values.

One broader example of the ties created between Henry VII and chivalric culture comes, again, from the Order of the Garter. As we have seen, the organisation was itself grounded in the cultural traditions of Englishness and chivalric performance, being linked with King Arthur through performative rituals, such as round table gatherings. It was also associated with St. George, patron Saint of England and Chivalry. Members of the group were expected to participate in celebrations to mark the Day of St. George every year. They were required to attend vigil as well as participate in a Feast, stipulated in the statutes, to be held at Windsor Castle unless the sovereign said otherwise.[59] An image of the Saint was worn on a gold chain during Order proceedings.[60] Along with King Arthur, who was a mythologised figure, adapted for the original Order's needs, throughout the medieval period, St. George became another chivalric emblem that promoted the idealisation of chivalric values within society.[61] St. George, alongside King Arthur, represented the chivalric masculine values that were often portrayed through the literary representations of the Saint during the medieval period. As a historical character, he had fought against the odds to achieve victory, showing valour and bravery. Consequently, he was seen to protect those seeking chivalric pursuits throughout the Middle Ages, such as those going to the crusades or fighting in battle.[62] This idea of protection was extended to the new king.

Furthermore, the association between Henry VII and the Saint did not just come through the Order itself. Robert Fabian, writing throughout Henry's reign, drew links between the English saint and the king, dramatically portraying Henry taking a pause before riding to save England from the evil Richard III at Bosworth. Fabian writes: 'incontyently [Henry] knelyd down vpon the erth, and with meke countenance […] he commundyd suche as were about hym boldly in the name of God and seint George to sette forwarde'.[63] Although quite fancifully depicting the future king, the text shows Henry as a worthy successor to the English throne. This was not simply for the reason that Henry was attempting to right the disruption Richard III's kingship caused to the overriding Commonweal principals, but also because Henry was granted protection by St. George to venture onto the battlefield safely, an action undertaken in the name of chivalry. He therefore claimed the throne and justly became king and head of the Order of the Garter.

---

[59] *The Statues of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London: T. H. Coe, 1804), 6-11.

[60] *The Statutes*, 43

[61] See: Andrea Ruddick, 'God and England: Ecclesiastical Rhetoric and a Political Theory of Nationhood' in *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 257-307.

[62] See: Danna Piroyansky, 'Thomas, Earl of Lancaster: Christ's Knights' in *Martyrs in the Making: Political Martyrdom in Late Medieval England* (Basingstoke: Pan Macmillan, 2008), 23-48. This chapter provides some context to the crusaders and the of St. George as their patron and protector, with specific examples to cultural adoptions and aligning particular individuals with the Saint.

[63] Robert Fabyan, *The New Chronicles of England and France, In Two Parts; by Robert Fabyan. Named By Himself the Concordance of Histories. Reported from Pension's Edition of 1516. The First Part Colleated with the Editions of 133, 1549, and 1559; and the Second with a Manuscript of the Author's Own Time, as well as the Subsequent Editions: Indlucing the Different Continuations. To which are Added A Biographical and Literary Preface and an Index, by Henry Ellis* (London: F. C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Co.; Cadell and Davies; J. Mawman; and J. Johnsons and Co., 1811) , 672.

Hilary Jane Locke

The idea that Henry as king was a positive model for England's future can also be seen by the comparisons made with Edward IV's reign. The alignment between the two reigns reveals the overall importance of chivalry in the early Tudor years for political stability; for the key establishing the Tudor dynasty lay through Henry's Yorkist predecessor. Edward IV, widely regarded as a highly chivalric king, was keenly interested in the way existing culture could help serve him and his court following the conflict that got him to the throne. The reality for Henry was similar, and his relations with Edward, both familial and cultural, enabled further dynastic development. The initial traces of a connection between these monarchs came in the form of Henry's marriage to Edward's eldest daughter Elizabeth of York. Following this, Henry restored the legitimacy of Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville in Parliament; the marriage had been declared invalid by Richard III so that his accession could be legal. Henry simultaneously used the opportunity to undermine Richard's kingship, describing his predecessor as 'Richard, late duke of Gloucester, and after, dede and *not of right*, king of England, called Ricard IIId'.[64] Emphasising Richard's improper rule, being the 'said late pretended King Richard', created the impression that Henry's rule was the legitimate, reinstating order. Whilst this can be seen as yet another chance to slander the king Henry dethroned, it also placed Edward's royal pedigree above that of his brother's, thereby bridging the gap between Henry and Edward and excluding Richard further. Bernard André, Henry's official court biographer, even refers to Edward as 'a powerful and magnificent king', while being otherwise highly critical of the Wars of the Roses and the Yorkists.[65] Crucially, the connection offered Henry another point of legitimation for his reign, if not only for him, but through his children with Elizabeth of York.

Moreover, Edward IV's reign was as much about establishing his legitimacy through chivalric practice as Henry VII's was. Pageantry at royal events, such as coronations, weddings, and funerals was one of the ways in which chivalric traditions linked with public representations of monarchy. For instance, in the November of 1494, Henry VII dubbed his second son Henry the Duke of York and a Knight of the Bath. This event was followed by several days of feasts, celebrations, and, most importantly, a tournament. The act of making Henry the Duke of York was a deliberate rebuttal to those who were still determined to undermine the Tudor dynasty. Ennobling the young prince with the title traditionally given to the second royal son, sent a direct message to those who were hoping to install Perkin Warbeck, who claimed to be Edward IV's second son, on the English throne. This highly political move gave Henry VII space to show the united monarchy and nobility to the public. Events included parading the prince through the streets of London: 'Lord Henry, which, with great honour, tryhumphe and of great astertes, was convoyed thorough London'.[66] Alongside the Yorkist title, Henry was also made a Knight of the Bath: 'and thenne the kyng gerd his swerde a bout hym, and after doubted him knyght in manner accustumed'.[67] The representation of a strong royal family was key to the message that the creation of Henry as the Duke was sending; the Queen and the older sister of Prince Henry, Margaret, were present throughout the celebrations. The description of the family and presentation of royalty was lavish over the days of the celebration. Moreover, the record of this induction, from the MS Cotton, Julius B. xii, is enriched by examples of chivalric language describing both proceedings and the

---

[64] *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII*, 120-122.

[65] Bernard André, *The Life of Henry VII*, trans. Daniel Hobbins (New York: Italica Press, 2001), 19.

[66] 'Appendix VI-The Creation of Henry Duke of York [MS. Cott., Julius, D. XI*I. f. 91*]' in *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII,* ed, James Gairdner (London: Longman, 1861), 389.

[67] 'Creation of Henry Duke of York', 391.

members of the royal family. Beyond the creation of Prince Henry's dukedom, the representation of the royal family this way — honourable, masculine, triumphant — played a part in creating a legacy of Henry VII as a reign successfully rich in chivalric traditions.

Seven year later, in 1501, chivalric pageantry created further opportunities to spread the message of legitimacy when Henry's eldest son married Katherine of Aragon. It also gave the Spanish newcomer to the country some insight into the role that chivalric ideology played in the workings of politics in the English court. The marriage itself was an opportunity for the Tudors. The alliance solidified their place on the European political stage, not only by linking the Spanish and English states, but also by demonstrating how Henry VII was accepted by foreign leaders, and domestically it offered another opportunity to show strength, riches and unity. The journey to the marriage had been fraught and difficult. The terms and conditions, agreements and disagreements, of the marriage contract were squabbled over many times, the children being married by proxy on several occasions. King Ferdinand of Aragon and Queen Isabella of Spain were careful about handing over one of their precious daughters. However, the Spanish were clear supporters of Tudor rule, expressing their loyalty to Henry VII as the rightful king of England in diplomatic correspondences during the Perkin Warbeck crisis (1490-1499).[68] Moreover, Ferdinand and Isabella had much to gain from the Anglo-Spanish alliance. It was a way of gaining a political stronghold over Europe. The threat of Warbeck weakened those chances substantially. The Spanish had grand plans, such as wanting a monopoly on political power in Europe: 'In fact', Isabella and Ferdinand wrote, 'we think that if we were to marry one daughter to the son of the King of England, and another daughter to the King of Scots, it would […] be sufficient to preserve peace between the Kings of England and Scotland'.[69] Representative of their political plans as a whole, the alliance with the English was a step toward ruining the grip of the French over the Scottish, and ultimately going to war with a weakened France. On another level, the correspondence affirmed words of confidence for Henry as king. Consequently, when the Warbeck episode finally came to a close in 1499, arrangements for the marriage of Arthur to the Infanta were finalised. Henry VII was presented with an opportunity to sell the image of the royal family, to promote the links of royal power with his own state, and display himself on the European diplomatic stage. He would achieve this through Arthur, the most important member of his legacy and dynasty.

Chivalric discourse saturated the wedding celebrations. The marriage itself finally took place in London on November 14, 1501, and it was lavish affair with grandiose performances, stage plays, and decoration. Once Princess Katherine was within the City Walls she was serenaded by performers, who recited lyrics before her journey to be married.[70] Firstly, she was welcomed 'into Brytayn/the land of Arthure', followed with of praises of her groom-to-be's attributes, he being an 'Armour of Justice'.[71] The significance of Henry's decision to name his son Arthur will be explored more thoroughly in the next chapter; however, it is hard to ignore the obvious double meaning here, England being both the place where Prince Arthur lives, and the land that King Arthur had inhabited. The three ushers of the Infanta were Policy,

---

[68] *Calendar of Letters, Dispatches, and State Papers relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere, Vol 1. Henry VII. 1485-1509,* ed. G. A. Bergenroth (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1862), 50-148.

[69] Ferdinand and Isabella, 'To De Puebla (1496)' in *Calendar of Letters Between England and Spain,* 97.

[70] *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne,* ed. Gordon Kipling (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 17-20.

[71] *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne*, 27

Nobility and Virtue. This trio relayed detailed messages to Katherine about England and qualities of character and personality — both Policy and Nobility were dressed as a knights, while Virtue was dressed as a bishop.[72] As Policy spoke, he identified in Katherine 'tokens of vertue and nobles. Two thynges to the commonweall necessary, And that to the commonweall I have 'a singular [joy]'.[73] Katherine had the character necessary to be the future queen of England, being of virtuous nobility, tempered with traditional signs of womanhood. Reaffirming this gendered role on her arrival, she made it clear that she understood her duties as future queen of England. She was to serve the 'commonweall' by bearing children and being closely linked to a sense of Englishness. Nobility followed Policy stating 'That […] Pollici entre first the gate, For we in noo wise may be seperate'.[74] By these distinctive interactions between the ideals of policy, nobility, virtue, and their traditional connotations with the ideal of chivalry, the Tudor regime offered a brief education and performative introduction to the political and courtly environment she was entering. These statements about nobility and virtue, those concepts being nothing without policy, or politics, and their ingrained nature in the understanding of the state, reflect the complex interplay between politics and court culture. Moreover, they were reflective of the personal attributes of virtue and nobility, which were the highest importance to a courtier in Henry VII's court.

Accompanying the installation of Prince Henry as Duke of York and Prince Arthur's marriage, and many other celebrations, were tournaments that showcased how crucial chivalric performative practice was to the projections of masculine values in the political arena. In order to be a successful member of the king's retinue, men needed to show their strength and success in the jousting arena. Following the inductions in 1494, 'justy and turney was proclaimed in the kyngis chamber […] to scew dyvers acts and exercises of armes'.[75] It was important, following the ennobling of Prince Henry, to show the strength of monarchy through the physical achievements by the king's men. This masculine play was a key part of the Burgundian chivalric model, as previously stated. Men of high status were given the opportunity to express masculine pursuits, without having to engage in battle. Jousts and tournaments facilitated the further growth of performative masculinity that rested within chivalric discourse, and coincided with events of political pageantry while the monarchy was on display to the public and to foreign guests. Being a man, or a companion of the realm and king, meant holding a legitimate place within the court and therefore displaying masculine values, which were to be expressed through the chivalric masculine arts of physical activity, as much as through outward presentation and participation in political life.

The ideals of masculinity and chivalry practice were reiterated in Royal MS 19 C VIII, particularly the idea of masculinity and chivalric practice is expressed through its illuminations. Compiled by Quentin Poulet, the Royal Librarian, in 1496 (the illuminations were completed in 1500), the manuscript demonstrates the ideals of masculine strength as linked with chivalric pursuits. It contains the poem *Imaginacion de vraye noblesse* (Imagination of True Nobility) by the medieval diplomat Hugues de Lannoy. The illuminations alongside the text tell a tale of a functioning, peaceful society, as the reader follows Lady Imagination guiding The Knight through different scenes. Of most interest, however, is the illumination titled

---

[72] *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne,* 18.

[73] *The Receyt of the Lady Katheryne*, 18.

[74] *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne*, 18.

[75] 'Creation of Henry Duke of York', 389

Man Without Chivalry or Honour.[76] This depicts Lady Imagination introducing The Knight to a man with severed arms, the limbs hovering beside his body. As a part of a manuscript dedicated to the king (the initial illumination is of Poulet presenting the king with the manuscript in the Burgundian fashion) this image reflects upon the importance of chivalry to the individual. Without having embraced a chivalric lifestyle, the man is disabled, and unable to participate in society in a functional or productive manner. He is also literally disarmed. Moreover, he cannot prove his chivalric character either, as a man-at-arms or in other ways such as jousting or tournaments. The image serves as a warning to The Knight. Without embracing an honourable life, with chivalric values, he cannot serve the realm as a member of society, least of all the king. With the limbs only hovering slightly away from the man's body, the image implies that once the man welcomes honour back into his life, he will regain the use of his limbs and will contribute to a chivalric society. This image within a manuscript dedication to the king provides a gentle indication that chivalry acted to give people worth and value; and it was a symbolic statement, that the chivalric ethos kept society progressing.

The generation of cultural content to develop chivalric behaviour, such as this manuscript, was common throughout Henry VII's reign, especially as a way to promote these values throughout society. Burgundian chivalry encouraged the patronage of artists and scholars and promoted the court as a hub of cultural production. This patronage offered a two way transaction. Firstly, by drawing a large number of European writers and thinkers to Henry's court, it generated a high cultural presence within Tudor England. Secondly, patronage also offered the king a platform to spread ideas about how the kingdom could operate and promote the ideals he felt were necessary. The clearest example of this occurred in 1489, when Henry patronised William Caxton to translate and publish Cristine de Pisan's treatise on late Middle Ages chivalric discourse, *The Boke of the Fayt of Armes and of Chyualrye* (The Book of the Deeds and Arms of Chivalry). Her work again emphasised that the king was, or needed to be, the *most* chivalric man in the realm, exercising justice and guiding his subjects with benevolent chivalric intentions. That Henry, according to Caxton's epilogue, personally requested that this text be translated and published seems to be an explicit attempt by the king to promote and circulate de Pisan's ideas on chivalry:

> [the king] desired and wylls me to translate this said boke [and] reduce it in our english [and] natural tonge / [and] to put it enprynte to thence that every gentylman born to arms [and] all manere men of werre captains / souldiours / vytayllesrs [and] all other shold have knowlege how they out to behave theym in the fayttes of warre [and] of battyles.[77]

Henry's request that the text be rendered in English made it accessible to the reading public, literacy being a skill that was slowly on the increase through this period. This book was explicitly intended to influence behaviour. The text itself is structured like a manual directed at segments of society: from king, prince, through justices entrusted with law enforcement, to men-at-arms. Chivalry, whether on the battlefield or at court, was to be performed to recognised standards, which Henry VII seems to have been promoting.

---

76 Hughes de Lannoy, *Imaginacon de vraye noblesse, with preface by Quentin Poulet*, 'Lady Imagination showing the Knight with severed arms representing a man without chivalry or honour (Illumination)', British Library, Royal MS 19 C VIII, 1496, f. 32.

77 Caxton, 'Epilouge to The Fayttes of Armes (1489)', 103.

Furthermore, de Pisan's text described how properly to educate children properly in the skills of chivalry and warfare. Henry intended this text to be a functional and influential manual for society. Thus de Pisan's guidelines would have chivalry, knowledge of warfare and arms taught not only to male children of the nobility from an early age, but also to the wider population, for de Pisan states that if a 'commoner' 'hath and power to lerne the arte and scyence of armes whyche is not to be thought of litel importans nor with litel peyne goten & to him saith he that in suche dyscipline is wel taught'.[78] Ideally, then, throughout England, chivalric education would be undertaken by as many people as possible, instructing boys and men how to properly behave under chivalric influences. Given Caxton's previous endorsement of chivalry as an important civilising ideal, it is unsurprising that he states de Pisan's text is 'in myn oppinyon […] as necessary a boke'.[79] Through Caxton and de Pisan, Henry promoted chivalric behaviour in his realm, issuing a direct endorsement of the positive influence chivalry had throughout society. As if promoting it further, Caxton ends the epilogue with hope that the king 'may have victories honour / [and] renommee to his perpetual glorye'.[80]

In the same year, Margaret Beaufort, the king's mother, requested the printing and translation of the French text *Blanchardyn and Eglantine*. As a courtly love tale, it was written to be entertaining, which Caxton takes note of in the prologue, the story being 'honeste [and] Ioyefull to all vertuouse yong gentylmen [and] wy*mm*en'.[81] Courtly love, which will be discussed further in Chapter Three, had value in this case through its connections to the chivalric traditions. Promoting courtly love alongside promoting chivalric deeds and masculine arts, was about promoting appropriately gendered performance. The feminine role of serving and rewarding their chivalric men would encourage them to follow their chivalric teaching.[82] Indeed, Caxton did not miss an opportunity to reiterate the valuable nature of chivalry. He stated that even after reading this text, 'it is request other whyle to rede in Auncyent hystoryes of noble fayttes [and] valia*n*t actes of armies [and] warre which achyevied in old time of many noble princes lordes [and] knyghtes / as well for to see [and] knowe'.[83] According to Caxton, readers should enjoy this tale, as well as seek other works to gain a further understanding of chivalry. Admittedly, it should be noted that Caxton was probably unashamedly promoting his other books. But, although Margaret's intentions with this text are not as clear as her son's in publishing de Pisan's work, the connection to the chivalric ethos clearly points towards the Tudors using their position to actively broaden and promote chivalric discourse throughout England.

The Tudor court also attracted large numbers of Humanist and Renaissance thinkers and scholars, some of whom went on to tutor the royal children.[84] Henry employed Burgundians to furnish his households, to illuminate his growing manuscript collections, and manage his growing libraries.[85] The already existing

---

[78] de Pisan, *Boke of the Fayt of Armes*, Fyrst Book, Capi. xxvj.

[79] Caxton, 'Fayttes of Armes', 103.

[80] Caxton, 'Fayttes of Armes', 104.

[81] Caxton, 'Blanchardyn and Eglantine [1489]', 105

[82] See: Anne Clark Bartlett, 'Tranlsation, Self-Representation, and Statecraft: Lady Margaret Beaufort and Caxton's Blanchardyn and Eglantine (1489)', *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22 (2005): 53-66.

[83] Caxton, 'Blanchardyn and Eglantine', 105.

[84] David Carlson, 'Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VII', *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* 22, no. 2 (1991): 253-279; this will be discussed throughly in the next chapter.

[85] See: Gordon Kipling, *The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance* (The Hague: Leiden University Press, 1977).

royal collection of manuscripts held a selection of chivalric texts, predominately dating from the mid-fifteenth century. The possession of chivalric texts represented the symbolic and powerful meaning that chivalry had to those who owned manuscripts. They were expensive to produce, translate and bind, but these texts themselves were intrinsically valuable because they represented the exploits and achievements of chivalric idols.[86] Examples circulating at the English court included various Royal manuscripts, which were compiled for Edward IV, including the works of Christina de Pisan and 'The Breviary of the Noble', the French poem by Alain Chartier.[87] The owning of others, not just local to English royal libraries, like the volumes of Jean Froissart's *Chroniques* of the Hundred Years' War (Netherlands, 1470s) and Jehan de Wavrin's *Chroniques d'Angleterre* (England, c.1470-c.1480), represented the increasing interest in possessing militaristic chronicles, which viewed chivalric achievement by the group and the individual with great importance.[88] In Henry's reign, Harley MS 6149 (*c.*1494) included texts such as Caxton's printed version of *The Book of the Order of Chivalry*, and other chivalric medieval texts.[89] These works all had chivalric discourse, characters, and practice in common, with characters and their narratives exploring the way chivalry, and its concepts, worked towards bettering themselves and society generally.

Ultimately, cultural content, such as manuscripts that contained chivalric texts and works from the press of Caxton, represented the culmination of the symbolic weight chivalry had brought to the king and his reign. The accumulation of texts that explored these ideals, or the patronising of works for a larger audience to gain access to them in print, pushed the boundaries further regarding circulation than in previous centuries. The chivalric culture that began to shift in Edward IV's reign gained momentum throughout the early Tudor dynasty, as its political ideals and masculine values were emphasised in both cultural and court life through practice and representation. With chivalric cultural content consolidating the engagement with long-standing chivalric institutions, the Tudor dynasty was on track to becoming a monarchy that upheld the values that Caxton and others thought suitable for rebuilding after such a time of upheaval.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the employment of chivalric institutions and engagement with chivalric culture for the potential they gave Henry as a king seeking to found a dynasty. The reliance on chivalric hierarchies for direct support, as well as the prolonged, active interest in generating cultural content that relayed and repeated chivalric themes and narratives, facilitated dynastic growth and the development of political strength and legitimacy. This achievement, however, becomes ever more clearer when considering both Prince Arthur and Henry VIII's roles in continuing the Tudor dynasty. What Henry VII began to build — a dynasty that was stronger and solidly based on chivalric discourse — carried over into the lives of his sons. The ways in which chivalric ideology developed and continued into the reign of Henry VIII reveal a fascinating reliance on this existing discourse for political and representational purposes. Both as heirs to the throne, and as young aristocratic men being raised in the court environment, Arthur and Henry were fostered

---

[86] See: Malcolm Vale, 'Manuscripts and Books' in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. 7: c.1415-c.1500* ed. Christopher Allmand (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 278-286.

[87] Alan Chartier, *Breviaire des nobles,* The British Library, Royal MS 15 VI, 1444-1445, ff. 403r-404v.

[88] Jehan de Wavrin, *Anciennes et nouvelles chroniques d'Angleterre,* The British Library, Royal MS 14 IV, 1470-*c.*1480.

[89] Ramon Llull, 'The Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry', The British Library, Harley MS 6149, *c.* 1494, ff. 83-109.

to exhibit chivalric characteristics and sensibilities. In the next chapter, the short life of Arthur will be discussed in the context of the chivalric court of Henry VII, as a further projection of the Tudor chivalric ideals constructed by the king explored in this chapter. Moreover, the early reign of Henry VIII, will also be examined in the context of chivalry, discussing the extent to which chivalry affected his personality, his power, and the cultural clash between his desire for the masculine pursuits of warfare, and the advanced political practice that was being shaped by humanistic discourse. The role that chivalric discourse played in the lives of the sons of Henry VII ultimately reveals his reliance on chivalry for the sake of political and dynastic strength in the hope that it would give longevity to the Tudor dynasty.

Chapter Two:

'All Goodly Sport, For My Comfort':
Prince Arthur, King Henry, and the Chivalric Tudor Dynasty

'[The] fyrst founder of the round table / Kyng Arthur kyng of the brytons that tyme regnyng in this Royam|me / of whos retenue were many noble Kynges. Prynces / lordes: and knyghtes· of which the noblest were knyghtes of the round table· of whos actes and historyes there be large volumes and bookes grete plente'.

— *The boke intituled Eracles, and also of Godefrey of Boloyne,*
Translated by William Caxton, 1481.[1]

Coming from larger works written by William of Tyre in the eleventh century, and translated and printed by William Caxton in 1481, *The Book of Godfrey* upheld King Arthur as emblematic of greatness and nobility. Continuing from the passage above, the text states that King Arthur was to be honoured above Charlemagne: 'Arthur [being] so gloryous and shynyng that he is stalled in the fyrst place of the mooste noble / beste and worthyest of the cristen men'.[2] Most importantly, alongside the 'many noble' company of knights, Arthur represented chivalric achievement and the perfection of chivalry. As a literary figure and mythologised character, King Arthur was the epitome of the chivalric past and represented a golden age to Henry VII. Therefore, it was significant that he named his eldest son Arthur, to be the next King Arthur, thereby making a symbolic statement of the chivalric values already explored in the previous chapter. Born in 1486, the year following Henry VII's ascent to the throne, Prince Arthur helped to solidify both the king's reign and the commitment to building a chivalric legacy in his dynasty.

Significantly, Prince Arthur's birth also elicited responses from others not focused on the chivalric connection with King Arthur. Prince Arthur's birth and future kingship were crucial to the humanist movement, which was gaining momentum in Henry's court and throughout Europe during the 1490s. Humanists saw the prince as the future king to bring about another classical golden age, a fundamental period for their teachings and methods.[3] Consequently, his birth was celebrated by those humanists already in Henry's court. As Italian humanist Giovanni Gigli remarked in his *Epigramma in natalem principis* following the prince's birth, 'offspring of Henries, for a long time now promised to the Britons, coming from heaven, be born, great youth'.[4] The prince, in this work, is the promised future king, not only for heralding a return to a chivalric kingdom, but also seen in the accompanying poem *Genethliacon,* Gigli marked the prince's birth as a symbolic 'pledge of perpetual peace'.[5] In this peace, it was the humanists and their ideals

---

[1] Gulielmus, Archbishop of Tyre, *Here begynneth the boke intituled Eracles, and also of Godefrey of Boloyne, the which speketh of the Conquest of the holy londe of Iherusalem, etc. translated out of ffreussche in to englyshhe by W. Caxton,* London, William Caxton, 1481, EEBO, The British Library, a 3.

[2] Gulielmus, *Godefrey of Bolyne*, a 3.

[3] David Carlson, 'Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VIII', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 no. 2 (1991).

[4] Antony J. Hasler, *Court Poetry in Late Medieval England and Scotland: Allegories of Authority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 23; translated from the Latin by Hasler.

[5] Hasler, *Court Poetry,* 24

Hilary Jane Locke

that would flourish under the patronage and encouragement of the future king, who would value the fundamental principles of this philosophy, broadly defined as the 'self-conscious commitment to return to the classics, or *ad fontes*, [...and] the *studia humanitatits*'.[6] Thus the new heir, and his younger brother Henry seemed to straddle this cultural division between Henry VII's dynastic hopes and the humanistic ideals of non-chivalric progress and adaption; it is all the more fascinating that both parties were determined to mine and explore the past for their educational and political purposes. In other words, the Tudor princes' lives represented the politicised ideal of embracing chivalry for the message it conveyed; also, the prospect of moving towards different, often contrasting, and developing ideas circulating among humanists at the time.

Following this interpretation, Chapter Two will first examine the brief life of Prince Arthur Tudor in the context of chivalric culture and its links to the Arthurian myth. It will argue that the prince was a clear example of chivalric symbolism, connecting the Tudors to the Arthurian historical legacy. While Arthur was only heir for fifteen years, his life indicates substantially Henry VII's intentions for him as a successor, and the dynasty as a whole. His education, which will also be explored, gives further context to the continuation of Burgundian chivalric values, as well as the cultural tensions that were at play moving from the medieval to the early modern, or chivalric to the humanistic forms of education. Subsequently, the early reign of Henry VIII will be examined in relation to chivalric discourse and masculine performance. By building on the foundations laid by his father, this young king would develop a court culture that actively utilised the same chivalric culture that helped establish the Tudor dynasty. Henry VIII personally identified strongly with the presentational roles of chivalric masculinity that shaped his reign and kingly persona. Finally, this chapter will explore warfare and its relationship to the kingly mindset and public perceptions. Early Tudor discourse regarding warfare interacted, and often conflicted, with the individual male desire to fight and actively engage in war. Indeed, this military ethos of the young king clashed with rising diplomatic ideals and his humanist educated advisors. The desire to fight and gain a victory, however idealised, resulted in tensions that arose several times throughout Henry VIII's early reign. Ultimately, this chapter will argue that chivalric culture, particularly the kind as discussed during in the reign of Henry VII, continued to develop and shaped the lives of his sons and English court culture more broadly.

'Blossoming on One and the Same Branch': Prince Arthur, Chivalric Legacy, and Cementing Dynastic Legitimacy.

The legacy and influence the Arthurian legend has had on English, and chivalric, culture is undeniable, particularly throughout the medieval period. To the early Tudor monarch, who wanted to communicate legitimacy and consolidate his place on the throne, the explicit referential nature of the name Arthur itself, and the actions taken after Arthur's birth, constituted an intelligent political strategy made in the context of chivalric culture. By the late-fifteenth century, the Arthurian legend was synonymous with England and what it was to be English; Bernard André, official court biographer to Henry VII, referred to the English as 'O race

---

[6] Daniel Wakeline, *Humanism, Reading and English Literature 1430-1530* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 8; *ad fontes* meaning back to original sources and *studia humanitatits* meaning the study of grammar, poetry, rhetoric, history, and moral philosophy which humanist promoted.

of Arthur' in his biography of Henry VII.[7] Consequently, the child born of the York and the Lancastrian alliance, and heir to the English throne, held an important position in the process of Henry VII maintaining power. André wrote that this son 'himself enhanced the sweet and shining roses, those red and white flowers blossoming on one and the same branch even as his celebrated virtue equalled, if not surpassed, the fame of the former princes'.[8] The child, as a consequence of his birth, was the heir of both Lancastrian and Yorkist dynasties, and he was therefore a worthy of the successor to the throne.

Furthermore, the name Arthur communicated that Henry wished his son to be seen as a legitimate successor to England through his name alone. It tied in with the links that Henry VII attempted to establish from in order to solidify his own kingship. The king had commissioned genealogists to trace his ancestry, which pointed to him being an obvious descendant of King Arthur.[9] Tudor representation, according to David A. Summers, used King Arthur for 'the cultural notions and roles, monarchal and messianic, that the people valued and which were consequently useful to Henry [...for recognising the] iconic position Arthur held in the popular conception of British national identity'.[10] In other words, King Arthur, as a cultural ideal strongly identified with by the English and their heritage, enabled Henry VII's communication of the strength and legitimacy of his kingship. Henry also engaged with his Welsh ancestry and symbolism by employing the red dragon for his royal emblem; Wales was also conveniently associated with the origin stories of King Arthur and the similarly much mythologised founder of Britain, Trojan Brutus, both of whom were deemed ancestors of Henry VII.[11] More obviously, as already discussed, Henry enlisted the Order of the Garter as a connection between himself and the mythologised king. In time, the Prince would take his place within this Order; however this was not the only symbolic Arthurian connection made by Henry VII regarding his son's birth.

The Prince was Christened at Winchester, which was historically associated with King Arthur; as Steven Gunn emphasises: 'Winchester was linked to King Arthur, as the city where he held court and proclaimed tournaments in [the] thirteenth-century romances of Chretien de Troyes'.[12] This Prince was born in Westminster, which makes clear that the decision regarding the site of christening was deliberate and a statement of this connection. The king brought his court to celebrate the birth of his son, and while little evidence remains of the events that took place, the very fact that Henry VII chose Winchester suggests he was drawing on the general mythology of King Arthur to create a chivalric aura around the child. However, as David Carlson argues, the poems that welcomed Arthur to the world were from humanist perspectives; not linking his name to the medieval knight King Arthur, but heralding a new antiquity aiding the humanists to spread their thinking and philosophical perspectives. These humanists, in particular André, the previously mentioned Gigli, and Pietro Carneliao, had their own ambitions, not to mention different nationalities and backgrounds, and naturally used the opportunity to bypass the Arthurian connection to discuss the works of

---

[7] André, *The Life of Henry VII,* 5.

[8] André, *Life of Henry VII,* 1.

[9] Calrson, 'King Arthur and Court Poems for the Birth of Prince Arthur Tudor in 1486', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 36 (1987): 151.

[10] David A. Summers, 'Refashioning Arthur in the Tudor Era', in *Exemplaria* 9 (1997): 377.

[11] Carlson, 'The Court Poets', 149-150.

[12] Steven J. Gunn, 'Prince Arthur Prepares for Kingship' in *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Birth Death and Commemoration*, ed. Steven J. Gunn and Linda Monkton (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009) , 7.

antiquity in relation to the new prince and the contemporary environment. Regardless, Henry VII intended Arthur's birth to be celebrated as the coming of a new chivalric prince, who could grow into a chivalric king, King Arthur Tudor. Despite Arthur's premature death, this emulation of King Arthur as a figure of celebration continued, for Henry VIII would come to hang a replica of the round table at Winchester Cathedral, with the Tudor rose in the centre, and a figure, who is possibly Henry VIII, painted on the table. So the naming and christening of Arthur were elements in Henry VII's plan for a chivalric dynasty, and a very clear indication that the first Tudor king was attempting to build a chivalric legacy.

Furthermore, the manner in which the Prince was educated shows the increasing interplay between the traditional chivalric models and the modern humanist ideals of thinking. Of course, historically, chivalry played an important role in the education of many male heirs during the Middle Ages. Arthur was no exception. Previous monarchs made sure their sons engaged with the art of chivalry by practice and through literature. During Henry VII's time in exile, the Yorkist monarchs ensured chivalry was a key component of the education of their heirs and the greater nobility. For example, during the 1480s, as noted in William Caxton's prologue to Llull's *Order of Chyualry,* Richard III states he 'commaunde this book to be had and redde vnto other *young lordes knyghts and gentylmen* within this royame/ that the noble ordre of chyvalry be hereafter better used [and] honoured than hit hath been in late dayes passed'.[13] Caxton again alludes to the lost chivalric ideal, and its reinstallation, and by printing these guidelines reminded those within the nobility how to conduct themselves. By directing young 'gentlemen' to emulate the practices of the past, and by adopting the character of civility, honour and respectability, these readers could reinvigorate chivalric performance and discourse as part of their overall education.

Edward IV had also ensured that his son Prince Edward was taught valuable lessons from existing chivalric tales. A letter from the king to the Earl Rivers, protector and uncle of the Prince of Wales, reveals details of how Edward's day was structured, including prayer times, meals and food, and whom the prince could socialise with. The king placed emphasis on the Prince's participation in 'training exercises of humanity, according to their birth […] and in nowise to be suffered in idleness, or in unvirtuous occupation'.[14] These exercises included horse riding, archery, sword play, and other such boyish pursuits for the young prince to participate in. One item is dedicated to the crucial chivalric lessons the prince needed to learn about character, masculinity, and behaviour:

> by the discretion of the Earl Rivers, that then be read before [Edward] such noble stories as behoveth to a prince to understand and know; and that communication at all times be of virtue, honour, cunning, wisdom, and deeds of worship, and of nothing that should move or stir him to vice.[15]

Although this is only one item of many in the letter, it gives a small clue to how the 'noble stories' were regarded, particularly their application as an pedagogical tool. Whilst the stories are not specified, chivalric texts like that of including *Kyng Arthur* or *The Canterbury Tales* for instance, would have formed part of this

---

[13] Caxton, 'Order of Chyualry', 84. Emphasis my own.

[14] 'The Education of a Prince, a Letter from Edward IV to Earl of Rivers and the Bishop of Rochester, quoted in *the King's Letters*' in *Readings in English Social History: From Pre-Roman Days to AD 1837* ed. R. B. Morgan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), 207.

[15] 'Education of a Prince', 205.

prince's education, giving him access to chivalric ideals to inform his kingly character. The king also informs Earl Rivers to monitor the behaviour of those socialising with the prince. The terms used — virtue, honour, cunning and wisdom — greatly emphasise chivalric conduct. Thus, by ensuring that the prince's social contact was with those exhibiting sensibilities linked with chivalric ideals, there seems to be a deliberate strategy of moulding the prince's character. Unfortunately, Prince Edward, like Arthur, never reached his full potential as king, neither was he given the opportunity to extend his chivalric lessons beyond his education. What is clear, however, is that Edward IV wished his son to be raised with the knightly virtues.

In Arthur's case, however, the traces of the exact chivalric education that he received are overshadowed by the humanist teachings of scholars whose records remain of Arthur's accomplishments in their own discipline. Employing these tutors can be seen as Henry VII's way of expressing the previously discussed Burgundian chivalric ideals. Under the king's employment were some of the finest humanist thinkers of the age and by opening his court up as a place for cultural patronage, the king drew these mostly European scholars to England; as David Carlson states,

> the patronage of Henry VII […] encouraged the development of humanism in England […] [and] in the longer term, the favour he showed humanists — not least allowing a group of them formative influence on his children through their education — contributed crucially to the creation of a climate where native humanism could flower.[16]

The Tudor children benefitted from this immensely. Educating the children were notable intellectuals and humanists, including the previously mentioned Bernard André, but also John Skelton, William Hone, Giles Duwes, and later Erasmus and Sir Thomas More; Skelton and More were to play a crucial political role in the kingship of Henry VIII, coming to prominence after the death of Arthur, tutoring Henry as the new Prince of Wales.[17] Of those employed to educate the Prince, only two were not of humanist background: John Rede, who was a politician and pedagogue, and John Holt, a pedagogue also; as discussed by both David Carlson and Aysha Pollinitz, Rede was a new and professionalised type of educator who began to emerge throughout this period.[18] Crucially, by employing these men to educate his children, Henry VII exposed the future king to new and revived ideas of learning, diplomacy, language and communication for royal development, which broadened the prince's educational spectrum. As Pollinitz states: 'humanists' emphasis on liberal education transformed the upbringing of royal children and reshaped political and religious culture of the British isle', a point which has particular resonance and will be explored in the later sections of this chapter.[19]

Part of Prince Arthur's education was recorded in Henry VII's biography by André who provides brief snippets of Arthur's scholarly abilities, summed up through the reminiscing eyes of the tutor who taught him into the Prince's adolescence. 'After the completion of my studies', André writes, 'I […] devoted myself for

---

[16] Carlson, 'Royal Tutors', 279.

[17] Carlson, 'Royal Tutors', *passim.*

[18] Carlson, 'Royal Tutors', 260-1; Aysha Pollinitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 36.

[19] Pollinitz, *Princely Education,* 17.

four years to tutoring Arthur'.[20] The prince was an eloquent, intelligent, and promising individual and future king. André stated:

> I boldly assert one thing, that though he was not sixteen years old he had either committed partly to memory or at least […] read on his on own the following works: in grammar the writing of Guarino, Perotti, Pomponi Leto, Sulpizio, Aulus Gellius, and Valla; in poetry the works of Homer, Virgil, Lucan, Ovid, Silius, Plautus and Terence; in oratory Cicero's Duties, Letters and Paradoxes and Quintilian; and in history Thucydides, Livy, Caesar's Commentaries, Suetonius, Tacitus, Pliny, Valerius Maximus, Sallust, and Eusebius.[21]

This passage from André provides insight into the texts studied by the future king. As a humanist, there is a clear leaning to classical texts and writers. Consequently, Arthur's education took a directional difference to the royal children of previous generations. The inclusion of these humanist texts broadened the educational experience of the child, and generally changed the educational environment of the Tudor children overall.

Nevertheless, the record from André gives no weight to the Prince's chivalric education. This is not to say that it was not included. Outside reading materials, the inclusion of Arthur in chivalric events at court would have been a formative experience for him, demonstrating the importance chivalry and politics had in the Tudor dynasty. In one case, at Arthur's entrance to Coventry in 1498, the Prince was greeted by 'St. George and the Nine Worthies' where King Arthur, acting as spokesman for these gentleman, told the king to be that 'chivalrous prowess had a political purpose in subduing "rebelles" and "outward enmyes"'.[22] The Prince was also inducted into the Order of the Garter in 1491, when he was just five or six years of age. Whilst this was a usual rite of passage for the heir, and a political move generally, this also placed upon him certain responsibilities and opportunities to interact with Order members. Being a part of this institution afforded Arthur a place from which to learn the rules of ritual, and understand the political motivations of his father and king, and he presided over the Order's Feast of St. George in 1499.[23] The Order also included the delicate chivalric nuances that represented conduct and power in the courtly space during Henry VII's reign. The Prince was a member of the Order had come to fruition through courtly men emulating the prince's namesake, a connection that would not been missed by the prince.

Arthur was also presented with the tools of chivalric practice. In 1492, the prince received a bow and arrow.[24] Archery was a sport actively encouraged for princes to participate in. It was a masculine, socialising sport, taught to, and engaged in, by many members of a hunting party, or in competitions around the target. Indeed, as Nicholas Orme has argued, archery was common in the physical chivalric education of princes through the medieval period to the end of Henry VIII's reign: it steadily rose in popularity following victory at Agincourt, the bow being used amongst the aristocracy despite it also being used by 'ordinary men-at-arms' on the battlefield'.[25] Later on, Henry VIII was also an advocate for the sport, having also received

---

[20] André, *Henry VII*, 4.

[21] André, *Henry VII*, 9.

[22] Gunn, 'Prince Arthur Prepares', 9.

[23] Pollinitz, *Princely Education,* 31.

[24] *Exerpta Historica, or, Illustrations of English History* (London: Samuel Bentley, 1831), 88.

[25] Nicholas Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: the Eduction of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1984), 198.

bows and arrows as a child, and continuing this tradition with his own bastard son Henry Fitzroy. Indeed Henry VIII passed laws in 1512 which enforced the possession of a bow and arrows and regular shooting practice, on all males under sixty.[26] Wynkyn de Worde also published Juliana Bernes *Manere of Hawking and Hunting* in 1496, which states in the opening pages:

> in so moche that gentylmen and honeste persones haue grete delyte in hawkynge / and delyre to haue the manere to take hawkys: and also how and in what wyse they sholde guide them ordynatly […] therfor this boke folowynge in a dewe four me shewyth very knowlege of suche plesure to gentylmen and persones dysposyd to se it.[27]

Whilst there is no record of Arthur practicing hawking, archery, hawking, and hunting were all gentlemanly pastimes of the Tudor gentry. These sports were considered honourable pursuits for men. Having the tools of the chivalric arts would have facilitated the Prince's growth in masculine chivalric values, looking towards implementing them as chivalric performance when king; this becomes much clearer with the early reign of his younger brother Henry, which will be explored later.

One source that offers more evidence about the perpetuation of chivalric discourse, and courtly love ideals, and the representation of Arthur as the future king. The exquisite manuscript Royal MS 16 Fii consists of the poetry of Charles d'Orleans (1394-1465), his love lyrics in particular, and the anonymous treatise called *Livre de grace entiere* (The Governance of a Prince).[28] As a whole, the manuscript is filled with Tudor iconography and decoration, leading historians to conclude that it was in the possession of or created for Arthur. John Fox states that there is 'little doubt that the form in which [the manuscript] has survived is the one prepared for Arthur, Prince of Wales' and it was possibly assembled as a gift for Arthur's marriage to Katherine of Aragon in 1501.[29] Fox's conclusions are drawn from the iconography throughout the illuminations, including the ostrich feathers and the words *ic dene* (I serve), both Arthur's emblem and motto.[30] Fox also argues that 'perhaps it was [Bernard André], or, more likely the first Royal Librarian, Quintin Poulet of Lille, who was given charge of the compilation of what is now the most sumptuous of all the manuscripts of Charles's poetry'.[31] Regardless of whether Arthur himself read through the text within the manuscript itself, having it within his possession, or compiled for him, is crucial. For example, one of

---

[26] Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry,* 203.

[27] Juliana Berners, *This present boke shewyth the manner of hawkynge and huntynge and also of diuysynge of cote armours. It shewyth also a good matere belongynge to horses: wyth other commendable treatyses. And ferdermore of the brasynge of arms: as here after it mate appere,* London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1496, EEBO, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, a i.

[28] See: Timothy Hobbs, 'Prosimetrum in *Le Livre dit Grace Entiere sue le fair du goqvernment d'un Prince,* the Governance of a Prince trestise in British Library MS Royal 16 F ii', in *Littera Est Sensus: Essays on Form and Meaning in Medieval Friend Literature Presented to John Fox,* ed. D. A. Trotter (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1989), 49-62; The author deals with the question of the author and concludes that it must have been written during the fourteenth century, and therefore the copy within Royal MS 16 F ii is not the original.

[29] John Fox, 'Glanures' in *Charles D'Orléans in England, 1415-1440* ed. Mary-Jo Arn (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000), 107; Stephanie Downes, '"Je Hé Guerre, Point Ne La Doy Prisier': Peace and the Emotions of War in the Prison Poetry of Charles d'Orléans' in *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature* ed. Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch and Katrine O'Loughlin (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 70.

[30] Fox, 'Glanures', 105

[31] Fox, 'Glanures', 105

d'Orlean's poems can be interpreted as explicitly stating the Prince needed chivalric values to be an effective ruler: 'To your son, begging His Highness / To please look upon His People […] Beating down the warfare that brings total destruction'.[32] Through this verse we see the valuable nature of chivalric discourse, teaching the future king to protect against harmful warfare, and knowing when to defend through chivalric arts. The original context of this poem was a religious plea to the 'Virgin Mary as a mediator of the peace, able to intercede with Christ'.[33] However, applying the message of this poem to its intended reader, the lyrics emphasised the need to maintain peace, yet managing this with the need to defend his position when necessary.

Amongst the small amount of literature that addresses the text *Livre de grace entiere*, an essay by Timothy Hobbs sheds some light on the content.[34] Placing the treatise in the context of chivalry and chivalric education, which Hobbs does not to do, *Livre de grace entiere* combines the traditional values of piety, political awareness, plus chivalric discourse to shape the ruler. The text presents the foundations of good governance, combined with what a prince needs to understand about himself and those within the realm. On a simple level the treatise outlines basic ruling principles: for example utilising revenues for 'rewards for good service', or loyalty, to the realm. On a more detailed level, as Hobbs states about the text, 'the prince should know himself in order to govern others with humility and charity'.[35] Humility, as we have seen, was emphasised by William Caxton as one of those qualities missing from the gentlemen of the age, a chivalric ideal that needed to be reintroduced. Essentially, if Arthur was to be chivalric as a king, having the ability for reflection, self-awareness, and humility, this would facilitate better governance, respect as king, and peace within the realm. Further, *Livre de grace entiere* emphasises that 'the prince is urged to rule justly and unselfishly with due regard for the fact that he himself will be called to account on the Day of Judgement'.[36] These terms, closely linked with the idea of the chivalric self, are followed in the treatise by the 'four virtues of science, foresight, justice, and mercy'.[37] Contrasting with Caxton's continual message in his prologues and epilogues, it was these virtues that were important to forming masculinity identity, and in reading this text as it was presented to him (if he did), Arthur would have developed a deeper knowledge of these chivalric ideals and their implementation in kingly identity. Importantly, the text itself was from the mid-fourteenth century, which further supports Caxton's outlined mid-1480s demand that in order to progress forward, the texts of the past were to be revered, read, and revived.

If the texts sought to convey to Arthur a model of behaviour he needed to adopt in order to be a just and chivalric king, the visual elements of the manuscript convey this further. The illumination of *Livre de grace entiere,* entitled 'The Prince and His Council', depicts elements important to a young prince learning to be a king.[38] Firstly Arthur, or 'the prince', is dressed in cloth-of-gold, surrounded by a council of trusted advisors relaying information. Secondly, the prince spends his time at prayer on a richly curtained dais. Both

---

32 Downes, 'Peace and the Emotions of War', 70; translated from the medieval French.

33 Downes, 'Peace and the Emotions of War', 70.

34 Hobbs' chapter will be relied upon in this section, particularly his appendix to the essay in which he provides a simple synopsis of the text, rather than argument about the content. This is because as the source has not been translated and is rarely discussed in English in the literature. Hobbs, 'Prosimentrum', 60-62.

35 Hobbs, 'Prosimentrum', 60.

36 Hobbs, 'Prosimentrum', 61.

37 Hobbs, 'Prosimentrum', 61.

38 'The Prince and His Council', London, The British Library, Royal MS 16 F ii, f. 210v.

Hilary Jane Locke

of these activities are conducted under the watchful eye of a white greyhound, the emblem of Henry VII and his represention in the illumination. At this time, as Arthur was approaching his marriage to Katherine of Aragon, he would have been venturing on his journey to take up leadership of the council of the Marches in Ludlow to put into practice the task of preparing for kingship. These richly decorated images portray the forthcoming independence of Arthur from the security of court life, and the possible hope of shaping the boy's adolescence and kingly practice.

Furthermore, this manuscript — with its poems on love, and the treatise about how to govern, intermixed with the image of Arthur taking control over his duties as prince — were aimed at polishing and representing the prince's character before he took the throne.[39] The link between his counsellors and the king, which *Livre de grace entiere* highlights, compares the metaphoric state of the body, such as the previously explored rhetoric describing the relationship between the Order of the Garter members and the king. They offer the prince security and strength as he proceeds with his political life.[40] The interconnected state of politics, chivalry, and the very body of the king was inherent within the government system of the late medieval and early Tudor period, as chapter one explored. It was therefore crucial for Arthur to understand how this worked, in both practice and in theory. It is clear that *Livre de grace entiere* is a moralistic tale of what a prince should be once on the throne, and the lessons of implied chivalric values are the clear themes for Arthur's formation of character as he moved from childhood into adolescence.

Regrettably, as Prince Arthur died in 1502, it is impossible to judge what kind of king he would have been in practice. Through his education, and as indicated by the influence of humanists scholars and the evolving political chivalric discourse, the Prince was well prepared, and a capable and intelligent king-in-waiting. As Pollinitz stated, 'Arthur had had a traditional apprenticeship in the political, administrative, judicial and geographical aspects of kingship'.[41] However, also raised in a similar, if not more humanistic, environment, Henry VIII became the conveyer of Henry VII's legacy and dynastic goals. While Henry VII would not have a King Arthur as his successor, but a successor who carried his name rather than that of a chivalric legend, Henry VIII would continue his chivalric legacy to an exaggerated extreme.

'the eyght kynge Henry / Of great hardy corage': Chivalry, Masculinity, and Henry VIII's Court, 1509-1525

Coming to the throne at the age of just seventeen in 1509, young King Henry was a dramatic shift in personality compared to Henry VII, who had grown increasingly sick and insular towards the end of his reign. The accession of Henry VIII was praised by humanist scholars, who were the main educators of the king as a young boy. Yet, Stephen Hawes, who wrote *A ioyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall souerayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght* to mark Henry's coronation celebration, also used chivalric language to describe the new king. Hawes writes that, 'Whan the rede rose toke the whyte in maryage […] Descended is by right excellent courage / Kynge Henry the .Viii. for to

---

[39] The poems and texts on love will be covered in the last chapter of this thesis.
[40] Hobbs, 'Prosimentrum', 60.
[41] Pollinitz, *Princely Education,* 31.

reygne doutles / Unyversall his fame honour and larges'.[42] He goes on to say, 'Dystylled is now from the rose so red / And of the whyte so spryngynge from the roote […] This ryall tree was planted as I knowe / By god above the rancour to downe throwe'.[43] As much as André reflected upon Prince Arthur's origins as the product of the marriage between Yorkist and Lancastrian families, Hawes instead proposed that Henry VIII would be successful as a consequence of his birth, because the throne was rooted down by the hand of god, as opposed to the dynastic insecurities in the Wars of the Roses. This success would also stem from 'his fader excellent', who had given England the 'grete wonder of his spendynge', with Henry VIII naturally inheriting this treasure.[44]

Hawes also makes note of those in the court around Henry. He praises the new queen, Katherine of Aragon, and those of the royal family present. He also includes the men who offer their services to the new king:

> And you noble knyghtes to hauntynge chyvalry / Unto our souerayne be make and tendable / Whiche wyll rewarde you well and nobly / As to shewe his largesse vnyuersally / Encouraggne your hearts ye courage chyvialrous / In time of batayll for be vyctoryous.[45]

Hawes outlines the essence of the masculine politics of Henry VII's court and makes clear that men within the new king's court should be determined to emulate this model, and the new king would reward such behaviours. Chivalry, as a discourse and political practice, was expected to be maintained by the new king, and deployed as an effective behavioural, masculine model. Furthermore, whilst Hawes expanded upon the power and greatness of Henry VIII as the king, and a beacon for England, through the techniques 'of the gentyll poets in olde antyquytes', expanding on the virtues of kingly ideology through the allegories Roman gods, he does not understate or bypass chivalry in court politics.[46]

From his coronation onwards, there seemed to be a determination from Henry VIII to prove himself as capable and chivalric. This is not a controversial position; in most biographies of the king he is presented as an educated, eloquent man with the taste for chivalric pursuits and extravagance. Henry VIII gained this reputation as a glamorous and highly active man from the first decade of his reign through his own, sometimes exaggerated, efforts to represent both in the English court and the European courts that his kingdom was wealthy, and that he was worthy of his title. One way he performed the role was by continuously showing his prowess in the masculine arts. Over the first decade of Henry VIII's reign, jousts and tournaments were common occurrences. Frequently, these were held in conjunction with visits from ambassadors and other foreign dignitaries, such as the Emperor of Spain, the queen's nephew. Jousts were also held for the general entertainment of the king. The orders of apparel and revels from the king to Richard Gibson, a merchant tailor in London, indicate how extravagant and carefully planned these

---

[42] Stephen Hawes, *A ioyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall souerayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght,* London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509, EEBO, Cambridge University Library, lines 37, 40-42.

[43] Hawes, *ioyfull mediytacyon,* lines 58-59, 61-62.

[44] Hawes, *ioyfull mediytacyon,* lines 69, 79.

[45] Hawes, *ioyfull mediytacyon,* lines 182-187.

[46] Hawes, *ioyfull mediytacyon,* line 2.

events were.[47] Henry and his men were to be adorned in cloth-of-gold, damasked, or rich fabrics, planned either to match or complement each other. The accompanying banquets were also lavish. In one instance, a tournament and banquet held in honour of the Flemish ambassador's arrival in London showed off the riches of the Tudor court. With the 'banquet being ended, the King and the guests above mentioned betook themselves into another hall, where the damsels of the most serene Queen were, and dancing went on there for two hours, the King doing marvellous things, both in dancing and jumping, proving himself, as he in truth is, indefatigable'.[48] Understandably, Henry was determined to show off his court, but also himself as a fit jouster, an honourable monarch, and a personable courtly lover.

Perhaps the most famous tournament of the early reign of Henry VIII was the Westminster Tournament, held in the February of 1511 to celebrate the birth of Prince Henry, his son who did not live longer than a month. The King appeared at the joust as Sir Loyal Heart (Coeur Loyall), where he presented himself to his queen as a lowly knight wanting her favours. Joining him were Sir Edward Neville as Valiant Desire (Valliant Desyre), William, Earl of Devonshire as Good Valour (Bone Valoyr), and Sir Thomas Knyvet as Good Hope (Joyous Panser).[49] Over the two days, the king jousted under his chivalric persona, and was awarded a prize by the queen on the second day.[50] The poem, *Justes at Westminster,* paints the picture the Henry he seemed to be determined to create through this tournament, and during his early reign generally: 'Harry the Viij owe joye, oure delyte / Subdewer of wronged mayntaner or rightwyness / Fowtayne of honor exsampler of larges. / Our clypsyd son now clergd is from the dark / By Harry own kyng, the flour of natewr's warke'.[51] Henry VIII, as the most honourable man in England, represented the necessary chivalric values, he being 'gounde of noblyness', and performing on the courtly stage as a successful knight, winning his lady's heart.

Moreoever, as stated by Dale Hoak, the record of Henry VIII's performance as Sir Loyal Heart, and the many tournaments that followed, exposed the 'polito-cultural purposes of the Tudor tournament-as-spectacle: here was the staged, chivalric magnificence of young Henry's court, an orchestrated magnificence meant to rival that of the Burgundian court'.[52] This tournament was an attempt by Henry VIII to build upon the chivalric image of his father. The Westminster Tournament represented the king's success in producing an heir, which established his own succession. More pertinently though, it provided the king with an opportunity to show his own virtue through performing as Sir Loyal Heart, presenting himself as not a king, but as a humble servant, seeking the queen's favour, also pulling Katherine into chivalric role-play. Furthermore, whilst this will be explored further in the next chapter regarding Henry's own reliance on the courtly love tropes and traditions to engage with his romantic interests, Sir Loyal Heart represents the internal, chivalric life of Henry.

---

[47] '28 Feb 1510. Revel Accounts, No. 1'. in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.Vol. 2: Part II: 1517-18*, 1490; '14 Nov 1515. R. O. Revel Accounts, No. 8' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.Vol. 2: Part II: 1517-18',* 1501.

[48] '11 July 1517, Nic Sagudino to Al. Foscari' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.Vol. 2: Part II: 1517-18,* 1166.

[49] 'Tourney on Birth of a Prince (1511)' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.Vol. 1: Part I: 1509-13*, 379.

[50] 'Birth of a Prince', 379

[51] 'Birth of a Prince', 379; Poem from *Vestra Monumenta, Vol. 1,* pl 21-26.

[52] Dale Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Imperial Crown' in *Tudor Court Culture* ed. Dale Hoak (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 79.

The young king actively created these scenarios of chivalric role-play, and grandiose pageantry, for even humble religious celebrations like Christmas. This fondness for ceremony exposes how ingrained the chivalric ideal was to Henry's persona as king and as a man.[53] For example, in another famous instance, dressed as Robin Hood in 1510, Henry VIII burst into the chambers of his then heavily pregnant wife Katherine, 'for the gladness to the Queen's grace'.[54] He and his men entered in disguise, encouraging the queen and her ladies to dance.[55] Again, in 1515, as recorded by Edward Hall, during the summer, the king and queen also participated in a staged interaction with a Robin Hood character and his merry men in the woods at Shooter's Hill, Greenwich. They watched an archery competition and were invited to eat with the Robin Hood character and his men. Following this were additional, richly decorated, celebrations. As Edward Hall states:

> The same after none, the kyng, the duke of Suffolke, the Marques dorset, and the erle of Essex, their bardes and bases of grene velvet and clothe of golde, came into the fielde on great coursers, on whom wayted diverse gentelmen in silke of the same colour. On the other side entred xvi. lordes and gentelmen, all appareiled richely after their devises, and so valiauntly they ranne their courses appointed: and after that they ran volant one as fast as he might overtake another, whiche was a goodly sight to se: and when al was done they departed, and went to a goodly banquet.[56]

This display of chivalric masculinity, featuring the king and his close, chivalric, colleagues on war horses (coursers) traditionally associated with medieval knights, intertwined with frivolity and grandiosity, seems a perfect metaphor for Henry VIII's court as a whole. The elaborate nature of these celebrations, with the costumes and complex performances both the king and the queen undertook with the Robin Hood character, shows how easily Henry took to performing in these events. The performance reveals the intimate knowledge and nature of Henry's relationship to chivalry, and his need to project it publicly, time and time again.

Indeed, although not a traditional figure of chivalric valour, but more one of subversive mischief, Robin Hood facilitated Henry VIII's desires for role-play, and in both these instances, gave him the opportunity to perform as a highly chivalric ideal man. Much like his performance as Sir Loyal Heart, the Robin Hood persona — which appeared throughout this first decade many times on apparel orders for court celebrations — gave the king access to the figure of the courtly lover and chivalric expression in a highly performative way.[57] Robin Hood was also a convenient representation of an individual who gained his notoriety through the mastery of the chivalric art of archery. Clearly, this role-playing gave the king an outlet and ways to express masculine pursuits.

---

[53] '14 Nov 1515. R.O. Revel Accounts, No. 8' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 2: Part II: 1517-18,* 1501.

[54] '28 Feb 1510. Revel Accounts, No. 1' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 2: Part II: 1517-18,* 1490

[55] Edward Hall, *Henry VIII, Volume One* (London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1904), *15*

[56] Edward Hall, *Henry VIII,* 147.

[57] '28 Feb 1510. Revel Accounts, No. 1' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 2: Part II: 1517-18*, 1490; '14 Nov 1515. R. O. Revel Accounts, No. 8',* 1501.

Hilary Jane Locke

This symbolic performance was of enduring importance to the king, as well as to others discussing kingly representation. For example, Thomas More's *Coronation Ode to Henry VIII* states: 'Among a thousand noble companions he stands out taller than any. And he has strength worthy of his regal person. / His hand, too, is as skilled as his heart brave, whether there is an issue to be settled by the naked sword, or an eager charge with leveled lances, or an arrow aimed to strike a target'.[58] Compared to the words of Hawes, More paints an even more enthusiastic image of the new king, with flattering descriptions of his greatness and potential. This image encapsulated the general optimism for Henry VIII, as previously seen. However, it is important to note how much emphasis More places on the king's strength, and masculinity, in the company of other men, as well as in the area of chivalric arts. It is in this way, More argues, that the more chivalric the monarch, the better king he will make. Indeed, More goes on to say: 'whatever virtues your ancestors had, these are yours too, not excelled ages past / For you, sire, have your father's wisdom, you have your mother's kindly strength / The devout intelligence of your paternal grandmother, the noble heart of your mother's father'.[59] Much like the links between Henry VII and Edward IV, as explored in Chapter One, the link between the new king and his maternal grandfather Edward IV provided inherited chivalric characteristics, that would assist him, along with the other familial traits, ensuring that he was equipped with what he needed to be an effective ruler.

As discussed in relation to Henry VII's reign, one of the key ideas of being an effective and chivalric ruler was the need to have a court which encouraged cultural patronage, both as a means to circulate ideas and to emulate existing chivalric discourse. Henry VIII continued his father's trend of patronising creative works, and sought to make his court a cultural hub to further add to the magnificence and spectacle of his courtly existence. Moreover, the printing culture of the early reign of Henry seems to reflect the state of court life and the political questions of the age. Masculinity, manliness, and reflecting upon past glory, seem to be an undercurrent within contemporary published works, but also particularly in texts that were patronised by the monarch himself, and those within his court.

The Duke of Norfolk, Thomas Howard, requested the Roman historian Sallust's (*c*.86-35 BC), *cronycle of the warre, which the romayns had agaynst Iugurth vsurper of the kyngdome of Numidy,* to be translated into English and printed in 1525.[60] This text outlined the events of the Roman Jugurthine War in North Africa in 111-105 BC.[61] The book also considered the political rivalries and rising of new men into the political roles traditionally held by ruling families in Rome. As the work was printed on behalf of the Duke of Norfolk, he perhaps wished to point towards the tensions rising at court between the new, usually humanist, men who had earned their place and relationship with the king, and those who considered themselves entitled to their positions through birth, much like Thomas Howard. The 'new

---

[58] Thomas More, 'Epigraph 19' in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More, Vol. 3.2 Latin Poems*, ed. C. H. Miller, L. Bradner and R. P. Oliver (New Haven: Yale University Press), 100-113, lines 60-63.

[59] More, 'Epigraph 19', lines 150-155.

[60] Sallust, *Here begynneth the famous cronycle of the warre, which the romayns had agaynst Iugurth vsurper of the kyngdome of Numidy: whiche cronycle is compyled in latyn by the renowmed romayn Salust. And translated into englysshe by syr Alexander Barclay preest, at co[m]maundement of the right hye and mighty prince: Thomas duke of Northfolk.* London: Richard Pinson, 1525, EEBO, Cambridge University Library.

[61] A. J. Woodman, 'Introduction' in *Catiline's War, The Jugurthine War, Histories* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), xvii-xxi.

man', and main figure in the text, Gaius Marius remains in his consulship at the end of the history, suggesting it was not intended to be proscriptive about reversing positions for the old aristocracy, but was subtly critical of the influx of parvenu figures like Cardinal Wolsey and Thomas More. It is possible the Duke also intended to reflect upon the on-going political anxieties caused by the Wars of the Roses, which could be seen in Sallust's attempt to view the conflicts between the old noble families and Marius, causing more tensions.

In his prologue, the translator Alexander Barclay clearly links the contemporary ideals of chivalric warfare and discourse to work of the Roman scholar. Specifically, he applies this to his patron Norfolk:

> But among all other noble men of this region: most hye and myghty prince: ye seme vnto me most worthy […] to whose grace I shuld deyccat this hystorie: bothe for myne owne duety to be obserued anenst your magnifycence: and also for the excellent worthynesse of your merites & great polycie of chyualry […] In whiche noble & glorious acte ye haue proued your selfe lyke vnto myghty Marius. […] Wherfore most myghty & magnifycent prince: pleas it your hyghnesse of gracious beniuolence to accepte this smal present […] [for] pleasure & profet of al gentylmen of this region: but namely of your hyghnes & of the noble men of your progeny & affynite.[62]

According to Barclay, the Duke of Norfolk was a very chivalric man. By patronising the printing and translation of this work, it became a further source of chivalric ideals for men to read and understand. This statement applies to the Duke through his association with the text. In the style of William Caxton, Barclay makes a note that gentlemen have access to the history of war, and therefore can glean elements of such works. The translator maintains here, also, that the Duke is bestowing a literary, chivalric gift for those to learn how to be chivalric like the Duke himself. Barclay's statement about Howard's 'policy of chivalry' referred to the Duke's ongoing role in Henry VIII's armies and campaigns. His military career lasted most of Henry VIII's reign: he fought at the Battle of Flodden against the Scottish in 1513, and led campaigns for Henry in France, Ireland, and Scotland.[63] As a man clearly skilled in the art of warfare, and in a court which actively patronised humanists and their works that which drew on ancient Greek and Roman scholars, this work was an appropriate thematic choice by the Duke, contributing to the cultural development of the era.

Also printed in 1525 was the play *Of gentylnes and nobylyte A dyaloge betwen the marchaut the knyght and the plowman dysputyng who is a verey gentylman,* by John Rastell. The discussion between the Merchant, the Knight and the Plowman offers advice and a general perspective on what being a gentleman was, as well as the differences in their perceptions of honour and gentlemanly conduct. Considerations of birth and rank seems preoccupy the conversation throughout the dialogue. However, as the knight states in his concluding remarks:

> Take [twenty] straynge gentylmen in lyke maner [and] / wt out chydyng quarrellyng or fyghtyng […]
> these gentylmen I warant you wyll study / who can shew to other most curtesy / And of theyr

---

[62] Alexander Barclay, *cronycle of the warre,* 1525, Preface, A1.

[63] David M. Head, *The Ebbs and Flows of Fortune: The Life of Thomas Howard, Third Duke of Norfolk* (Athens, GA.: The University of Georgia Press), 40-69.

gentylnes wyll pfer to pay / For the other and shew what pleasurs they may / So touchyng gentylnes I say surely / Men of grete byrth vse it most com~ynly.[64]

Essentially, after much fruitful debate, it is concluded that a man can learn to be a gentleman through socialising with others, learning to be more courteous and gentle.

The work presents an explicit discussion about what it is to be a man in 1520s England. Within the context of Henry VIII's court, the plays is a contemporary dialogue, revealing the truth about gentlemanly performance and how a man should conduct himself in the world. The Knight character, unsurprisingly, measures his manliness by how well he wields a sword and how chivalric he is in relation to others. Alongside these publications, it should also be noted that *Morte Darthur* was updated and reprinted in 1529 by Wynkyn de Worde. Whether or not Henry VIII had access to this work is unknown, but that it was in circulation throughout this time indicates its enduring popularity. Indeed, David Starkey has argued that the presence of texts such as Malory's work created 'an atmosphere which Henry and his intimates not only breathed but whose heady fumes affected their behaviour and beliefs as well'.[65]

In 1525, Volume One of John Froissart's *Cronycles of Englande, Fraunce, Spayne, Portyngale, Scotlande, Bretayne, Flau[n]ders* was printed, translated by Johan Bourchier. This work was printed at the request of Henry VIII and it is easy to see why the king would have wanted it in circulation. Froissart's *Chronicles* documented the Hundred Year's War, and, importantly for Henry, the reign of Edward III, founder of the Order of the Garter. Three years earlier, in 1522, Henry had reissued the *Statutes and Ordinances of the Order of the Garter*, the text having been 'Refourmed explayned declared and Renewed by the most high moste evellent and moost puissant prince henry viiith'.[66] Within the initial pages, the link between the founder and his eventual successor as head to the Order is made through the connotations of chivalric character and the institution of knighthood, which both monarchs celebrated. Indeed, the *Statutes* issued by Henry VIII declared the king's 'Love, good Zeal, ardent and intire [*sic*] Affection […] to the said most noble Order, and to the State of Chivalry and Knighthood, and for honourable Continuance and Increasing of the same'.[67] As a clear statement of Henry VIII's feelings towards chivalry, it seems the king, taking Edward III for inspiration, would continue to promote the importance of chivalric kingship and culture.

The king's ancestors were historical role models for their chivalric glory; they assisted in his own ideal of chivalric behaviour, communicated through his request to publish the *Chronicles*. Through the Order of the Garter, Henry VIII is associated with historical chivalric achievement. Moreover, in the preface of *Cronycles of Englande,* Johan Bourchier places emphasis on the achievement of fellow Englishmen in battle and Edward III's place within historical chivalric glory. As Bourchier noted: 'What

---

[64] John Rastell, *Of gentylnes and nobylyte A dyaloge betwen the marchaut the knyght and the plowman dyputyng who is a verey and who is a noble man and how men shuld come to auctoryte, compiled in a maner of an enterlude with diuers toys and gestis addyd therto to make mery pastyme and disport,* London: Johnannes Rastell me fieri fecit, 1525, EEBO, The British Library, Ciii.

[65] David Starkey, 'King Henry and King Arthur' in *Arthurian Literature XVI* ed. James P. Carley and Felicity Riddy (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1998), 173-174

[66] *The Statutyts and ordynaunscys of the moste noble order of Satynte George named the Garterm refourmed, explayned, declared, and renewed by the most high, moste excellent, and mooste puyssant prince, Henry VIIIth'.* London. The British Library. *c.* 1510-c.1530. Lansdowne MS 783, ff. 28

[67] *The Statutes of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London, J. Hayes, 1801), 2.

pleasure shall it be to the noble [gentlemen] of Englande / to se / beholde / [and] rede: the highe enterprises / famous actes / and glorious dedes / done and atchyued by their valyant [ancestors]'.[68] Once again, the emulation of those glorious chivalric heroes of the past seems crucial to informing the behaviour in the present. Bourchier further states:

> And by the benefite of hystorie: all noble / highe / and vertuous actes be immortall. What moued the strong and ferse Hercu|les to enterprise in his lyfe / so many great incoperable labours and pyls? Certaynly noughtels / but ye for his meryt[is] immortalyte mought be gyuen to hym of all folks [...] [and] many other innumerable worthy prices and famouse men / whose vertues ben redemed sro oblyuion [and] shyne by historie.[69]

In this statement lies the justification for Henry VIII's fixation on the pursuit of glory and the desire to go to war. As Bouchier clearly states here, those who are remembered by history, as 'immortall', were those who committed chivalric acts, participated in glorious battles, and laboured to prove themselves through these masculine acts.[70] Henry VIII sought to do this throughout his reign. Through his desire to emulate these chivalric figures of the past, his dedication to cultural promotion, and the constant performance of chivalric masculinity, in the initial years of his reign, Henry's kingly persona grew through his dedication and implementation of chivalric discourse as courtly, political practice.

As Stephen Hawes reflected, to return again to his *ioyfull medytacyon,* the role of warfare in kingship played a crucial role: 'But by hardynes that we maye subuerte / Our soueraynes enemyes to hym contraryous / By batuylles fyerse ryghtfull and rygorous'; as such Henry VIII 'wyll be alwaye ready to defend the ryght' and his honour as king.[71] Even though this was written in 1509, without knowledge of future events, these lines sum up the attitude of the young monarch. It can easily be seen that Henry VIII, as a young and eager to please king, whose sense of self was steeped in chivalric discourse, wanted to prove his masculinity and chivalric identity, firmly and forever. The clearest way to accomplish this, as was historically proven, was to enter into and win a war, gloriously at that. However, Henry did not foresee the complex relationship between his humanist advisors, existing chivalric discourse, and political practices. This made war a challenge for the king. Furthermore, as will be shown, these philosophical differences made it difficult for Henry as a young man seeking to prove his honour as a king, and it consequently shaped the discussions of warfare and diplomatic practices into the mid-1520s and beyond.

---

[68] Jean Froissart, *Here begynneth the first volum of sir Iohan Froyssart of the croncyles of Englande, Fraunce, Spayne, Portyngale, Scotlande, Bretayne, Flaunders: and other places adioynynge. Translated out of frenche into our maternall englysshe tonge, by Iohan Bouchier knight lorde Berners: at the commaundement of oure moost highe redouted soverayne lorde kyng Henry the. viii. kyng of Englande and of Fraunce, and highe defender of the the christen faith. etc.* London: Richard Pynson, 1523, EEBO, The British Library, column one, aiii.

[69] Johan Bouchier, Preface to *croncyles of Englande*, column two, A. ii.

[70] Bouchier, Preface, column two, A. ii.

[71] Hawes, *ioyfull medytacyon,* lines 116-118, 166.

Hilary Jane Locke

'Because Warre Lyke the Tyde Ebbeth and Floweth': Chivalry, Glory, and the Rhetoric of Warfare 1513-1525

The practice and contexts of war changed gradually during the late medieval period and into the sixteenth century. War became increasingly separate from the chivalric notions of medieval warfare, of battlefield glory, individual honour, celebration, and commemoration. This shift occurred for a number of reasons, such as the inclusion of artillery, the building of a more militarised and professionalised army, and the development of naval power, which grew dramatically in Henry VII's reign, and increasingly with Henry VIII's strength and power as a monarch.[72] However, while the practices of war changed, the principles of glory and honour, both for personal reasons and for the realm, heavily influenced the young king's desire to pursue warfare. Complex discussions and rhetoric in the public sphere regarding warfare disclosed these shifts within military discourse, but also drew attention to their tensions with conflicting chivalric mentalities.

War was a normal state of affairs for late medieval and early modern monarchs to deal with. Kings and leaders prepared for potential conflicts through legislation, inter-state negotiations and treaties. As documented by the Venetian Ambassador in the late 1490s, Henry VII had in place specific financial arrangements in the event of war. This included how much the war would cost, where it would come from, and the increased contributions through taxation and the clergy.[73] Nevertheless, what is distinctive about the nature of these funds is that war is separated into two different kinds, stipulated as one of necessity and one of glory. The difference carried through into the amount of taxation: 'if it should be a case of glory, or necessity, such as a war with France or Scotland' the king should receive a substantial revenue from various estates from around the country.[74] The king received funding from the clergy and estates of the gentry regardless of why the war was fought. However, if the case were for glory, the king would receive more funds.[75] Whilst this document only reveals a small portion of the role warfare had in the overall role in political power for Henry VII, it suggests that ultimately monarchical strength was associated with the concept of glory; to enter into a war against a foreign nation required the unity of members of the nobility and the ability to rally numbers to support the king's mission, and if the war was won it would give glory to both the king and the nation.

Indeed in the *Statutes and Ordinances of War*, printed in 1492, it states that Henry VII if the king were to go to war, 'necessitye when the case it requyreth' the decision to be declare.d[76] Henry VII, after claiming his throne on a battlefield, never ventured into a full-scale war with a foreign realm, and this

---

[72] See: D. J. Trim, *The Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

[73] 'Revenues of Henry VII [circa 1498]' in *Readings in English Social History: From Pre-Roman Days to AD 1837* ed. R. B. Morgan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), 227.

[74] 'Revenues of Henry VII [circa 1498]', 227.

[75] 'Revenues of Henry VII [circa 1498]', 227.

[76] Anon. *Here begynneth certayn statutes and ordenaunces of warre made ordeined enacted and estalysshed [sic] by the most noble victorious and most cristen prince oure moste drad souerayn lorde King Henry the vii. King of Fraunce and of Englond by the aduyce of his noble and discrete counseyl holdynge than his hygh courte of his parlament at his paleis of westmynster the xvii. day of October in the yere of oure lord god M.CCCClxxxxii and of his moste noble reigne the vii. yere. For the wele suertie good rule [and] saufgarde of his honorable lordes capitaignes [and] other his humble subgettes and also for suche of them of his said realme of frau[n]ce that herafter wol become his true subgettis being in his most royal hoste ayenst his auncyent enmys of fraunce,* London, 1492, Society of Antiquaries, Pamphlet.

Hilary Jane Locke

statement reveals the underlying compromise between subject and the king when a war was fought. Importantly, the preparation for war, in terms of revenue generation, but also in printing and making public the statues regarding warfare, indicates that being chivalric and soldierly was entwined with the ideal of English monarchy, and ingrained in Henry VII's sense of monarchical power. This tension between war and chivalry developed more intensely as his son's reign continued.

The distinction between a war of necessity, one for protection of England and justifiable in its cause, and a war for glory, or indeed chivalric ideas of glory, outlines the tensions that would arise between chivalric and humanist discourse throughout his son's reign. During the early part of Henry VIII's reign, the English crown was often placed in a position to assist in a conflict, out of necessity to protect the English people, or to assist an ally such as the Spanish and Holy Roman Emperor, who were in alliance with England through Henry's marriage to Katherine of Aragon. Henry aided the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian X in 1513, when war was declared with France. Henry's own army claimed small victories, particularly at the Battle of the Spurs and the capturing of the city of Tournai, in August 1513. In essence, this conflict was a way for the young king to stretch his legs in war, commanding armies, circulating with the men-at-arms, and practicing negotiations with his allies.[77]

In contrast, the victory over the Scottish at the Battle of Flodden, fought in the same year, can be seen as an attempt to gain the glory he was seeking. The English soundly defeated the Scottish army, and James IV, Henry VIII's brother-in-law, died on the battlefield. However, his armies were presided over by Queen Katherine, and commanded by the Earl of Surrey (the aforementioned Duke of Norfolk's father). While Henry was not present, fighting in France for his political alliance, the victory for England gained him the glory he so wished for, even though he was not directly involved. Furthermore, although the war was fought as a necessity, with James IV being 'contrary to his honour all good reason [and] conscyence And his oothe of Fidelite', the victory was claimed as a glorious one for Henry's kingdom.[78] In this manner, Queen Katherine of Aragon wrote to her husband saying: 'this battell hath bee to your grace and al your Reame the grettest honour that coude be'.[79]

Both of these successes were celebrated in an extravagant measure. As recorded by Edward Hall, the king treated the victory at Tournai as hugely triumphant: 'thus the kinge with his nobilitie al richely apparelled with his swerde borne before him, his herauldes and serjants of armes with trumpettes and mynstrelsy entered the citie'.[80] What followed were several victory celebrations, including tournaments and banquets. In one instance, as usual, the king participated in the dances that followed the banquet, Hall stating: 'came in the king […] in a maske, [and his men] all richely appareled with bonnets of golde, and […] they […] passed the tyme at their pleasure'.[81] Furthermore, in a similar fashion to his father, he also knighted hundreds of men involved at both campaigns, corresponding with events.[82] An anonymous

[77] Jasper Ridley, *Henry VIII* (London: Constable, 1984), 60-67.

[78] Anon. *Hereafter ensure the trewe enoutnre of […] batayle lately don between Englande and Scolande. In whiche batayle the. Scottshhe Kynge was slayne*, London: Richard Faques, 1513, EEBO, Cambridge University Library, Pamphlet, leaf 1.

[79] 'Q. Catherine (of Aragon) to Hen. VIII; after the battle of Flooded-field. Sept. 1513', Cotton Vespasian F/III, State Papers Online, The British Library. ff. n.a.

[80] Hall, *Henry VIII, Vol. 1*, 115-116.

[81] Hall, *Henry VIII, Vol. 1*, 117

[82] Knights of England, 36-42.

account of Battle of Flodden relays the names of forty men knighted after the battle on the field, Surrey acting in the king's stead.[83] Warfare, and the celebratory glory following, had its performative rituals, just as any other royal function or event.

This celebration of victory in war is of particular interest when compared with the 1520 Field of Cloth of Gold celebrations to mark the signing of a peace treaty between Francis I of France and Henry VIII. This event was celebrated by several tournaments, banquets, other displays of masculine arts, and pageantry.[84] In comparison to the description of Henry's glorious victory in France, The Field of Cloth of Gold was significant as it utilised these warlike celebrations for an event that signified peace. Moreover, the event was a serious demonstration of the humanist opposition to warfare, especially as an expression of political strength. In this instance, the signed treaty worked to draw the kings away from engaging in further conflict with each other, if only temporarily. As J. J. Scarisbrick notes in his biography of Henry, 'Erasmus [and] More, to name but the most conspicuous [humanists], had already dedicated themselves […] to denouncing bloodshed which national pride and prejudice brought in their train'.[85] The key indication of this incipient pacifism comes through in the rhetoric regarding warfare, which infiltrated public discourse, as well as being discussed in the literary works of people such as Thomas More.

As the 1520s progressed, it became apparent that the tensions between those working for the king were distinct from the ideals of Henry VIII and his continual search for chivalric and glorious victory. Insomuch as the advisors could deter the king from seeking another war, the arguments that arose in the public sphere shifted the weight from active participation in warfare, towards gaining honour through other means. The complex link between warfare, masculinity, and early modern kingly identity, arose in the political discussions during this time. Particular terms, which will be explored here, were employed throughout this period in relation to discussions of warfare. Their presence in political and warfare discourse increased through the middle of Henry VIII's reign. These terms, which include the notions of honour, masculinity, appetite, and abstinence, were all evolving within the public and political spheres during this time, and had curious relationships to the individual perspective of Henry VIII and his chivalric interpretations of warfare.

In a 1523 speech in Parliament Cardinal Wolsey, Henry VIII's chief advisor, outlined the problems of going to war with France in aid of the Holy Roman Empire, particularly as a financially viable option, and in the light of the peace treaty signed at the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520. Once again, the king's marital alliance to Charles V indicated that warfare seemed inevitable. Wolsey remarkd: 'by such report and declaration as I have made unto you on his grace's behalf, that his highness is commen unto the wars […] only by extreme constraint, inforce and necessity'.[86] Wolsey continues to say that:

> And whereas God hath sent him honorable and victorious successes in the wars heretofore made
> against France, being inforced thereunto by like breach of promise, injuries and necessity, his grace,

---

[83] Anon, *batayle lately don between Englande and Scolande,* Pamphlet, leaf two.

[84] Glenn Richardson, *The Field of Cloth of Gold* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

[85] Scarsbrick, *Henry VIII*, 41.

[86] 'Wolsey Speech to the Two Houses of Parliament (1523)', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Volume 3, Part 2: 1521-23,* 1235.

giving lowly thanks to Almighty God therefore, doubteth not but, with the gracious favor and assistance of Almighty God, and the good prayers of you and other his subjects, like victory shall follow and succed unto his highness.[87]

Wolsey then outlined the 'defensive and offensive' intentions of Henry VIII's armies in joining Charles V's invasion of France. Crucially, however, Henry is continually depicted as the honourable king, undertaking the war for chivalric reasons, the justification resting in the alliance, his honour stemming from upholding this relationship. Wolsey also made clear that the war would rectify injustices and satisfy the Emperor's need for revenge against the French for previous slights in warfare.[88] Therefore, Henry's army is represented as on the side of justice, and the king's armies would be entering into a war based on assistance, rather than personal glory. Wolsey seems to promote English intervention in this conflict as being on 'Almighty God['s]' side, and thus Henry would be quickly rewarded with victory against the enemy.

The clear image that Wolsey evokes of the king within this speech not only reveals the political importance of warfare in England during Henry VIII's reign, but also the negotiations involved and considerations undertaken in order to enter into war. From one perspective, Wolsey communicates a sense that England is surrounded by the enemy and identifies the paranoia associated with this; previous conflicts between France, Spain, and the Holy Roman Empire, and England's own with Scotland are all referred to in the speech. Keenly felt in yet another speech made during in the same 1523 sitting of parliament, an unknown speaker presented the argument of going to war with France to ensure Henry and England's protection and reduce their isolation in Europe: 'What friends we have now, I dare not venture to speak, and no nation was ever so united as our enemy'.[89] This speech, alongside Wolsey's, conveys a sense of consideration, measured and debated, in all aspects of entering into this war. Moreover, and essentially, according to Wolsey, the decision boiled down to Henry's honour and his need to uphold the alliance for security. However, Wolsey makes it crystal clear that the honour of the king gained through this war, regardless of it being of fought through necessity, was still honour and glory nonetheless.

In this same speech Cardinal Wolsey also insists that Henry VIII's personal desire to venture into war had no room to be insulted, even if this war was being fought for political purposes. Wolsey states that it was, 'not by will and appetite which his grace hath thereunto' that Henry came to the decision to go to war.[90] The concept of having an appetite for warfare was used in the early modern era to signify the deeply masculine urge to fight and seek honour and glory. In this instance, Wolsey encouragingly depicts Henry VIII's appetite as still present, the king's desire for war a constant. Moreover, in contrast to the king's own, honourable appetite for war, the previous mentioned anonymous parliamentarian's speech portrays the French appetite for conflict and warfare as all consuming and dangerously so. He states: 'Want of truth is so deeply rooted in the French nation, and their appetite to extend their bounds is so insatiable, that even if we had no quarrel of our own against them, we could not but detest their false

---

[87] 'Wolsey Speech', 1235

[88] 'Wolsey Speech', 1235

[89] 'A Speech Delivered in Parliament in the Presence of Henry VIII (1523)', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Volume 3: Part 2: 1521-23*, 1246

[90] 'Wolsey Speech', 1235

dealings with other princes'.[91] The effort to link this conflict to the long standing rivalry between the English and French leads the speaker to emphasise the depiction of France to be seen as a place of barbarity, political bankruptcy, and an all consuming appetite for war. This is echoed by Robert Wingfield, an English diplomat on the War Council during the 1520s, who noted to Wolsey in 1526 that Emperor Charles V 'could not trust the promises of the French for their words are always forged according to their appetite, and seldom concur with the truth'.[92] Depicted as having no respect towards their royal counterparts in Europe, motivated purely by their appetite for war, they found ways to conquer where they could. In this way, it is apparent that, either regarding political motivation or seeking a justification, there was a good and bad appetite for war. The idea further places the French in a position of mistrust for reasons of misguided appetite.

This criticism, of course, is the opposite to how Henry VIII is depicted; in the context of appetite, the king is peaceful and driven only by a need to resolve the conflict between Frances I and Charles V, entering into this war to help this resolution. Nevertheless, as a man, Henry had a complex attitude to war when considering his political sovereignty in England and negotiations with the continent. Wolsey's speech makes clear that he is driven by the goal of being a good king for which he is willing to do so by maintaining peace or entering into a war that pushes for peace throughout other realms that he has no jurisdiction over. However, the contradictions in Henry's character are perhaps misrepresented. As Richard Sampson, ambassador to the Holy Roman Emperor, remarked to Wolsey in 1523: 'His majestie [Henry] seyd that, os a christyn Prince, He was right well myndyd to a peace or treves, but os anthir man, to accomplis his appetite, He was much rathir willing to warre'.[93] Henry was split between the role of king, who by right demands peace for his subjects, and his position as a man of honour, who wished to engage in and make war, thereby proving his masculinity and chivalric worth. Indeed, the celebrations in response to his victories in 1513 can be seen as a public statement of how, having surrendered to his masculine appetite for war, he was rewarded and he marked the occasion accordingly. Wolsey revealed that this was Henry's attitude to war a decade earlier, in an attempt to calm the idea of war in the mind of Scottish King, James IV in 1511: 'by whose wanton means his Grace spendeth much money, and is more disposed to war than peace. Your presence shall be very necessary to repress this appetite'.[94]

The consequences of going to war frequently to fulfil the king's appetite for glory were costly and problematic. It is here that humanist philosophy began to play its part by switching the preference to peace, rather than the continual search for glory. As discussed, the Field of Cloth of Gold was significant for its warlike celebration of the signing of a peace treaty, a famous and impressive event during the reign of Henry VIII. Nevertheless, treaties were often termed 'abstinence' of war in the early Tudor period, and were seen as a diplomatic way to quell the masculine desires of men such as Henry to pursue war. It is not coincidental that appetite and abstinence, traditional concepts linked throughout the medieval period,

---

[91] 'A Speech Delivered in Parliament', 1246

[92] '15 April 1526 B.M. Sir. Rob. Wingfield to [Wolsey]' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 4: Part I: 1524-26,* 942.

[93] 'Foreign Correspondence, LXXI. 1523. Sampson, &c. to Wolsey' in *State Papers Published under the Authority of his Majesty's Commission: King Henry the Eighth, 1830-1852. . Vol. 6: Part V: Foreign Correspondence, 1473-1527* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1849), 211.

[94] 'Wolsey to [Fox] Bp. of Winchester (1511)' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.Vol. 1. Part I: 1509-13,* 462.

were terms that were seen in conflict with each other. Most obviously, these terms were used to describe desires related to sex and food, and the problems of overconsumption on both the body, mind, and spirit in medieval ideas and theology. Simply put, if the appetite is too great, then abstaining from the need was beneficial for the self. Moreover, the notion that the appetite as a state of being that needed constant attention and abstinence by having self-control and discipline, was commonly preached in sermons about sexual lust, and in the vows taken by those in the church.[95] Appetite and abstinence, in contrast and in the context of warfare, unlocks the key to understanding war and masculinity in relation to the state in early Tudor England.

The contemporary emphasis on abstaining from warfare suggested the desire for warfare in kings, and in men, was almost at a constant. In the sources, the proposal of this abstinence was, more often than not, based around the decision to avoid ongoing warfare and for the negotiation of a peace treaty of sorts. In other words, the notion of avoiding war altogether was out of the question. Abstaining placed a temporary pause on the conflict and allowed for a moments of consideration from warring parties. Often, the discussions and such negotiations were carried on in the diplomatic correspondence, among those who were chief advisors, diplomats, and counsellors to the king. On paper, those who were in political power presented their perceptions of how appetite fed and was maintained by those attempting to keep the peace, and preserve funds. In Tudor England, figures such as Wolsey, More, and Thomas Cromwell sought to ensure that Henry played a role in the negotiations himself, whilst seeking adequate resolutions to the king's own appetite to fight.

Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, first printed in Latin in 1516, presents a dire warning to those who wish to enter into a conflict for reasons of conquest. In Book One, More tells the tale of a king, determined to reclaim the lands that are his by the right of inheritance.[96] After gaining the territory, what remains is chaos, brought on by the unruly soldiers and the unmeasured effects on the civilians whose land has been claimed. The situation is hardly ideal: 'they hadde euen as muche vexation and trouble kepynge it, as they had gettynge it'.[97] There is constant conflict between the invaders and the citizens, who are unaccommodating to these soldiers and suffer greatly at the hands of the army:

---

[95] Covered extensively in his work on romantic love, William Reddy engages with the church's doctrine of sexual desire-as-appetite. Arguing that courtly love literature was a form of dissent against the church doctrine, Reddy also argues that the church's ideal of love-as-appetite, as well as desire, was justification for Gregorian Reforms in the eleventh century restraining and outlining strict rules on sexual desire. In that way, courtly love was the ultimate rejection of church doctrine, as it rejected the notions of love and partnership, for the feeding and fuelling sexual desire and appetite: 'The refinement, the pure selflessness of *fin'amors*, known as "true love," as its promoters called it, was such — or so they claimed — that true love easily mastered sexual desire. Love easily disciplined the dangerous sexual appetite that plagued Christian ascetics in their quiet retreats and terrified Christian theologians, who branded sexual *concupicentia* or *libido* (both meaning appetitive desire, or "lust") as the great threat to salvation. So holy was love, its promoters insisted, that and any sexual enjoyment to further love's aim was good and innocent'. William Reddy, *The Making of Romantic Love: Longing and Sexuality in Europe, South Asia, and Japan, 900-1200 CE* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012), 44.

[96] Thomas More, *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More in Latin from the Edition of March 1518, and in English from the First Edition of Palph Robynson's Tranlation in 1551 with Additional Translations, Introduction and Notes by J. H. Lupton, B.D. Surmaster of St. Paul's School, and Preachers of Gray's Inn Formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. With Facsimilies* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895).

[97] More, *Utopia*, 85

Hilary Jane Locke

so that they were euer fyghtinge other for them, or agaynste them, and neuer coulde break vp their

campes: seynge them selves in the meane season pylled and impoueryshed ; their money carryed owt

of the Realme ; theyr owne men kylled to mayntayne the glory of an other nation.[98]

More alludes here to the idea that a glory won is not necessarily glory gained. For example, the problems caused by those who fought in the king's army: 'they had taken a delycte and pleasure in robbinge and stealing ; that through manslaughter they had gathered boldnes to mischiefe' undermines prospects for engaging in the conflict.[99] More portrays both sides in a state of lawlessness, not bound by any code of honour to each other, or any king. More suggests the solution to this predicament is to abstain from entering into a war for reasons of glory. Indeed in a previous section, More criticised the policy of counsel designed to push the king to war, 'Here I saye, where so greate and high matters be in consultation, where so manye noble and wyfe men counsell their kyng only to warre ; here if I sely man, shoulde ryse up and wylle them tourne ouer the leafe, and learne a new lesson'.[100] In telling the tale of the destitution and fate of the invaded realm, and the degradation of character of the armies who invaded, More attempts to dissuade those who counsel the king, away from making war in search for a broader, continual peace.

Even though *Utopia* was an idealised vision, the effects of More's humanist rhetoric can be seen in reality. Thomas Magnus, a diplomat, sought to negotiate peace in 1525 between France and England, purely from a financial basis: 'this realme is so ympoverished that of necessity they must be enforced to have peas w Einglane'.[101] Magnus implores Wolsey to enter into peace negotiations and end the war, throughout the letter depicting both England and France's situations as wretched as in More's *Utopia* imagery. Should they agree to an abstinence, even 'for a season', it would be enough for both countries to regroup and attend to other political and local matters.[102] A later example, from George Lawson to Thomas Cromwell in 1533, states the anxiety of the Scottish King in news from France: '[James V] taryeth for word from the French King of ane abstinence of warr, in trust to have peax with his Kinges Grace, and head no gret nomber ne power with Hym, that can be knowne'.[103] In this case, the Scottish counsel have a desire for their ally France to remain in a state of abstinence, James being unable to support France at war.

Overall, a war abstained from, and a peace negotiated for, was for the better. Thomas More touched upon this in 1528, writing to Wolsey. He took this opportunity to place his philosophical groundings into political practice. More uses the phrase appetite for peace rather than the usual appetite for war. More suggests that Henry VIII should be persuaded away from entering into a war, the letter depicting Henry, in More's words, as a saviour of his ideas of negotiation and peace. He states: 'His Grace thought the hte peace myght yit be trayned, and cum to good point […] Wherun to the Kinges Grace answered, that no

---

[98] More, *Utopia,* 85-86

[99] More, *Utopia*, 86

[100] More, *Utopia,* 84

[101] 'Thomas Magnus to Cardinal Wolsey (1525)', *The Life and Administration of Cardinal Wolsey,* ed. John Galt (Oxford: Oxford University, 1812), iii.

[102] 'Thomas Magnus to Cardinal Wolsey', iii

[103] 'George Lawson to Thomas Cromwell (1533)' in *State Papers Published Under the Authority of His Majesty's Commission: (pt. IV) Correspondence relative to Scotland and the borders, 1513-1546* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836), 638.

creature living, prince nore pore man, was more lothe to have cummen to the warre than he, nor that more labour and travile had taken, in his mynde, to conduce the peace'.[104] By abstaining from war, or seeking peace rather than war, More portrayed Henry as the protector and unifier of Christendom, placing emphasis on peace being both a holy and political pursuit for the monarch. The implications were that Henry VIII, by adopting the humanistic values that More suggests, becomes more glorious in the eyes o God upon shifting his appetite from war to peace.

Jumping forward to 1543, when Henry VIII declared war on France, there is a distinctive contrast to with what the humanists saw as the good political foundations for exploring peace, rather than war. This conflict was solely about Henry's assertion of England's military strength; England by the 1540s had in its possession a well maintained military, with an arsenal used to gain a victory by total defeat of the enemy, or at least, this is what the king wished to be on display. Henry's dramatic fortification of the country, through the building of coastal garrisons, investments in the navy and artillery development, contributed to the shift away from the traditional chivalric values of medieval warfare, previously discussed. The 1543-45 conflict is distinct in comparison to the 1520s cases previously discussed, as it highlights three different perspectives on warfare in Henry's mentality. Firstly, the eventual campaign shows that, overall, the medieval concepts of chivalric warfare were dying as a consequence of the technological and military revolution. Secondly, this war with France clearly shows the overpowering remnants of an imagined chivalric cultural ideal that fed Henry's kingly search for glory, despite his growing age and his deteriorating physical health. Lastly, by this time, Henry was no longer held back by those negotiating him out the unfruitful venture that warfare was seen to be. The achievement of Henry's dominance over the English kingdom and political landscape made his determination to go to war irresistible by any diplomat or humanist thinker seeking peace. Indeed, by this time Henry had executed Thomas More (1535), and Thomas Cromwell (1540), while Cardinal Wolsey had died under arrest (1529). This conflict gave Henry one last chance to assert his chivalric prowess, his masculinity, and a chance to be the magisterial head of a culturally chivalric court and dynasty as he had been in 1513.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the complex layers that chivalric discourse and early modern politics had formed within the court of Henry VIII. Building upon the foundations laid by Henry VII, it is clear that chivalry played a formative role in the development of Henry VIII and his subsequent kingship. When comparing his reign to the early life of his brother Arthur, it seems obvious that Henry VII pushed chivalric values onto his sons, as this was his way of conducting his kingship. These ideals informed Arthur's upbringing, and although Arthur died at such a young age, his younger brother Henry developed them further, utilising chivalry for political and personal advantages that chivalric discourse could offer him. The king used it for his own fun, engaging in chivalric role-plays, but also for extravagant exhibitions of his masculinity, as well as rich, expensive and grandiose political events, often tied to chivalric themes and tales. He also used chivalric discourse to develop his own standing on the political

---

[104] 'Correspondence between The King and Cardinal Wolsey, CXL. 16 Mar [1528]. More to Wolsey' in *State Papers Published under the Authority of his Majesty's Commission: King Henry the Eighth, 1830-1852. Vol. 1: Part I: Correspondence between the King and Cardinal Wolsey, 1518-1530,* 284.

Hilary Jane Locke

stage of Europe. Aided by his advisors, the admixture of humanist discourse, as discussed, did not necessarily hinder the king's reputation, despite Henry's own restlessness to seek chivalric glory on the battlefield. Throughout Henry's reign, England grew in power and influence, and the king maintained his reputation as an honourable figure within the kingdom, despite opting for peace more often than not throughout the 1520s and 1530s. However, the king still hankered for that glorious victory in warfare, which persisted throughout his reign, thinking it would ensure he would be forever perceived as chivalric. This is crucial to understanding Henry VIII's mentality and the behaviour of those within the court around him. The next chapter will explore Henry's relationships with women and the application of the chivalric and courtly love traditions at court. This further indicated how Henry's own perceptions of his chivalric character could be maintained at his court, and emulated by those within it, attending his romantic pursuits, offering different perspectives and explanations for those events already well-known as part of Henry VIII's story and reputation in history.

Chapter Three

'Yours as long as life endures':

Courtly Love and Chivalry, Gender, and Politics in the Court of Henry VIII

Syon House Estate in Middlesex was familiar with the turmoil of the sixteenth century. The estate house, Syon Abbey, stood three-stories high with immaculate features, decorative gardens, and views of the Thames.[1] It was also a prison for at least two of Henry VIII's prisoners. In 1537, Margaret Douglas was held at Syon under house arrest after enraging her uncle the king. In 1541, she returned to Syon for another crime, before being moved on to another location. Henry's fifth wife, Katherine Howard, was also held there for a short time, before following the Thames back to the executioner's block that awaited her at the Tower in February of 1542. These two women were condemned for similar crimes, Margaret on two separate occasions. Margaret and Katherine betrayed the honour of their king by subverting the established conventions of love. Along with Anne Boleyn, who had no such privilege as house arrest in May 1536, these cases reveal telling details about the nature of relationships, gender dynamics, and the role cultural traditions played in the performance of politics during Henry VIII's reign.

Whilst this thesis has predominantly focused on masculinity and chivalry, this chapter will explore courtly love discourse and chivalric foundations in the language of love, and how they influenced the process of courtship conducted at court. Courtly love, strongly connected to chivalric masculinity and its ideals, influenced political and diplomatic engagement, public representations, and honour. However, courtly love discourse, while allowing women a platform for agency and power, clashed with perceptions of honour and masculinity. Therefore, the consequences of utilising the courtly love conventions were great for some women, and occasionally men, involved; their actions contravened preexisting gender and cultural roles and was seen to overstep political and legal boundaries. The events that will be examined are often viewed in the historiography as an indication of Henry VIII's harshness. This chapter will examine notions of courtly love and chivalric ideals to offer a reassessment by contextualising courtly love, and the cultural phenomenon that it was, for the role it played in court culture.

Firstly, this chapter will explain the background of the courtly love ideal in the context of medieval and early modern English court culture. The interpretation of courtly love comes with its own ambiguities, like chivalric ideals, and consequently, as this section explores, the cultural crossover of courtly love was as much a part of the shifting and transposition of medieval ideals as chivalry. Secondly, the chapter will use particular examples where courtly love can be seen in both the public and private spheres, by providing detailed analysis of the ways in which chivalry and courtly love were bound together, and on display in events and relationships during this period. Exploring the functions of these ideals as political platforms, this section argues that the rhetorical traditions of courtly love filtered into court culture. This interpretation is gleaned through lovers' communication and other interactions, particularly in love letters and lyric culture.

---

[1] George James Aungie, *The History and Antiques of Syon Monastery, the Parish of Iselworth and the Chapelry of Hounslow; Compiled from Public Records, Ancient Manuscripts, Ecclesiastical and Other Authentic Documents* (London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1840), 117.

Hilary Jane Locke

Finally, the chapter will explore how the religious and humanist ideas informed gender expectations, as well as the chivalric principles of honour previously explored in this thesis. Consequently, it will discuss the limited power women could gain from entering into courtly love trysts and relationships. Overall, the final chapter of the thesis will discuss how courtly love, gender and their relationship to chivalric principles, provides further context for lover's behaviour and their consequences, some of which have been viewed as particularly dramatic. The chapter will, ultimately, reveal how crucial these cultural ideals were to the early Tudor courtier, the king, and romantic communication in the Henrician court.

'Love is an inborn suffering': Courtly Love as a Medieval Ideal

Before exploring the particular examples of courtly love in Henry VIII's time, it is first important to view the wider courtly love traditions and their foundations. Courtly love is defined as an aristocratic culture that appeared alongside, and is often linked with, the ideal of chivalry in the medieval courts. In the literary tradition, the development of courtly love culture was aimed at men-at-arms as a reward for their time in battle. The reward was usually an aristocratic lady, out of reach of his class or social standing; this was a common trope of courtly love literature and often meant that the knight himself was a suffering victim of his love. The man in courtly love tales were often in a state of lovesickness, falling pray to the trap of their chosen lady, whom he wanted with every fibre of his being, but forever out of his reach and therefore pushing him to suffer constantly. Famous examples of courtly love relationships are Lancelot and Guinevere, Tristan and Iseult, and works of Geoffrey Chaucer including *Troilus and Criseyde* and sections of *The Canterbury Tales*. Within these works, the knight commonly attempts to gain the affection of the woman he loves. The placing of these woman above men, in these circumstances, inverted the gender dynamics and the political power balance. The literature places emphasis on the man's suffering but also the cruelty of the lady, as she remains unobtainable, but usually engaging, with the men without completely committing to sexual or romantic relationships.

The foundations of the courtly love ideal are found within the twelfth-century text by author Andreas Capellanus. *On Love* 'sets out to teach lovers how to behave in an orderly and 'seemly' fashion'.[2] Capellanus outlined the sexual and romantic relationships appropriate for the court spaces, ordering them into formulaic behaviours. The effects of lovesickness became the ongoing trope within courtly love literature; the first line of *On Love* speaks of the suffering induced by falling in love: 'Love is an inborn suffering which results from the sight of, and uncontrolled thinking about, the beauty of the other sex'.[3] Most of *On Love* takes the form of dialogue between different players, usually a man speaking to a woman about his love for her. This, consequently, shaped the representation of love, in both courtly spaces and in courtly love tales. As Georges Duby asserted, courtly 'love […] had its own laws, and, far from undermining the moral and social order, it helps to strengthen it by virtue of its remaining outside the neighbouring but strictly separate realm of marriage'.[4] Courtly love culture allowed for certain relationships to be explored between two people that could not be explored in the traditional marriage. At times, this simply meant a platonic friendship, which

---

[2] George Duby, *The Knight, The Lady and the Priest: the Making of Modern Marriage in Medieval France,* trans. Barbara Bray (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985)*,* 217.

[3] Andreas Capellanus, *On Love* ed. and trans. by P. G. Walsh (London: Duckworth, 1892), 33.

[4] Duby, *The Knight, The Lady and the Priest,* 217.

facilitated closeness between those of the opposite sex, the marriage of either partner placing an automatic barrier between it developing further. At other times, the convention easily allowed for inappropriate and sexual affairs to develop. As shall be explored later, the manifestations of courtly love in the realms of the political and public spheres led to dramatic downfalls following accusations and reproaches between those involved.

Investigating at length the development of romantic love from *c.*900, William Reddy's analysis of courtly love ideals intersects with the rhetorical terms previously discussed: warfare and masculinity. Reddy highlights the tendency to place courtly love, or *fin'amors*, also alongside the notion of appetite. Using the troubadours, performers who dedicated themselves to writing and performing about love, as an example, Reddy states that: 'elaborating their love doctrine, […] troubadours conceded the existence of desire-as-appetite. Accepting desire-as-appetite, they affirmed only that 'true love' also existed and that could govern dangerous energies of desire-as-appetite and prevent appetite from motivating selfish, harmful acts'.[5] The prohibition of appetite and desire, coming from theological doctrine, further emphasises the dichotomy between sexual abstinence and fulfilment, which was echoed in the courtly love literary tradition. Courtly love was recognised and developed to be an altogether complex display of human emotion, which was exhibited in situations that were dangerous but also fulfilling to the featured lovers, who often disregarded societal norms to pursue this interest. As Reddy explains:

> The courtly love literature conceded the dangerous power of sexual appetite. But its authors did not concede the separation between bodily and spiritual realms as laid out in Christian theology. Neither did the courtly love authors revert to the ancient Platonic strategy of treating love of another person as the first step on a ladder of spiritual enlightenment. Instead, they glorified specific this-worldly love between two individuals, asserting such love was ordained by God and under God's protection. In effect, the bodies of true lovers were purified by love, and their sexual appetites, guided by love, could find satisfaction without sin. By spiritualising love, the promoters of courtly love also upheld aristocratic women's capacity for courtly grandeur and for rule, treating *fin'amors* as a sexualised form of homage, devotion, and loyalty to a ruling figure.[6]

Reddy's analysis reveals the complex nature of medieval courtly love, and the implications for development of romantic love during the following centuries. Furthermore, the example provided by Reddy can help to illustrate what occurred in early Tudor court, where courtiers engaged with the 'dangerous' games that courtly love potentially allowed. Courtly love could be seen as a risk as it allowed for a space that detracted from the normalised setting of marriage by circumstance so that follies of attraction could take precedence over politics. Whilst there is an emphasis here on the development of the religious and the secular together in a union of bodies, the complex nature of the courtly love ideal intersected with gender norms, feelings of satisfaction and fulfilment, and, of course, the great influence that courtly love literature had on the act of loving and being loved in the late medieval and early modern periods. Courtly love rejected the medieval Christian nothing that love was mere appetite, and instead it required sole dedication and performance of

---

[5] William Reddy, *The Making of Romantic Love: Longing and Sexuality in Europe, South Asia, and Japan, 900-1200 CE.* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012), 4.

[6] Reddy, *Making Romantic Love,* 351-2.

love between individuals devoted to each other. As Reddy also suggests, courtly love was perhaps a way in which romantic love developed a new set of rules, away from platonic notions of connection and godly love seemingly prescribed the Church's teachings.

By using courtly love to search for a foundation of romanticism and emotionality, Jennifer Wollock argues: 'courtly love refused to stay safely between the covers of books or in the lyrics of songs and sonnets'.[7] Wollock situates courtly love as having a direct influence on the development of love relationships, stating that it continued to inform the development of love rituals and romantic relationships throughout the latter fifteenth and into the sixteenth centuries, and that this idea of love persisted well into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Manifesting itself in relationships which developed between courtiers, the patterns of courtly love informed the shape of romantic encounters and dalliances, and sometimes marriages. Examining these influential ideals, therefore, provides crucial details about how relationships could function in this aristocratic space.

'Wyth syghes depe my harte ys prest': the Courtly Love Tradition in the Tudor Family Tree

It is hard to overlook the Tudor family tree's own controversial history of courtly love unions.[8] As discussed in Chapter One, Henry VII's paternal grandmother Katherine of Valois, the widow of Henry V, became involved in an intimate relationship with the Welsh Wardrobe Clerk Owen Tudor. This relationship had obvious courtly love tropes: an unobtainable lady, lowly male court figure, and the development of a secret tryst in the court space with the threat of political consequences looming over them. Katherine and Owen's children were recognised by their king and half-brother Henry VI; the oldest sons Edmund and Jasper Tudor were awarded titles and lands.[9] Despite Owen suffering financial problems and ostracisation after the death of his possible wife Katherine, he was somewhat protected by his Lancastrian sons.[10] Edmund, by then the Earl of Richmond, was married to Margaret Beaufort. She was herself the product of a family history of a courtly love style liaison, only legitimised through the marriage of John of Gaunt (Margaret's great-grandfather) to his longterm mistress Katherine Swynford. Despite Margaret and Edmund's marriage being a traditional union between prominent members of the aristocracy, the sole offspring being Henry VII, the history of the future dynasty of England had courtly love intwined in its origins.

One of the most problematic unions of this kind in fifteenth-century England was the marriage between Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville. Even though their relationship was strong, it nevertheless caused problems of legitimacy and instability throughout the courtly sphere.[11] Edward IV was a successful king, as previously discussed, and his marriage to Elizabeth can be somewhat romanticised in the eyes of those who followed. The meeting is even akin to a courtly love drama: the couple were said to have met under a tree, where Edward quickly fell for the married, but soon to be widowed, Elizabeth Woodville. This inevitably unravelled the dynasty Edward was attempting to establish. Richard Neville, the strongest ally of Edward's early reign, grew impatient with the match after he had worked to establish a more advantageous

---

[7] Wollock, *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love* (Santa Barbara, Cali.: Praeger, 2011), 215.

[8] Wollock, *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love*, 216.

[9] John Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 294-295.

[10] There is no official record that this couple were married.

[11] David Grummitt, *A Short History of the Wars of the Roses* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2013), 86-87.

marriage for the young Edward. Because Elizabeth was married to Sir John Grey, with two sons by him, she was less than desirable as the new queen of England, especially in a politically fragile time. Furthermore, when Edward died in 1483, Richard III utilised the pre-contract to invalidate Edward's marriage with Elizabeth. Thus the pre-contract provided King Richard with a means to declared the children of Edward and Elizabeth illegitimate and to secure his own place on the throne. As we have seen, these measures were unsuccessful in the long term, and the validity of the York and Woodville marriage was reinstated by Henry VII.

These examples in Tudor family history, however, reveal the presence of courtly love in romantic culture and the way it infiltrated relationships in the courtly space throughout the previous century in particular. Courtly love had played its part in the relationships that developed between kings and queens. It also facilitated illicit affairs that developed into long lasting unions which created legitimate spaces for offspring and political advantage, such as in the cases of Katherine and Owen, or John of Gaunt and Katherine Swynford. While traditional avenues for marriage were the norm for creating aristocratic unions, the intertwined complexity of courtly love courtships, chivalric masculinity, feminine roles and the power dynamics thereby created played a role in many relationships throughout this period. Courtly love was powerful, even if it was problematic in the long term.

The circulation of courtly love lyrics and romances in the early Tudor court had an effect on the development of courtship conversations. In William Caxton's catalogue, the romance of *Blanchardyn and Eglantine,* commissioned by the King's mother Margaret Beaufort in 1489, gave him an opportunity to promulgate courtly love discourse as a socialising force, much like his sentiments about chivalric ideals explored in Chapter One. In Caxton's prologue he states: 'that the storye of it was honeste and loyefull to all vertuouse yong noble gentylmen and wymmen for to rede therin as for their passe tyme'.[12] Through courtly love Caxton is further able to communicate to his audience the benefits of these ideals. That Margaret Beaufort commissioned the publication may hint at the political interpretation of the text as representative of the marriage between Henry VII and Elizabeth of York.[13] More clearly, however, the publication of this work consolidated the traditional courtly love voice in the courtship processes, providing access to older representations of courtly love stories for a newer, receptive audience. In other words, gentlemen were exhorted to emulate the character of Blanchardyn, with his respective love interest in order to gain Eglantine's affections. Conveniently, also, by promoting the ideal of courtly love, the story further highlighted the chivalric ethos that Caxton had outlined for restoring social order in England.

This chivalric theme, and the tying together of chivalric ideals and courtly love, developed the relationship between masculine performance and the court setting and space. One such example can be seen in Royal MS 16 Fii, discussed in Chapter Two in relation to Prince Arthur. This manuscript offers further evidence of the development of Prince Arthur's courtship abilities and language appropriate to engage with his new bride. With the English love lyrics by Charles d'Orlean, it also contains illuminations that depict courtly love engagements. Courtly love can also be read in *The Governance of a Prince* insofar as the style of engagement and rhetoric that appears in d'Orlean's lyrics, as well as the presentation of young couples in

---

[12] William Caxton, *Prologues and Epilogues,* 105.

[13] Anne Clark Bartlett, 'Translation, Self-Representation, and Statecraft: Lady Margaret Beaufort and Caxton's Blanchardyn and Eglantine (1489)', *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22, no. 1 (2005): 53-66.

two courtly and distinctly royal settings, could represent the development of the prince's ability to converse with his bride Katherine. Moreover, the poetry within the early part of the manuscript instructed Arthur how to communicate with his new bride in the early days of marriage and attempted to cement their union through courtly love engagements of sweet, flattering conversations. The two illuminations that accompany d'Orleans work are named the Court of Love and the Castle of Love. The Court of Love depicts a couple in the midst of courtly celebrations and life, possibly in a marriage procession, followed by a lute player and courtiers. The Castle of Love, shows a man, hat removed, gesturing to three ladies enjoying a conversation in the courtly environment. Overall, within the context of the manuscript material, these illuminations exemplify courtly love, and a create a court as a lively environment for young chivalric men that actively involved courtly love as part of its.

'Mine Own Sweetheart': Communicating through Courtly Love and its Political Power

The dynamics of masculinity, chivalric honour, and the practice of being a courtly lover is expressed most clearly in Henry VIII's letters to Anne Boleyn, penned between *c.*1526 and 1530.[14] These letters reveal the complexities of gender interplay and dynamics that worked with courtly love practices. For instance, the letter written in 1527 by the king, reveals a desperate man, wanting to hear Anne Boleyn's intentions:

> I […] beseech […] you earnestly to let me know your whole mind as to the love between
> us. It is absolutely necessary for me to obtain this answer, having been for the whole year
> stricken with the dart of love, and not yet sure whether I shall fail or find a place in your
> affection.[15]

The nature of these intentions was neither political ambition nor for power, but the intentions Anne had for his heart. Having found himself caught between his need for her, the actions of Anne herself, and the necessity in Henry's mind to have clarity in his position, the king is pushed to write a letter from a place of passion: in this case, he was wounded by the lovesickness inflicted by the said 'dart of love'.

Henry's letters reveal the explicit role that courtly love played in the courtship process between himself and Anne Boleyn. These documents are valuable for the representation of the king's expressions and mind. Written in the period where Henry VIII was solidifying his power as the head of state, but also experiencing serious doubt in his personal life, the letters show a king whose own sense of masculinity was

---

[14] The letters used in this thesis come from two sources. The first were printed in James Halliwell's *Letters from the Kings of England, vol. 1* published in 1848 and translated from the original middle English and French (these were then compiled in the sourcebook *Anne Boleyn In Her Own Words and the Words of Those Who Knew Her* Elizabeth Norton in 2011). The second come from the *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Vol. 4: Part II: 1526-1528* published in 1872. These two sets are potentially problematic as they offer slight variations of the translation (the 1848 version being more grandiose and fluid with the language used). The quotations used in this thesis have been predominantly taken from Halliwell's collection, simply for the completeness of their nature and the superior translation. James Halliwell, *Letters of the Kings of England, now first Collected from Royal Archives, and other Authentic Sources, Private as well as Public. Edited with an Historical Introduction and Notes by James Orchard Halliwell, ESQ,., F.R.S., Hon. M.R.I.A., Hon. M.R.S.L., F.S.A., ETC. In Two Volumes, Vol. 1.* (London: Henry Colburn, Publishers, 1848). I have also labeled them numerically based on publication order to aid the flow of the writing as they are published in estimated chronological order.

[15] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 305.

wavering, having failed to produce a male heir. Anne was the woman who would promise a son to soothe Henry's anxieties. Moreover, she received these letters from a man who immediately established the power dynamics as he assumes the role of courtly lover. As the above quotation shows, Henry's suffering mind shows his lovesickness, placing these letters as prime documents steeped in the courtly love tradition, especially through the rhetoric and the imagery employed.

Even though the remaining letters in the series are still greatly influenced by the employment of these devices, letters one to four fit most closely into the romantic genre. It is through the direct employment of various literary devices and rhetorical tropes, the courtly love model places expectations upon both Henry and Anne. As such, in letter one, which begins with '[m]y heart and I surrender ourselves into your hands', Henry expresses himself through the courtly love ritual.[16] This in turn reveals the cultural perceptions, gender roles and socio-political interplay through the language of love and performance. For example, Henry submits himself into Anne's hands, offering himself and his heart to his mistress-in-waiting. In the following three letters Henry adheres to pattern of the courtly lover, expressing himself as one who is subordinate to Anne in his love, and subject to her whims as his potential lover.

The motivation of the initial correspondence is clear: Henry's obsession to gain Anne as his mistress. Henry does this by casting himself as the knight or male courtly lover, being forced to suffer greatly at the hands of his mistress. Most pertinently, the manner in which he expresses his love reflects upon the trope within the medieval romances. For example, in letter one he refers to his suffering and pain, induced by both his love of Anne and the absence from her he is forced to endure. He begs her not to cause an 'increase of that which I [am] forced to suffer'. Their separation causes the king nothing but pain, which is 'intolerable': the 'pain of absence is already too great for me'.[17] As he submits himself to the role of suffering, for his love and for himself, Henry is primed into the position of courtly lover as is his representation of himself as the lowly knight subject to the whims of his lady.

Anne's appearance in the letters pays further homage to the demanding and cruel mistress of the tradition. Anne does not answer either frequently enough or in response to Henry. Letter Two begins with Henry stating 'because the time seems very long since I heard concerning your health and you, the great affection I [have] for you has induced me to send you this bearer, to be better informed of your health and pleasure'.[18] This places Henry in a state of duress as the one left waiting, Anne expecting him to wait. Moreover, Anne appears to be torturing Henry, with her lack of assurance for her love and her willingness to be his mistress. Henry constantly seeks reassurance that she is comfortable and that she is of good health. Moreover, that Anne appears to be absent from him, not responding directly to Henry's cries for attention and not submitting herself directly to the will of the king, leaves her represented on the page as unobtainable to Henry.

This further emphasises that, even though he was king of England, Henry embraced the game of courtly love in his courtship of Anne, which placed Anne on the pedestal of unobtainable reach.[19] As Anne does not answer the king's desire, she is placed in a powerful position in the context of their courtship.

---

[16] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 302.

[17] Halliwell, 302.

[18] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 303.

[19] Reddy, *Making Romantic Love*, 21

Acting as a means for feminine agency, the letters convey how much of a hold Anne had over the king through in-action or by means of 'leaving him hanging'. This comes through clearest when Henry presents himself on the page in conflict with his emotional responses and his feelings for Anne. In Letter Two, he remarks: 'I could do no other than mourn my ill-fortune, and by degrees abate my great folly'.[20] He therefore faces the proposition that his love for Anne might be misplaced or unreciprocated. The portrayal of Henry's feelings, possibly exaggerated to encourage a response, paints a somewhat distressed image of a man wallowing in grief and lovesickness. The distress could easily be solved with an answer from Anne, yet she simply refuses to confirm or deny her feelings for the king. Henry's comments in the next letter place him as the one suffering from Anne's cruelty and inability to commit or confirm her stance, stating: 'yet we must sometimes submit to our misfortunes, for whoever will struggle against fate is generally but so much the farther from gaining his end'.[21] This contextualises the courtship in the courtly love tradition as Anne pushes Henry into a place of misfortune, one that he is willing to 'struggle' or suffer through, expecting the outcome to be positive and fulfilling his desire for Anne. However, continuing her unobtainable stance, Anne gives no response to the king.

Only in letter four does Henry shift his stance slightly, taking a semi-dominant role in the conversation to seek a definitive answer from his thus far impartial mistress. In response to an apparently inconsistent and perhaps misleading letter from Anne, Henry demands to know what her intentions are with him and his love for her. This does not stop Henry from resurrecting certain courtly love imagery to convey his message. 'I have put myself into great agony', he states, once again provoking Anne to see the damage and suffering she has caused with her dispassionate responses.[22] Henry further adds that he had 'been for above a whole year stricken with the dart of love and not yet sure whether I shall fail or find a place in your heart and affection'.[23] It is through this uncertainty that Anne creates a balance of power between herself and Henry. Because the king is unable to know her intentions, he is subject to her demands. Also, the blame that is pointed in Anne's direction for having somehow infected him with this love sickness and suffering, through this metaphorical dart, allows Anne more power; she manipulates the situation in her favour. Thus, by the next letter, the king declares 'my heart shall be dedicated to you alone'.[24]

As Anne gains power from the courtly love experience, the same can be said about the employment of chivalric tropes and power dynamics. The very nature of the male and female roles within courtly love literature draws upon the chivalric ideal of gender roles and it is therefore crucial to the narrative in the documents and the dynamics of power. Henry presents echoes of the chivalric ideals to emphasise his masculinity — previously examined in Chapter Two — even though representing himself as a lowly knight in the letters, rather than proclaiming his dominance. Henry continually asserts his loyalty to Anne, ending his letters with the word 'loyal' a total of four times throughout. Alongside playing the role of pained and suffering knight, Henry is also determined to cement his reputation as a chivalric figure through the evocation of certain phrases and ideals. As an example, Anne receives gifts of game, a buck that the king

---

[20] Halliwell, 304.

[21] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 305.

[22] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 305

[23] Halliwell, 305.

[24] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 307.

Hilary Jane Locke

killed with his own hand, which Henry uses to promote his masculinity by noting himself as 'the hunter'.[25] This is done not only so Anne can recall Henry to her mind, but also to portray her lover as a strong, sporting man who participates in the chivalric pastimes of hunting in her name. Another notable example comes from Letter Five, where Anne finally accepts Henry's proposal to be his mistress. Here, Henry writes about the very chivalric ideals which he clearly valued. In referring to Anne's acceptance of their relationship and adoption of new mottoes that reflect this, Henry states: 'they oblige me for ever to honour, love, and serve you sincerely'.[26] Here, the king dedicates himself, through the chivalric code, to Anne and her needs. This not only reflects the idea that Anne has a position of great power, despite the need for Henry's feelings to be 'reciprocal', but points towards Henry's own ideas of masculinity. This morality is clearly driven by the chivalric code which pushes Henry to serve those whom he deems worth his dedication. Moreover, the king references his own chivalric past, asking Anne to accept his 'loyalty of heart'.[27] The connection to his jousting performance of 1511, when he rode as Sir Loyal Heart, further proves his ingrained chivalric identity. Even if Anne had no knowledge of this event, Henry asserts himself as he had been in the past, parading his chivalric and masculine self in the lists as a knight in disguise.

Adding a further layer to the complex cultural ideals within the conversation between Henry and Anne, the manner in which Henry finishes his letters also indicates the importance of courtly love and chivalric conversation in the development of this relationship. These documents usually end with a personalised flourish. On six occasions he signs his letters off using the term 'servant', and once as 'secretary'. The roles of 'servant' and 'secretary' place Henry as subject to his desire and need for Anne; the words servant and secretary are accompanied by words of emphasis such as 'entire' and 'assured', stressing the already existing determination within the letters for Anne to be with the king in all ways.[28] Although ending letters with the words 'servant' or 'secretary' was an extremely common device in the early modern era, the appearance of this in the king's love letters places emphasis on his devotion to Anne. Henry's correspondence frequently ended with an authoritative statement, such as 'given under our signet', or with an abrupt ending and no signature.[29] Rarely did the king sign letters with his full name or even initials. Mostly, this indicates that his letters were composed by others and completed with a wax seal. Or, to look at another example, in a letter to Cardinal Wolsey and contemporary with the correspondence to Anne (*c.* 1528), Henry ends with 'written with the hand of your loving master, Henry Rex'.[30] Whilst this is different to other letters from the king, it places emphasis on the notions of his dominance over Wolsey as his master, and on the Rex (King). This allows the reader to understand that while there was affection between these long term acquaintances, indicated by the word loving, the relationship was based around the genuine power dynamic, Henry remaining the most powerful.

In writing to Anne, Henry approaches the composition differently from the usual kingly correspondence, even with close acquaintances like Wolsey. The king is a secretary to his love, and a servant

---

[25] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 311.

[26] Halliwell, 307.

[27] Halliwell, 307.

[28] Halliwell, 304, 307, 312.

[29] Seth Lerer, *Courtly Letters*, 87.

[30] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII. to Cardinal Wolsely', 286

to his 'mistress and friend'.[31] His hand, which is referred to nine times, acts as the conveyer of his passion and these letters place the king as unquestioningly committed to this relationships despite circumstances. The evocation of the secretary, accompanied by the image of his writing hand, further pushes Henry's submission into the character of lowly knight of the romantic tradition, as he has submitted himself to employing the kingly hand to letters of passion rather than of state. This has two effects on the wider narrative of these documents. Firstly, that Henry is engaging in the rhetoric to have an effect on Anne, caused by Anne's appearance on the page as the mistress who seems, in stages, unobtainable: first as his mistress, then in their psychical relationship and, finally, as his wife. Secondly, Henry represents himself on the page as a figure of intimacy, rather than of royal intimidation. Unlike the letter to Wolsey, Henry never refers to himself as Anne's master or the king. Ending the letters on most occasions with initials or his name is significant because it does not continually ask Anne to submit to him by right of his position. These letters place him in Anne's grasp, granting her power, by the removal of the kingly title and emphasising his place as the writer, the servant or secretary, and potential lover.

Comparing these ideas to how Henry represents himself on the page in a surviving letter to Henry's third wife Jane Seymour, there are some subtle differences. Whilst courtly love informs the tropes and conversation in this document, there is a shift in tone, possibly symptomatic of Henry's personal circumstances in 1536. The letter invokes similar secretarial and servant tropes. Not once, but twice, Henry places himself as a servant to Jane. In the first instance he is her 'devoted servant', alluding to his dedication and the love that he bears for her. Secondly, and more pertinently, Henry offers a contradiction by naming himself 'your own loving servant', then following this with the assertion that he is still Jane's 'sovereign'. Unlike the correspondence with Anne, the dominance of 'sovereign' removes any power, and the feminine courtly love role from Jane's position in the conversation about their relationship. Henry devotes himself to Jane only as much as his role as king allows, and vice versa. The distinct change in conversation means the appearance of courtly love and the chivalric themes in Henry's letters to Anne stand out strongly, as the tropes and rhetoric, despite their continual use, boldly emphasise these letters as a courtly love conversation.

The political discussions that weave through these documents reveal a life beyond the courtship and romantic aspect. The agency granted to Anne through the correspondence is complemented by a transformation in the traditional gender roles. This unique gender shift had a curious effect on Henry and Anne's relationship with each other, which becomes apparent throughout the later letters. As Seth Lerer notes:

> Crucial to the rhetoric of his epistolary erotics [… Henry] places Anne not in relationship to other women but to other men. He defines her political and personal role with reference to minion services and male counsel. Anne is invited to share the world of the Privy Chamber, of grooms to the royal body, of secretaries, ministers and servants all of who are men.[32]

---

[31] Halliwell, 302.

[32] Lerer, *Court Letters,* 91.

Hilary Jane Locke

This is important on several levels, as Anne is drawn into the world of homosociality. As a woman, her place amongst members of the council is perceived as uncommon. However, Anne is continually informed of political negotiations through this correspondence. Anne interacted with courtly men, who relay political information and receive Henry's letters. For example, in one instance the king wishes for Anne to be at court, rather than her brother, and close friend of the king, George.[33] Later, George is sent 'on [Henry's] part' to rendezvous with Anne and pass along information in place of the king.[34] Henry, furthermore, refers to 'other men's light handlings' of their relationship, pointing towards his frustrations during the process of acquiring the rights of his divorce from Katherine of Aragon.[35]

These letters also pull Anne into the realm of men and political masculinity and add another layer in which the chivalric concept of honour allows Anne and Henry's relationships to develop, not only as lovers, but as a political couple. The events that usually concern Anne are the proceedings being undertaken to get the king's divorce; it is important to note that Anne was included in the discussion. Anne is informed when the Papal Legate, Cardinal Campaggio, begins his journey towards England to start the trial, and how the proceedings are being prepared and handled: 'there can no more done, nor more diligence used, not all manner of dangers both foreseen and provided for'.[36] Henry continually pushes his optimism upon Anne until the last letter, stating that once Campaggio's illness abates, 'I trust verily, when God shall send him health, he will with diligence recompense his demur'.[37] In other words, their union and companionship, which 'doth somewhat retard' during the proceedings, should shortly be fulfilled, once the Cardinal's illness ends, as it is the inevitable conclusion to Henry's faith in Anne's position as his sole mistress, further wife, and queen.[38]

The inclusion of Anne into the political inner circle is indicated clearest through the role Anne plays within the web of close advisors and negotiators. Henry asks Anne to relay messages to her father: 'but that begging you, my mistress, to tell your father from me, that I desire him to hasten the time appointed by two days, that he may be at court before old term'.[39] In another case, Henry relays that 'I have caused my lord, your father, to make provisions for his speed' regarding Anne's return to court.[40] Furthermore, the king is thrust into Boleyn familiar affairs; Henry is petitioned and entrusted with Anne's 'sister's matter' after the death of Mary Boleyn's husband, which leaves her struggling for money. Henry states: 'I have caused Walter Walche (a gentlemen of the Privy Council) to write to my lord [Thomas Boleyn]'.[41] The king prompts a discussion to get support for Mary and her infant children. Through Anne's position as mistress, which is the key to prompting these negotiations even though she is not yet married to the king, she becomes a player amongst courtiers' bids for patronage.

---

[33] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 311.

[34] Halliwell, 318.

[35] Halliwell, 318.

[36] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 309.

[37] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 320.

[38] Halliwell, 320.

[39] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 311.

[40] Halliwell, 309.

[41] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 310.

Poignantly these letters mark Anne Boleyn's transition into separate roles in the power relationship and dynamics between herself and Henry. She, as a political player, moves from the much desired mistress of a lusting king, to a woman being primed and readied to become queen. The correspondence that follows 'this my rude letter', where Henry demanded clarification regarding Anne's, becomes sweet, alluding to the flirtation of the couple and the affection that the king feels for her.[42] However, the shifting in the tone, away from courtly love towards Anne's inclusion in courtly politics and public matters, allows for this transposal of Anne from role to role in both Henry's eyes and therefore the public realm of court life. This conveys the sense of increasing duty through the communications of mistress and king, as Anne is almost groomed to be his queen and potential regent; Anne is placed in the context of the political sphere as their romantic and sexual relationship developed in the courtly love tradition. Importantly, through the employment of these courtly love tropes, Anne gains herself a powerful position, one that places her on the trajectory towards queenship, and Henry is granted a language in which he can express himself, to gain the woman he loves as his sole mistress and eventually, publicly crowned queen.

While in isolation, the letters convey the influence that courtly love had on the intimate relationship between Henry and Anne, courtly love traditions and influenced other couples in their courtships. 'The Devonshire Manuscript', containing lyrics, some original from the 1530s and others by Thomas Wyatt and Geoffrey Chaucer, has several such examples of lyrical courtship and courtly love narrative among the courtly nobility.[43] The dialogue that occurs throughout these lyrics reveals gendered expectations and behaviours that the paradigm of courtly love discourse facilitated in courtship and lyrical self-expression. For example, in one of her original compositions that appears in the manuscript, Margaret Douglas, niece of Henry VIII, states of her love Thomas Howard: 'wych faythfullnes ye dyd euer pretend / and gentylness as now I see'.[44] The lyrics further state that Howard should 'take ye thys vnto yowr part/ my fythful / trwe and louyng hart'.[45] Exploring the common presentation amongst the lyrics in this manuscript, Margaret Douglas represents the repeated themes of gendered behaviour in relation to the courtly love and courtship models. These verses reflect upon Margaret's ability to remain steadfast in her relationship with Howard, who is portrayed as patiently waiting for her, as he is competing against her political position as niece of the king. More crucially, though, the verses convey that Margaret has suffered, but not to the same extent as her young lover. Howard is represented as the man who 'as euer dyd louer for hys part', throughout the poems, exaggerating his position in pursuit of Margaret, through the courtly love lyrics.

With important contributions from men and women, the manuscript features original contributions from Thomas Howard, Thomas Wyatt, and Margaret Douglas, as well as entries by Mary Shelton (Anne Boleyn's cousin and Henry VIII's short-term mistress), and Mary Howard (also Anne's cousin and wife of

---

[42] Halliwell, 306.

[43] There are some notable, recently published, journal articles which cover interpretations and key figures in the Devonshire Manuscript. See: Christopher Shirley, 'The Devonshire Manuscript: Reading Gender in the Henrician Court', *English Literary Renaissance* 45, no. 1 (2015): 32-59; Molly Murray, 'The Prisoner, the Lover, and the Poet: The Devonshire Manuscript and Early Tudor Carcerality', *Renaissance and Reformation* 35, no. 1 (2012): 17-41; Bradley J. Irish, 'Gender and Politics in the Henrician Court: The Douglas-Howard Lyrics in the Devonshire Manuscript (BL Add 17492)', *Renaissance Quarterly* 64, no. 1 (2011): 79-114; Elizabeth Heale, 'Women and the Courtly Love Lyric: The Devonshire MS (BL Additional 17492)', *The Modern Language Review* 90, no. 2 (1995): 296-313.

[44] London, The British Library, Add MS 17492 The 'Devonshire Manuscript', lines 15-16, f. 29r.

[45] Add MS 17492, lines 20-21, f.29.r,

the king's illegitimate son Henry Fitzroy). Similar to the love letters, the poems and lyrics in the volume are mostly composed by men. That they are used by women, however, allows for the explorations of the ways in which courtly love, in the lyrical context, allocates space for gendered behaviours and expectations in the courtship process. As Love and Marotti states about the manuscript form: 'The Devonshire Manuscript is, perhaps, the best surviving sixteenth-century example of a blank book that was used as a medium of social intercourse'.[46] A blank book allowed women, and others invited, to enter in their own verses, lyrics and signatures. This was a vital space for women to express themselves, since women appeared as printed authors only on rare occasions.[47] It also facilitated dialogues and personalised flourishes between contributors, as can be seen with Douglas' and Howard's entries.

Appearing in Thomas Howard's hand, a short passage from Geoffrey Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde,* beginning with 'O very lord, O Loue, O God, Alas!', situates him in the courtly love tradition. The employment of Troilus's suffering, then copied and engaged with by Thomas Howard, is evidence of the complex adoption of courtly love discourse for rhetorical and expressive means by these courtiers. This verse contains a narrator who suffers 'in torment and in creuel payne' by his unfulfilled love, burdened by this great 'infortune'.[48] Similar to other examples penned by Howard, the most prominent of which evoke the themes of suffering, the verse enacts a search for happiness with his love and the asserts himself in the narrative of his love story with Margaret Douglas. As Lerer explains, Howard's ventriloquising of Chaucer's work are 'acts of impersonation that cautiously and, at times transgressively, tread the line between public life and private memory, between romance and remembrance'.[49] The lyrics copied into the manuscript give an indication of gender dynamics: 'some of these verses are clearly in the man's voice, some obviously in the woman's, and read in sequence they chart a rhetorically conventional epistolary exchange centred on the angst of courtly love'.[50]

It is true that in the work of *Troilus and Criseyde* itself, Chaucer plays with the meaning and effectiveness of the trope of suffering, and so speaks of the degrees of suffering implied by Howard's adoption of Troilus' voice. However, the relationship as it appears in text form between Thomas and Margaret cements both the context of courtly love and the political circumstances that surrounds them. Much like *Troilus and Criseyde,* which is set during the fall of Troy, Margaret and Thomas find themselves in a courtly romance set against a backdrop of suspicion, turmoil, and the struggles for political power. The lyrics become a private representation of their relationships, enacted by committing lyrics to paper as emotional confessions. Moreover, the courtly love narrative allows for the adoption of performance to a public audience as well as themselves.

The entries by Thomas in particular, can be seen as a further employment of the courtly love framework of communication, just as it was with Henry's love letters. Here, the lyrics become a means for expressing his love and seeking to have it fulfilled. As Barry Windeatt states in his introduction to *Troilus*

---

[46] Harold Love and Arthur F. Marotti, 'Manuscript Transmission and Circulation', in *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature* ed. David Lowenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 63

[47] Love and Marotti, 'Manuscript Transmissions', 63

[48] Add MS 17492, line 9, f. 29v

[49] Lerer, *Courtly Letters,* 145.

[50] Lerer, *Courtly Letters,* 145.

and Criseyde: 'For Troilus everything is being done for the first time. His experience is unique, unparalleled, wholly possessing'.[51] This is connected to how Thomas understands these lyrics. Indeed, the interwoven nature of the Chaucerian voice and the nature of Thomas and Margaret's relationship potentially offers the lovers a 'private code', as Arthur F. Marotti has stated, another common courtly love trope.[52] The adoption of the courtly love verses, particularly the sections which give weight to lovesickness and suffering endured, allocates Thomas language to express his own feelings for Margaret. Therefore, courtly love, and the character of Troilus, provide a readymade role for Thomas, as he negotiates his romantic relationship with the king's niece, attempting to communicate and comprehend the emotional complexities of this relationship. By employing the imagery from the Chaucerian romance, Thomas inhabits the man who is 'lurkying in thys woful nest' of lovesickness.[53] In doing so, Howard conveys different meanings through the lyrics. These words represent Thomas' own feelings, rather than solely those belonging to Troilus. They project him onto the page, waiting and anticipating the responses from the woman he has cast as his Criseyde. It is in this way that courtly love discourse — the rhetoric, imagery, tropes and devices — can be seen as a means for lovers in the Henrician court to express themselves to each other.

The idea of the hand or pen, in particular, as representative of the self, especially in the context of lyrics and letters, adds another layer. This is particularly pertinent when examining the courtly love framework. Partly influenced by humanist ideas which informed the processes of writing and self-representation, letters and lyrics throughout this period strove for a deeper and more personal representation of the authors character and what they wished to communicate. Essentially, humanism slowly influenced how courtiers used letters, the elements of the hand and the language, to stand in for the absent and physical body of the author.

Returning briefly to the example of the letters penned by Henry, he continually refers to the king's physical hand. This usually reflects two ideas. Firstly, that Henry has made the effort to write these letters himself, scrawling on the page to his mistress to represent his suffering and to play out the courtly love narrative. Secondly, his hand is representative of ownership, particularly in the later letters. Initially, his hand is associated with words indicating Anne has full ownership of Henry's feelings: 'written with the hand of him which I were yours'.[54] This changes as their relationship becomes established, as Henry's hand becomes increasingly associated with their mutual relationship. For instance, Henry ends letter fourteen with: 'written with the hand of him which desireth as much to be yours as you do to have him'.[55] This small flourish to the letters allows the reader to see how the emotional understanding of this relationship has developed, as Anne is acknowledged as wanting Henry, rather than owning him or being the demanding mistress. It is not until letter sixteen that Henry completely asserts himself, also reflecting the current state of political vulnerability: 'written with the hand of him that was, is, and shall be yours by his own will'.[56] This shows the transition through the various stages of the courtly love traditions, from ownership to the owned. In other words, Henry

---

[51] Barry Windeatt, 'Introduction' in *Troilus and Criseyde* trans. by Barry Windeatt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), xxiii.

[52] Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 40.

[53] Add MS 17492, line 18, f. 29v

[54] Halliwell, 309.

[55] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 317.

[56] Halliwell, 'Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn', 319.

VIII's employment of this device shows the transition of his position visible on the page, shifting from being the suffering lover to the dominant and masculine role of honourable chivalric male.

Another example comes from Margaret Douglas's contributions in the Devonshire Manuscript, in which she offers annotations and edits the document. In other words, her hand provides a voice enacting what courtly love facilitated for women as a source of expression. Throughout the manuscript, there are many examples of Douglas' hand changing, correcting, and editing various contributions. Compared with the hand of Henry VIII, who uses writing to perform his courtly love role, Douglas acts as mediator for the courtly love content upon the page and the employment of her hand becomes a powerful tool. She is able to replicate and copy previous lyrics to represent emotions and ideals, and the process of courtship. Margaret acknowledges the power of the physical act of writing in her poem which contains: 'both I and my pen […] take god to record whych knowyth my hart'.[57] And just as Thomas adopts the voice of Troilus for the point of his love, the pen gives Margaret some power of expression and the manuscript a space to express it.

That the main contributors were women, or those men attached to certain women, indicates that courtly love provided an avenue of agency, enabling women to contribute to courtly culture. Henry's employment of his own handwriting further indicates the performative element to the suffering. Instead of lying on a bed in an induced love sickness, like characters such as Troilus, Henry is scrawling on the page as if he is compelled to. 'The Devonshire Manuscript' reveals the role that courtly love discourse played, even if the manuscript was not for public consumption. The content indicates the cultural precedent for courtly love as a means of heterosexual communication. Although the written lyrics and annotations did not provide the same opportunities as Anne Boleyn, the women who contributed to the literary culture in this period show how effective the uses of courtly love were in the political and gendered arena.

Moreover, the relationship that developed between Thomas Howard and Margaret Douglas offers a glimpse into the private sphere of courtiers and lovers. The comparison with the letters from Henry VIII, and his own personal suffering for his love for Anne Boleyn, reveals the emotional complexities within the courtly love discourse; they were clearly employed not only for men to convey themselves on the page, but also for the women to cement their role within the courtship and partnerships that formed. The eventual conclusion to Margaret and Thomas's relationship is played out in similar narrative style to the courtly love romances, which only emphasises the pre-existing courtly love narrative in the manuscript itself. The themes that are explored within the quotations, attributions, and original compositions portray the crucial existence of courtly love in the framing of both the presentation of the inner suffering and the contextualised lyrical expression of an emotional framework.

'Beware the Third Time': The Betrayal of Honour and the Limitations of Courtly Love Relationships

All things considered, courtly love operated alongside and often against the framework of masculine values and chivalric ideals. Engaging in courtly love led to severe consequences for several women and courtiers between 1530 and Henry VIII's death. They were speaking about the king's masculinity and honour, which can offer an explanation of why both women and men suffered punishments like execution or long term imprisonment. Furthermore, the misreading of courtly love's applications in both social and political

---

[57] Add MS 17492, line 2, 7, f. 29r.

environments had ramifications: the unfortunate initial meeting between Anne of Cleves and her disguised husband to be, which will be explored, is one example where the concept of courtly love play, used for diplomatic purposes, failed to meet expectation and resulted in an insult to Henry's honour and the downfall of Anne of Cleves as his queen. As the following section will discuss, several instances in Henry VIII's own life provide examples where the mix of courtly love roles and chivalric ideals created upheavals for those involved.

Anne Boleyn and her supposed lovers, George Boleyn, Francis Weston, Henry Norris, William Brereton, and Mark Smeaton, were arrested and sent to the Tower of London in early May of 1536. Thomas Cromwell's investigations into the conduct of the queen revealed damning evidence. Anne was accused of adultery with these men, and ultimately they were all condemned and executed before the month's end.[58] Furthermore, Anne was also accused of scheming to marry one of these men after the death of the king, which was an act of treason. These events, well known and debated within historical accounts, have great significance for the perception of both Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn's characters and circumstances. Indeed, it is hard to understand how quickly Anne went from queen, developing, and strengthening her position on the European political stage, to a woman without her marriage and head.

These events are also a curiosity because they occurred so rapidly and dramatically. From courtship, to marriage and execution, Henry VIII's relationship with Anne Boleyn shows how the great courtly love romances that have been explored previously in this chapter. Perhaps this is not coincidental. Indeed, one historian has drawn links between the accusations and trial of Anne Boleyn and the trial of Guinevere in Thomas Malory's *Le Morte D'Arthur*. As Ruth Lexton's article states, the coincidences between the famous story, may have given courtiers the context to understand these events: the analogy between the events around Anne and Henry and Malory's trial of Guinevere benefited and baffled contemporaries, 'providing patterns of interpretation […] to make sense of what was most likely a rapid and terrifying series of events'.[59] To some extent, this perception may be true. Just as courtly love narratives and tropes offered Henry VIII a way to communicate with his potential mistress, contemporaries could have viewed the rapid descent of the Boleyn family through the lens of similar tropes. More deeply, however, just as courtly love provided an emotional framework for lovers to communicate, the courtly love ideals can be seen to influence these events and reveal their complex relationship with the norms of gender dynamics.

Suzannah Lipscomb's analysis of these events expands upon these ideas. She outlines how Anne Boleyn's downfall was a result of Boleyn seeking to honour her feminine-self, and therefore insulting the king: 'understanding the inner tensions in the ideas of masculinity and femininity helps explain both why Anne fell — why she appeared guilty when she was not — and also why, in the light of her apparent guilt, Henry acted so ruthlessly and rapidly to exterminate her'.[60] Courtly love was one way for women to 'win honour for themselves other than simply by remaining sexually chaste'.[61] Moreover, Lipscomb asserts that

---

[58] Eric Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 319-356.

[59] Ruth Lexton, 'Reading the Adulterous/Treasonous Queen in Early Modern England: Malory's Guinevere and Anne Boleyn', *Exemplaria*, 27 no. 3 (2015), 232.

[60] Suzannah, Lipscomb, 'The Fall of Anne Boleyn: A Crisis in Gender Relations?' in *Henry VIII and the Court: Art, Politics and Performance*. Edited by Thomas Betteridge and Suzannah Lipscomb (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), 305.

[61] Lipscomb, 'The Fall of Anne Boleyn', 296-7

the queen's actions, particularly where she reportedly told Henry Norris he looked for dead man's shoes, implying that Norris wanted to marry Anne after Henry VIII died, were formed within the framework of courtly love. Those words provided 'affirmation and admiration […] in a rash, unrestrained way' and showed that Anne was increasingly unstable in her position as queen.[62]

The tensions present in gendered performance, and the small details of Anne's conversation with Norris, situate the events in a complex cultural environment. Importantly, most analysis has stopped attempting to prove Anne Boleyn, and her five lovers, guilty or innocent. This thesis will not be involved in that debate either, but will examine the trial records to discover the gender perceptions and courtly love influences, building upon the interpretation of Lipscomb, and will delve deeper into the record. Ultimately, by using a courtly love and chivalric lens to analyse the downfall of Anne Boleyn, her lovers, and Henry VIII's responses to this personal crisis, it may answer some pertinent questions about why a queen was beheaded. It also alludes to the dangers present for aristocratic women for engaging in courtly love beyond certain limitations.

At the trial of Anne and George Boleyn, some evidentiary details allude to the courtly love influences. The eroticised and dramatised nature of the relations between the queen and five alleged lovers allowed courtly love to play its part in the rise of Anne Boleyn as much as it did her eventual downfall. At her trial Anne is cast as the demanding-female courtly lover, having 'falsely and traitorously procure[d] by base conversations and kisses, touchings, gifts and other infamous incitations'.[63] This is achieved through her womanly agency, seeking out those men who would worship her, give her said gifts, and hint at the possibility of sexual activity. The relationship between Anne as a courtly love object, a woman on a pedestal, and as Henry's queen, assisted the representation of her as a combination of demanding, vulnerable, passions, actively participating in these dangerous interactions. For instance, she 'procured, by sweet words, kisses, touches, and otherwise, [Henry] Noreys of Westminster, gentleman of the privy chamber'.[64] The sexual activity, however, comes from the common perception of the female body, with Anne's actions being described as simply 'following daily her frail and carnal lust'.[65] As the wife of the king, Anne was untouchable, and yet she controlled her social interactions with men by engaging in the tropes of courtly love, or through flirtation, friendship, and erotic innuendo.[66] To echo Lipscomb's argument, courtly love gives Anne agency to forge her own relationship, be they romantic or platonic. The problem is the corresponding risk of others misinterpreting the role play of courtly love, thereby reflecting poorly on the queen, the men in her circle, and, most damagingly, the participants' attitudes towards the king. Consequently, Anne's first crime was 'entertaining malice against the king'.[67] The words spoken by Anne to her flirtatious partners, lowly and adoring, sabotaged her reputations by misinterpreting courtly love activity.

At her trial, each gentleman was presented as one in a line who brought gifts in exchange for their right to 'violate' the queen. The use of such aggressive language suggests that the men in their own way were

---

[62] Lipscomb, 'The Fall of Anne Boleyn', 297-8.

[63] '15 May 1536. R. O. Trial of Anne Boleyn and Lord Rochford' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 10: 1536*, 361.

[64] 'Trial of Anne Boleyn', 361

[65] 'Trial of Anne Boleyn', 361

[66] Lipscomb, 'The Fall of Anne Boleyn', 297-8.

[67] 'Trial of Anne Boleyn', 361

violating the king's honour, his masculinity, and damaging the purity of his marriage. This damaged was aggravated by the inversion of the agency granted to Anne through the courtly love ideal. Indeed, it is alleged that she abused her position to demand the affections of potential lovers and by so doing brought dishonour to her role as queen. At the same time, the men are demeaned by submitting to Anne's forthright and lustful behaviour: 'several of the King's servants yielded to her vile provocations'.[68] That they 'yielded' gives the impression of surrendering. This is further exaggerated when the men are represented as squabbling and jealous lovers, competing with each other for the queen's affections. But again, this is relayed as the queen's fault, in so far as her elevated status gave her agency. Anne 'gave them great gifts to encourage them in their crimes', and pushed further by her inability to 'endure any of them […] convers[ing] with any other woman, without showing great displeasure'.[69] Anne, the demanding mistress of all these men, is represented as the great manipulator, and, most harmfully to her case, active betrayer of the king's affections for her.

The most damning of the cases presented is that of George Boleyn, the queen's brother. The incestuous nature of this relationship necessarily excludes it as part of the courtly love ideal. George's masculinity is devalued by his grotesque sexual contact with his sister. Anne lures her brother 'with her tongue in the said George's mouth, and the said George's tongue in hers'.[70] Anne was described as 'frail' against the driving forces of her 'carnal lusts'. Their trial records, and the evidence that they were seduced by the queen, leaves these men looking somewhat pitiful. When they did have agency, William, Henry and George were allegedly initiating sexual conduct 'sometimes by [their] own procurement'; but it is mostly framed as Anne's own behaviour that enticed these men. By succumbing, ultimately, the accused men were stripped of their masculinity and honour, both for reasons of their violation of the queen, and for breaking of the honourable connection they had to their king.

Henry VIII proved how dissatisfied he was with Anne's actions and the personal hurt they caused him by the eventual executions of the queen and her alleged lovers. He is described as having concern for not only for the dishonour to his crown, but also his heart and the state of his kingly body. Having learned of the extent of the queen's crimes he 'took such inward displease and heaviness […] that certain harms and perils have befallen his royal body'.[71] This can be interpreted as the effect on his reproductive body, and that of Anne's as she is deemed royalty in relation to producing the future heirs. But there can be other meanings, the term body reflecting upon the sentiment of Henry VII and his knights being of the political and personal body. Participating in illicit sexual acts with the queen was the highest insult to the king from a chivalric perspective. The men in this case were members of the privy chamber and therefore had intimate relationships with the king in terms of his political standing and his position in the private spheres of the court. As previously discussed, chivalric conduct was crucial to Henry VIII's personal ideals, and therefore informed the public discourse of honour and masculinity at court. The betrayal of values that informed how he communicated with male members of his political body, and how he interacted socially with these men, was unforgivable. Adding further insult, the woman Henry once called 'mine own sweetheart' was found guilty of 'never lov[ing] the King in her heart'.[72] The dangerous mix of courtly love and the crucial ideals of

---

[68] 'Trial of Anne Boleyn', 361
[69] 'Trial of Anne Boleyn', 361
[70] 'Trail of Anne Boleyn', 361
[71] 'Trail of Anne Boleyn', 361
[72] 'Trail of Anne Boleyn', 361

chivalric ethos informed the startling circumstances that led to the beheading of these men, and the wife Henry VIII had fought so desperately to have. Inflicting such severe punishments on these victims, as a consequence of slighting his honour as a man and a king, was necessary for the preservation of the honourable reputation of the king of England.

Shortly after the downfall of Anne Boleyn, Henry VIII was dealing with a family crisis which proved to be just as insulting for his honour. Margaret Douglas was another who faced the negative consequences of courtship. Her relationship with Thomas Howard, discussed in conjunction with the Devonshire Manuscript, had them both arrested and sent to the Tower. There was the question of the legality of her contract to Thomas, which was potentially treasonous because Margaret was of royal blood and needed the king's permission to marry.[73] This is alluded to by poems within the Devonshire Manuscript, where Margaret discusses troubled feelings in reaction to her uncle's anger.[74] Throughout, she makes references to the extent in which courtly love proved fruitful as a means of union between courting lovers. In one example, Margaret states, 'that happy hap is dangerus'.[75] For someone in Margaret's position, a relationship entered into for reasons of love had a high risk. This echoes a poem entered in the manuscript by Thomas Howard, which states: 'what clowde hath browght this thunderclape / shall I blam here nay I blame the happ'.[76] The dynamic, representation of love, through the courtly love lyrics that Douglas and Howard readily engaged in, became a means to express the limitations that this culture imposed upon them. As Howard's lyrics reveal, it was an illusion that courtly love could give these lovers, but they also could refer to the limitations of his relationship with Margaret because of her status. After all, why would the king, who would be the one to bring on the 'thunderclape', allow his niece, a highly prized and politically valuable woman, to marry him?

It is through some of her poems that Margaret also seeks to soothe Henry's angered response to her relationship. In another poem she asks that he 'frely pardonn myn offence / sythe yt presendeth off lowers ffervence'.[77] Margaret also refers to Henry as her 'ffather Dere' and 'that off my blud ar the nerest'.[78] She directly appeals to their familial relationship, in the hope to inspiring the security expected. Stating that she would rather not be made a political pawn, as was her uncle's probable plans, but rather marry one whom truly loves. Taking a bold stance, Margaret continues this theme from in her manuscript contributions, stating: 'I spek not thys to know your mynd / nor off your councell ffor to be / but yff I wer thow should me ffynd / thy ffaythffull ffrend asesuredly'.[79] In other words, she wished to know if she would cause offence though her actions, and attempted to remain civil regardless. Margaret's self-assured pledges within her poetic contributions to the manuscript give the impression that she wanted the agency that these verses allowed her, and hoped that reason would outweigh the consequences.

---

[73] Charles Wriothesley, *A Chronicles of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from A.D. 1485 to 1559 Vol. 1* ed. by William Douglas Hamilton (London: The Camden Society, 1875), 54.

[74] Murray, 'The Prisoner, the Lover, and the Poet': 17-41

[75] Add MS 17492, line 2, f. 42r.

[76] Add MS 17492, lines 20-21, f. 46v

[77] Add MS 17492, lines 20-21, f. 88r

[78] Add MS 17492, line 3, f. 88r

[79] Add MS 17492, lines 9-12, f. 41r.

Of course, the arrest of both Margaret and Thomas caused a reaction from Margaret's mother. In response to her daughter being placed under arrest, Henry VIII's sister, Margaret Tudor, Queen of Scotland, wrote a letter disapproving of her brother's actions. She condemned Henry's 'extreme rigour' in his approach, stating that she could in 'no way can believe [this] considering [Margaret] is our natural daughter, your niece and sister natural unto yet king [James V of Scotland] our dearest son your nephew'.[80] The actions Henry had taken against his niece may have struck an uncomfortable chord. Margaret Tudor, much like her sister Mary, had dutifully followed through with marriage to a foreign king arranged for her, James IV of Scotland. Yet, her subsequent relationships were initiated on her own terms, including that with the father of Margaret Douglas.[81] The imprisonment of her daughter, for the reasons of a courtship and personal choice of a husband, could have been offensive to Margaret or even perceived as a direct insult. Consequently, the queen appealed to Henry's 'grace and favour [to] remit of such as your Grace has put to her charge'. Crucially, Margaret appeals directly to Henry's chivalric nature to fix the situation, asking 'most humbly beseech Your Grave to do, as we doubt not your wisdom will think to your honour'.[82] With Margaret Douglas falling ill during her time in the Tower, and Thomas Howard's death occurring shortly after she was released from Syon in the October of 1537, it is impossible to know if the words of Henry's angry sister had any effect upon Margaret's treatment, or eventual release. What is clear, however, is that Margaret's mother did not regard her daughter's choice of husband as a problem.

The couple responded quite differently once arrested. Thomas Howard remained firm in his position as Margaret's future husband, and asserted that the marriage contract was made appropriately. In his examination, conducted in the July of 1536, he remained committed to Margaret. He stated 'he hath loved the lady Margaret a twelvemonth' and makes no mention of renouncing or regretting this.[83] Howard died unfulfilled in prison, just as in some of the courtly love narratives he cast himself in. Margaret, in return, tried to appeal to her uncle. Writing to Cromwell in 1536, once moved to Syon, Margaret exhibits her sacrifices in giving up her courtly lifestyle and her commitment to Thomas to prove she had learned her lesson. Discussing the dismissal of her servants that were associated with Thomas, Margaret appears humbled. In an effort to maintain her good image, she states she had dispensed with the company of men during her stay at Syon.[84] She also tells Cromwell that she does 'not to thynke that eny fancy doth remayn in me towchyng hym'.[85] In other words, she was moving past her relationship with Thomas. Her main meditation while she remained at Syon was to figure out 'how to plese the kyng's grace and to contune in hys faver'.[86] This letter conveys a reflective Margaret, put in her place by this experience, and awaiting a return to the king's good graces.

---

[80] 'Margaret Tudor, Queen consort of Scotland Recipient: King Henry VIII', in *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland, 1509-1603. Ed. M. J. Thorpe. Vol. 1: 1509-1589* (Edinburgh: H.M. Register House, 1858), 36; Transcribed from original document: 'Queen Margaret to Henry VIII', SP 49/4, State Papers Online, The National Archives of the United Kingdom, ff. 148.

[81] 'Margaret Tudor', ff. 148

[82] 'Margaret Tudor', ff. 148

[83] 'R.O. Thomas Howard', *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 10: 1536,* 28

[84] 'R.O. Thomas Howard', 28

[85] '1536. B. M. Margaret Dowglas to [Cromwell]' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 11: 1536*, 124. Transcribed from original document: 'Margaret Dowglas to [Cromwell], Cotton Vespasian F/ XIII, State Papers Online, The British Library, ff. 241.

[86] 'Margaret Douglas to Cromwell', ff. 241.

However, Margaret did not fully learn her lesson during the 1536 ordeal. In 1540, she was again placed under house arrest for inappropriate interactions with another man from the Howard family, this time Katherine Howard's brother, Charles. A 1541 letter from Sir Ralph Sadleyr to Cranmer and the Privy Council asks that Margaret be taken aside at Syon, where both she and Katherine Howard were under house arrest, and be told, 'beware the third tyme'.[87] The councillors make the point as to how 'indiscreetly she had acted'.[88] While there is no more detail, the link between her first indiscretion with Thomas, and that with Charles, suggests that she had engaged with the new man in the same manner.[89] It is clear that Margaret's actions had again angered the king, who may have feared Margaret entering into another marriage contract. Being given a stern warning, or even threat, that if this was to happen again, there might be greater consequences for her, was designed to put the king's niece in her place. She was held at Syon for a shorter period than her 1536 house arrest, but it still withdrew her from courtly life and potentially caused more trouble for the king. That this message was conned in a letter of instruction to the Privy Council about how to deal with Katherine Howard attests to how important this matter was in the eyes of the king and his most trusted politicians. Given her uncle's restrictions, and Margaret being 25 years of age, frustration at being unmarried may have pushed her to follow her own desires in the courtly environment, where suitable men were available to her. Finally, three years later, in 1544, she was married to the Earl of Lennox. Margaret's harsh and turbulent relationship with courtly love had seemingly come to an end.

Offering further perspective on the role and limitations that courtly love played for women in the royal courts, this chapter will lastly examine the stories of two women whom Henry VIII married in 1540. Anne of Cleves, married to Henry in the January of 1540, and Katherine Howard, married in the July of 1540, were two women who were also confronted with the contradictions between the courtly love culture in diplomacy and intimate relationships, and Henry's hyper-sensitivity about kingly honour and masculinity. Anne is perhaps the least discussed of his wives, simply because her time as queen was short and her presence in historical events that followed was practically non-existent. However, the initial meeting between Henry VIII and Anne of Cleves in 1540 is well-known.[90] In the context of courtly love and chivalric discourse, their brief relationship highlights the themes of the thesis: the interconnected nature of gender perceptions, personal honour and the politicised, performative nature of chivalry and courtly love. Wriothesely recorded the events in his *Chronicles.* By his description, what followed conveys an impromptu and impetuous decision on Henry's behalf: 'the Kinge['s] Grace, with five of his Privie Chamber, being disguised with clooks or marble hoodes, that they should not be knowne, came privelie to Rochester, and went upp into the chamber where the said Ladie Anne looked out the wyndowe'.[91] As we have seen, Henry VIII was known to

---

[87] '[12. Nov.] 1541. R.O. Sir Ralph Sadleyr to Cranmer and Others' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 16: 1540-41,* 615. Transcribed from original document: 'Sir Ralph Sadleyr to Cranmer and Others', SP 1/67, State Papers Online, The National Archives, ff. 127.

[88] 'Sir Ralph Sadleyr to Cranmer', ff. 127.

[89] 'Sir Ralph Sadleyr to Cranmer', ff. 127.

[90] See: Lisa Mansfield, 'Face-to-face with the 'Flanders Mare': *Fama* and Hans Holbein the Younger's *Portrait of Anne of Cleves*' in *Fama and Her Sisters: Gossip and Rumour in Early Modern Europe* ed. Heather Kerr and Claire Walker (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015): 115-135; Retha M. Warnicke, *The Marrying of Anne of Cleves: Royal Protocol in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[91] Wriothesley, *Chronicle*, 109

have done this when he was married to Katherine of Aragon, and at the Field of Cloth of Gold celebrations with Francis I. The act of disguising himself for fun was not uncommon. In this case, he was the lover on his way to meet the woman he loved before their arranged marriage. However, Anne of Cleves' response was less than perfect. When meeting Anne, the disguised king 'sudenlie […] embraced her and kissed and shweded her a token that the King had sent her for her New Yeares gift, and she being abashed, not knowing who it was, thanked him, and so commoned with her, but she regarded him little'.[92] This was less than ideal for Henry, who then disappeared, returning in his royal attire, to be received by the queen-to-be and her ladies. Despite Wriothesley saying that Anne and Henry were talking 'togeether lovinglie' after the initial meeting, there were clear follow-on effects from this meeting.[93] Even though they were married not long after, within six months Henry was seeking legal routes to annul their union.

This particular meeting between Henry and Anne also provides insight into the limitations of courtly love and chivalric discourse in the political sphere. The incident showed a complex mixture of diplomatic misunderstandings and cultural clashes. Anne respectfully rejected the advances of a man she could not have known was the king. In that sense, the absence of the courtly love engagement, or the failure to participate in the game that Henry was putting to her, proved a disconnect between Henry's sense of kingly honour and his inability to relate to his bride to be. The self-conscious pride that Henry had as a king, and the offence Anne unwittingly caused, gives a clear indication where the limitations of courtly love lay in the context of contemporary gender dynamics. From the perspective of the king, Anne failed to understand and engage with the courtly love and chivalric role-play. Why he made the decision to connect with his future bride this way is unknown, although no double personal vanity was part of the cause. However, given Henry's previous use of disguise in his relationships, both personal and political, his aim may have been harmless fun. That Anne did not follow through left Henry somewhat unsure about where he stood with his new wife.

Indeed, there are several references to their meeting in the divorce proceedings conducted in July of 1540. Henry immediately rejected Anne as both a suitable wife and as an attractive woman. In Sir Anthony Browne's deposition, he noted: 'the King entered to embrace and kiss her, he noted on his countenance a discontentment and misliking of her person, and the King tarried not to speak with her twenty words'.[94] Furthermore, the meeting with Anne left the king 'abashed'.[95] When the marriage between himself and Anne was over, the perceptions of kingly assertiveness and dominance were restored, and any damage caused by the interaction with Anne resolved.

Henry's next marriage, to Katherine Howard, ended in less civil and more dramatic circumstances. Katherine was sent to Syon in late 1541, after being found guilty of having previously been in relationships with Francis Durham and Henry Maddox before her marriage to the king. She was also allegedly conducting an affair with Thomas Culpepper, the king's Groom of the Stool. The nature of Katherine and Culpepper's relationship is not fully known. However, courtly love tropes in the surviving letter to Culpepper informed perceptions and suspicions of the affections that the queen had for him. After asking after his health, she asks

---

[92] Wriothesley, *Chronicle,* 109-110

[93] Wriothesley, *Chronicle,* 110

[94] '[7 July.] 1540. The Divorce from Anne of Cleves', *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Vol. 16: 1540,* 421.

[95] 'The Divorce from Anne of Cleves', 421.

to see him in private, saying that it 'makes me die to think I cannot always be in your company'.[96] Katherine's letter particularly highlights the courtly love framework: 'I wode you war wyth me now that you moutte se wat pane I take yn wryteg to you'.[97] At the ending of the letter Katherine states: 'yours as long as lyffe endures'.[98] Both these statements emphasise, once again, the suffering and pain which were central to courtly love. By using emotive terms such as 'endures', Katherine evokes the lovesickness trope. Consequently, Henry VIII's reaction was similar to the way he reacted to Anne Boleyn and her lovers. While he appeared to be gentler to his young wife than to Anne Boleyn, Culpepper, as a trusted and very intimate member of Henry's household, was not so fortunate, being hung, drawn and quartered alongside Francis Durham. After these events Henry was reduced to a great 'sorrow'.[99] This example further emphasises that the extreme dishonour by men like Culpepper, who were in the private spheres of the king, was to be met with the harshest of consequences.

Considered alongside the previous examples, the chivalric interplay between the courtly love tropes and their influence on gender presentation had clear limitations. Thomas Culpepper and Katherine Howard's relationship ended with both their executions, as the king's honour and reputation had suffered thoroughly, in both the private sense and on the public stage. Henry VIII, who had fought to prove his honourable self with dominant masculinity and power on the European political stage against competitors like Francis I and the Holy Roman Emperor, could not be seen to be politically humiliated and weakened by the betrayals of his respective wives and the men with whom they were involved. Ultimately, the courtly love discourse that facilitated relationships and allowed them to develop, could not translate into lived experiences without the permission of the king. It simply could not function alongside or coexist with the chivalric codes of masculinity and honour that had developed in the culture of the Tudor court. As Francis I of France reminded Henry, through diplomatic correspondence in 1541, his 'honour did not rest in the lightness of woman'.[100]

Conclusion

As this chapter has demonstrated, courtly love, in various forms, from role-play to courtship, had great limitations. However, the rhetorical tropes offered courtiers an easy means of emotional expression during the process of courtship. Anne Boleyn and Katherine Howard's circumstances provide crucial examples of the delicate role courtly love had within court culture and how it was situated within wider gender norms and perceptions. Similarly, the brief marriage of Anne of Cleves provides key evidence of how Henry VIII perceived himself as king and the relationship this had with ingrained chivalric ideals. The languages of chivalry and courtly love reacted against each other in these ill-timed and mistranslated circumstances. Furthermore, Margaret Douglas, and her misadventures in romance, gives courtly love in the court of Henry VIII further context. The relationships that Margaret Douglas found herself in before her eventual marriage

---

[96] '1541. R. O. Katherine [Howard] to Culpepper' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Vol. 16: 1540-41*, 534.

[97] 'Katherine [Howard] to Culpepper', 534

[98] 'Katherine [Howard] to Culpepper', 534

[99] '11 Nov 1541. R. O. The Privy Council to [Cranmer and Others]' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Vol. 16*: 1540-41, 613.

[100] '15 Dec 1541. R.O. Southampton to Sadler' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 16: 1540-41,* 677.

were conducted in the courts where Anne Boleyn and Katherine Howard fell foul of misunderstood courtly love behaviours. Therefore, it is not impossible to suggest that court life during Anne Boleyn's time as queen harboured an environment in which 'The Devonshire Manuscript' could be produced and the love of Margaret and Thomas Howard could be expressed in the lyrical tradition. As Margaret entered into her dalliance with Charles, who happened to be the queen's brother, so did Katherine Howard with Thomas Culpepper. This suggests that courtly love contributed significantly to the interplay between private and public spheres of feminine existence during this period. Ultimately, as has been argued by this chapter, the tragic end to these stories goes some way to unravelling the threads of courtly love, and how culturally ingrained within gender relationships it was; offering outlets for emotional expression but also potentially lethal conflicts wiht the chivalric codes of the early Tudor courts.

Hilary Jane Locke

Conclusion

In a state of increasingly ill health, Henry VIII made the decision to enter into what would be his final war with France in 1543. The king ventured with his armies into French territory to command his forces. In her letter to her husband, Queen Katherine Parr wrote that she hoped his activities against his enemies were victorious. She continued onto say that she wished him well 'and perfection in all your majesty's most nobel enterprises'.[1] In doing so, Katherine wished her husband glory both as king and in the name of God. Exemplifying the complementary place chivalric ideals had alongside warfare, Katherine's letter gives a small hint as how she saw her husband in entering into this conflict. This, in turn, reveals the possible reasons why Henry VIII attempted to enter into war with France at this stage of his life. Henry was now fifty-three, heavily injured, overweight and in an unfit state to command an army. This suggests, quite strongly, that Henry's motivations to participate in this war, and gain a victory, were of a personal nature, not simply because of a perceived political threat. In other words, this was a war entered into for the sake of glory, not necessity. Henry was seeking glory for the sake of himself and the English throne, and in completing a successful siege of Boulogne (between July and September 1544), he returned to England semi-victorious.

The attitudes and new mentalities to warfare, examined in Chapter Two, were becoming increasingly crucial for understanding the fluidity of the chivalric concept examined in this thesis. When considering Henry VIII's attempt to invade France, despite it being a disaster overall, the evolution of chivalric discourse in early Tudor court culture becomes even clearer.[2] This chivalric ideal, developed over the reigns of his father and in his own court, was ingrained in Henry VIII's perception of himself and his image as a monarch. Henry's actions, political goals and behaviours, as have been examined, have clear chivalric and courtly love contexts. The 1543-46 conflict with France is a distinct example of this. Unable to enter into conflicts as a younger man in the 1520s, halted by justifications outlined by his advisors now removed, the king was able to pursue the chivalric dream of winning a war for the sake of gaining a chivalric reputation. Moreover, this conflict outlines some of the underlying tensions within the early modern idea of chivalry; the stark contrast of the medieval battlefield ideal compared with the technological and military revolution which was gaining more ground throughout Henry VIII's reign is one example. More pertinently, this conflict highlights the enduring remnants of the cultural ideal. This legacy manifested itself in the ageing Henry VIII, determined to invade and conquer France, as his chivalric ancestor Henry V had done, resulting in chivalric immortality. Both Francis I and Henry VIII, described by David Potter as 'two ageing warhorses', reignited the rivalry to fight against each other for similar reasons.[3] Henry's chivalric reputation was neither improved, nor tarnished, by the outcomes of this war. What is important, however, were his partial motives for entering into this conflict, for the sake of glory and his honour as a king and a man.

---

[1] 'Katherine Parr to Henry VIII' in *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence,* ed. Janel Mueller (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2011), 58.

[2] David Potter, *Henry VIII and Francis I: The Final Conflict* (Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2011), 1-33.

[3] Potter, *Henry VIII and Francis I,* 8

Hilary Jane Locke

This thesis has demonstrated how crucial the ideals of chivalry and courtly love were to various aspects of court life during the reigns of Henry VII and his son Henry VIII. It has shown that, despite the often ambiguous nature and tensions within the concepts, they played an important role throughout the early sixteenth century. By examining these cultural ideals, together and separately, the thesis has examined in depth how they influenced gender roles, political practice, and courtier performance in the court space. Seeking to understand how crucial they were to the foundation of the Tudor dynasty, as well as the role they played in gender relations (political, friendly, and romantic), this work has shown the enduring influence both chivalry and courtly love had as a set of cultural ideals in the period, in both a court context and in the wider, social sphere. Ultimately, by placing emphasis on the concepts and ideals within chivalric and courtly love discourse — honour, glory, virtue, loyalty, love — the thesis aimed to trace the trajectory and the complex interplay between chivalry and courtly love.

The main aim of this thesis was to draw attention to the gaps within the literature on the early Tudor period regarding the influence chivalry and courtly love had on various aspect in court life. As concepts and ideals, they are present in texts relating to Henry VIII, his personality and his love life, but usually remain unexplored or un-contextualised. Whilst this work is not a comprehensive analysis of *all* aspects of chivalric and courtly love discourse throughout court life, society, and culture, it has presented and drawn attention to crucial points of influence, highlighting the complexity and malleability of these concepts in a period which is often regarded as the death of chivalry, and courtly love alongside. Furthermore, by suggesting that courtly love was in tension with the enduring influence of a personal chivalric ethos, this work provides further platforms for developing a more complex and detailed picture of a period of history that has been revisited time and time again.

In doing so, this work examined three principal themes. Firstly, the thesis has sought to unpack the changing and fluid nature of the concept of chivalry among contemporary courtiers, at various levels of political engagement: as a diplomatic tool, as an educational principle, and for creating power dynamics. In doing so, it has been argued that chivalry remained a durable and practical concept to late medieval courtiers, particularly during the transition from the end of the Wars of the Roses into the Tudor era. However, crucial developments during the reigns of the first Tudor kings substantially shifted chivalric practice and thought. These medieval ideals were molded and shaped by contemporaries to suit *political* ends. The introduction of new types of thought, such as humanism, bound pre-existing chivalric concepts together to inform political performance and masculine values in the public sphere. The transition was smooth, the combining of ideas happening within the political framework installed by Henry VII after his ascension to the throne. As explored, this courtly and political space enabled the development of an intimate circle of relations, advisors, courtly friends and political players, united by loyalty to kingly authority. Therefore, the transition over the first half of Henry VIII's reign, outlined in chapter two which discussed warfare, grew from the chivalric trust placed in the hands of his advisors, who adopted these concepts in humanist approaches to political practice.

Secondly, the examination of Henry VII and Henry VIII's reigns provides an avenue to explore the evolution and lasting effects of the medieval ideal of chivalry. As seen in chapter one, Henry VII built his dynasty after the Wars of the Roses with chivalric principles influencing political practice and monarchical representation. Consequently, this strategy began to shape the concept of chivalry into the complex cultural

ideal that developed in later decades and centuries. Furthermore, by looking at the short life of Prince Arthur, the centrality of the chivalric to the Tudor conception of royalty and the monarch can be fully appreciated. The intention of Henry VII and his dynastic legacy was made poignant, and if Arthur had lived to ascend to the throne, he would have been the second 'King Arthur', as well as continuing the Tudor dynastic foundations which were heavily influenced by the chivalric ideal. Arthur's marriage to Katherine of Aragon again demonstrates the importance of these ideas, and how chivalry was closely connected to the emblems of dynastic security — King Arthur and St. George — and monarchical presentation to the public and European political players. The death of Prince Arthur did not, however, signal the end of the development of chivalric ideals in the Tudor dynasty. The reign of Henry VIII presents historians with a very clear example of the way in which chivalry functioned and was embraced by early modern courtiers. This is perhaps most easily seen in Henry VIII's own personality and representation as king. After all, Henry paraded as Sir Loyal Heart, in a courtly environment where chivalric values were crucial to how politics operated, and negotiated on the diplomatic stage.

Finally, the avenue that both chivalry and courtly love allowed for relationships to form between men and women at court has been explored throughout the thesis. The installation of chivalric culture in the political and courtly sphere allowed new courtiers to rise through the ranks of the senior aristocracy based on their chivalric merit and loyalty. Institutions like the Order of the Garter, explored in chapter one, allowed for those who had shown the king the greatest loyalty in difficult circumstances to be brought into the inner political circle. Chivalry also provided a framework for conversation between king and courtier. The masculinity that informed homosocial relationships in the courtly space was based on the chivalric ideals of manhood. Chivalry, therefore, was crucial to the political networking and connections formed by courtiers throughout the early Tudor period, as it framed conversations, enabled relationships to develop, and represented ways of communicating in both a domestic and international sense.

Moreover, examining courtly love discourse, as done in chapter three, highlights the role women played in the cultural chivalric narrative. The clear tensions between the chivalric and courtly love traditions intermixed with the political circumstances of Henry VIII's reign, and created dramatic situations for political players at court. The relationships between Henry VIII and his wives Anne Boleyn, Anne of Cleves and Katherine Howard, as explored throughout chapter three, had courtly love connections which influenced how these relationships developed and ended; the letters Henry VIII wrote Anne Boleyn are examples of how ingrained and useful the chivalric and courtly love discourse was to courting couples in this period. Just as chivalry was a fluid concept, courtly love had tensions in both in practice and in relationship to the chivalric culture created in the court environment. Courtly love gave women some agency and power. Yet, as has been shown, this often clashed with masculine perceptions of honour and therefore had limitations and consequences, especially when the actions counteracted preexisting perceptions of gender and cultural roles.

Furthermore, the materials used to examine courtly love, such as the The Devonshire Manuscript in combination with the love letters of Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn, show clear cases of courtship and   as such what it meant to perform the acts of love throughout the 1510s to the 1540s. The continuation of the courtly love ideals, alongside the chivalric code, moulded interpersonal behaviour between courtiers, in their attempts to network, negotiate politics, and engage in both homosocial and heterosocial relationships. In exposing the complexity of courtly love influenced relationships, intermixed with the dynamics of chivalric

Hilary Jane Locke

masculinity, feminine roles, and the power attached, this thesis has highlighted the underlying cultural perceptions, gender roles, and socio-political interplay expressed through the performance inherent to courtly love discourse. As we have seen, Anne Boleyn gained great power by utilising the courtly love tradition. More tellingly, the employment of chivalric tropes, power dynamics, and the very nature of the male and female roles within courtly love literature, convey the enduring power of the chivalric ideal. Moreover, the courtly love and chivalric analysis of the downfall of Anne Boleyn, her lovers, and Henry VIII's responses to this personal crisis, contextualises these events within the complex cultural framework in which they unfolded.

The chivalric 'revival' in the reign of Henry VII facilitated what was to come during the following reign of Henry VIII. In the period from 1509 until Henry VIII's death in 1547, the chivalric code and courtly love model influenced, and assisted, justifications and changes in the approach to war, political negotiation, scholarship, love, marriage, and friendship. The concept of chivalry has been revived numerous times, most notably in the seventeenth, late eighteenth centuries, and mid-nineteenth century, having direct and complex effects on conduct, culture and attitudes. The allure of chivalry as a concept which either facilitates or assists the development of a 'golden age' meant that the presence of chivalry is hard to ignore in the historical analysis of cultural development following the medieval period.

Ultimately, chivalry and courtly love are critical to understanding both how the royal court functioned and for understanding monarchs such as Henry VII and Henry VIII. In answering how prevalent both concepts were in the transition from the medieval to the early modern period, they acted as a bridge. They were culturally present, acting as a socialising force, and crucially, they influenced the ways in which Henry VII established his dynastic and monarchical power over the first years of his reign. This influence continued well into Henry VIII's reign, pushing the boundaries of how chivalry functioned against and with new political philosophy. By highlighting chivalry and courtly love, this thesis has demonstrated just how essential these concepts and ideals were in the context of early Tudor English court culture from the founding the Tudor dynasty in 1485 to the death of Henry VIII in 1547.

Hilary Jane Locke

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Lyrics

Anon. 'The Agincourt Carol (Middle English) from Bodleian Library, MS 3340 (previously Arch. Selden B. 26) fols. 17v-18r.' In *The Battle of Agincourt: Sources and Interpretations.* Edited by Anne Curry, 283-284.Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000.

Hawes, Stephen. *A ioyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall souerayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght,* London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. EEBO. Cambridge University Library.

Malory, Thomas. *Le Morte Darthur, Volume 1.* Edited by P.J.C Field. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2013.

More, Thomas. 'Epigraph 19' in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More, Vol. 3.2 Latin Poems.* Edited by. C. H. Miller, L. Bradner and R. P. Oliver, 100-113. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Manuscripts from The British Library

Add MS 17492 The 'Devonshire Manuscript'

Harley MS 6149

Lansdowne Manuscript 783

Royal MS 14 IV

Royal MS 15 VI

Royal MS 16 F ii

Royal MS 19 C VIII

Individual Documents and Letters

'Queen Margaret to Henry VIII', SP 49/4. 1536. State Papers Online. The National Archives of the United Kingdom. ff. 148.

'Q. Catherine (of Aragon) to Hen. VIII; after the battle of Flooded-field. Sept. 1513'. Cotton Vespasian F/III. State Papers Online. The British Library. ff. n.a.

'Margaret Dowglas to [Cromwell]'. 1536. Cotton Vespasian F/XIII. State Papers Online. The British Library. ff. 241.

'Sir Ralph Sadleyr to Cranmer and Others'. 1541. SP 1/67. State Papers Online. The National Archives. ff. 127.

Letters and Papers, Calendar of State Papers, Letters, and Materials Volumes

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Preserved in the Public Recover Office, The British Museum and Elsewhere in England. Multiple Volumes. Edited by J. S. Brewer. London: Longman & Co., Trübner & Co., 1862, 1864, 1867, 1887, 1889.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.Volume. 1: Part I: 1509-13.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.Volume. 2: Part II: 1517-18

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Volume 3: Part II: 1521-23

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vol. 10: 1536

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Vol. 16: 1540-41

Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII, Vol. 11 edited by James Gairdner. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1863.

Letters of the Kings of England, now first Collected from Royal Archives, and other Authentic Sources, Private as well as Public. Edited with an Historical Introduction and Notes by James Orchard Halliwell, ESQ,., F.R.S., Hon. M.R.I.A., Hon. M.R.S.L., F.S.A., ETC. In Two Volumes, Vol. 1, London: Henry Colburn, Publishers, 1848.

Calendar of Letters, Dispatches, and State Papers relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere, Vol 1. Henry VII. 1485-1509. Edited by G. A. Bergenroth (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1862.

State Papers Published Under the Authority of His Majesty's Commission: (pt. IV) Correspondence relative to Scotland and the borders, 1513-1546. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836.

Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII: From Original Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office Part 1, Edited by William Campbell. London: Longman and Company, 1873.

The Life and Administration of Cardinal Wolsey. Edited by John Galt. Oxford: Oxford University, 1812.

Readings in English Social History: From Pre-Roman Days to AD 1837. Edited by R. B. Morgan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.

Books and Pamphlets

Anon. *Exerpta Historica, or, Illustrations of English History.* London: Samuel Bentley, 1831.

Anon. *Hereafter ensure the trewe enoutnre of […] batayle lately don between Englande and Scolande. In whiche batayle the. Scottshhe Kynge was slayne*, London: Richard Faques, 1513. EEBO. Cambridge University Library. Pamphlet.

Anon. *Here begynneth certayn statutes and ordenaunces of warre made ordeined enacted and estalysshed [sic] by the most noble victorious and most cristen prince oure moste drad souerayn lorde King Henry the vii. King of Fraunce and of Englond by the aduyce of his noble and discrete counseyl holdynge than his hygh courte of his parlament at his paleis of westmynster the xvii. day of October in the yere of oure lord god M.CCCClxxxxii and of his moste noble reigne the vii. yere. For the wele suertie good rule [and] saufgarde of his honorable lordes capitaignes [and] other his humble subgettes and also for suche of them of his said realme of frau[n]ce that herafter wol become his true subgettis being in his most royal hoste ayenst his auncyent enmys of fraunce,* London, 1492. Society of Antiquaries, Pamphlet.

Anon. *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne.* Edited by Gordon Kipling. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Anon. *The Statues of the Most Noble Order of the Garter.* London: T. H. Coe, 1804.

Berners, Juliana. *This present boke shewyth the manner of hawkynge and huntynge and also of diuysynge of cote armours. It shewyth also a good matere belongynge to horses: wyth other commendable treatyses. And ferdermore of the brasynge of arms: as here after it mate appere,* London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1496. EEBO. Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery.

André, Bernard. *The Life of Henry VII.* Translated by Daniel Hobbins. New York: Italica Press, 2001.

Caxton, William. *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton.* Edited by W. J. B. Crotch. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

Cépède, Pierre de la. *Here beganneth thystorye of the noble ryght and worthy knyght Parys, and of the fayr Vyenne the daulphyns doughter of vuenneys the whyche sufferd many aduersytees bycause of theyr true loue or they coude enioye the effect therof of echo other.* London:William Caxton 1485. EEBO. The British Library.

Charny, Geoffroi de. *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry.* Translated by Elspeth Kennedy and edited by Richard Kaeper. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2005.

Fabyan, Robert. *The New Chronicles of England and France, In Two Parts; by Robert Fabyan. Named By Himself the Concordance of Histories. Reported from Pension's Edition of 1516. The First Part Colleated with the Editions of 133, 1549, and 1559; and the Second with a Manuscript of the Author's Own Time, as well as the Subsequent Editions: Indlucing the Different Continuations. To which are Added A Biographical and Literary Preface and an Index, by Henry Ellis.* London: F. C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Co.; Cadell and Davies; J. Mawman; and J. Johnsons and Co., 1811.

Froissart, Jean. *Here begynneth the first volum of sir Iohan Froyssart of the croncyles of Englande, Fraunce, Spayne, Portyngale, Scotlande, Bretayne, Flaunders: and other places adioynynge. Translated out of frenche into our maternall englysshe tonge, by Iohan Bouchier knight lorde Berners: at the commaundement of oure moost highe redouted souerayne lorde kyng Henry the. viii. kyng of Englande and of Fraunce, and highe defender of the the christen faith. etc.* London: Richard Pynson, 1523. EEBO. The British Library.

Gulielmus, Archbishop of Tyre, *Here begynneth the boke intituled Eracles, and also of Godefrey of Boloyne, the which speketh of the Conquest of the holy londe of Iherusalem, etc. translated out of ffreussche in to englyshhe by W. Caxton.* London, William Caxton, 1481. EEBO. British Library.

Hall, Edward. *Henry VIII, Volume One.* London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1904.

Llull, Ramon. *The Book of the Order of Chivalry/Llibre de l'order de Cavallena/Libro de la Orden de Cabellaría.* Translated by Antonio Cartijo Ocaña. Amersterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2015.

Monmouth, Geoffrey of. *The History of the Kings of Britain* trans. Lewis Thorpe. London: Penguin, 1966.

More, Thomas. *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More in Latin from the Edition of March 1518, and in English from the First Edition of Palph Robynson's Tranlation in 1551 with Additional Translations, Introduction and Notes by J. H. Lupton, B.D. Surmaster of St. Paul's School, and Preachers of Gray's Inn Formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. With Facsimilies.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895.

Pisan, Cristina de. *The Boke of the Fayt of Artmes and of Chyualrye.* London: 1489, William Caxton. EEBO. The British Library.

Rastell, John. *Of gentylnes and nobylyte A dyaloge betwen the marchaut the knyght and the plowman dyputyng who is a verey and who is a noble man and how men shuld come to auctoryte, compiled in a maner of an enterlude with diuers toys and gestis addyd therto to make mery pastyme and disport,* London: Johnannes Rastell me fieri fecit, 1525. EEBO. The British Library.

Sallust, *Here begynneth the famous cronycle of the warre, which the romayns had agaynst Iugurth vsurper of the kyngdome of Numidy: whiche cronycle is compyled in latyn by the renowmed romayn Salust. And translated into englysshe by syr Alexander Barclay preest, at co[m]maundement of the right hye and mighty prince: Thomas duke of Northfolk.* London: Richard Pinson, 1525. EEBO. Cambridge University Library.

Wriothesley, Charles. *A Chronicles of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from A.D. 1485 to 1559 Vol. 1.* Edited by William Douglas Hamilton. London: The Camden Society, 1875.

Secondary Sources

Monographs

Aungie, George James. *The History and Antiques of Syon Monastery, the Parish of Iselworth and the Chapelry of Hounslow; Compiled from Public Records, Ancient Manuscripts, Ecclesiastical and Other Authentic Documents.* London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1840.

Barber, Richard. *Edward III and the Triumph of England: The Battle of Crécy and the Company of the Garter.* London: Allen Lane, 2013.

Baker, Juliet R. V. *The Tournament in England 1100-1400.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1986.

Bennett, Michael. *The Battle of Bosworth.* Stroud: Gloucester, 1985.

Bertelli, Sergio. *The King's Body: Sacred Rituals of Power in Medieval and Early Modern Europe,* translated R. Burr Litchfield. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.

Brown, Warren C. *Violence in Medieval Europe.* Abbington: Routledge, 2014.

Collins, Hugh E. L. *The Order of the Garter 1348-1461: Chivalry and Politics in Late Medieval England.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Cunningham, Sean. *Henry VII.* Abington: Routledge, 2007.

Daybell, James. *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Desmon, Marilynn and Pamela Sheingorn. *Myth, Montage and Visuality in Late Medieval Manuscript: Christine de Pizan's* Epistre Othea. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Duby, George. *The Knight, The Lady and the Priest: the Making of Modern Marriage in Medieval* France. Translated by Barbara Bray. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

Ferguson, Arthur B. *The Chivalric Tradition in the English Renaissance.* Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1986.

_____. *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1960.

Grummitt, David. *A Short History of the Wars of the Roses.* New York: I B. Tauris, 2013.

Guy, John . *Henry VIII: The Quest for Fame.* London: Allen Lane, 2015.

Gunn, Steven J. *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Hasler, Antony J. *Court Poetry in Late Medieval England and Scotland: Allegories of Authority.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Hindley, Geoffrey. *England in the Age of Caxton.* London: Granda Publishing Limited, 1979.

Ives, Eric. *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Johnson, Lauren. *So Great a Prince: England and the Accession of Henry VIII.* London: Head of Zeus, 2016.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theory.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Kaeuper, Richard. *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Keen, Maurice. *Chivalry.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Kipling, Gordon. *The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance.* The Hague: Leiden University Press, 1977.

Lees, Clare A. *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Lerer, Seth. *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII: Literary Cultures and Arts of Deceit.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Loades, David. *Henry VIII.* Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2001.

Lynn, John A. *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture.* Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 2003.

Manley, Laurence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Marotti, Arthur F. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Matusiak, John. *Henry VIII: The Life and Rule of England's Nero.* Stroud: The History Press, 2015.

McGlynn, Sean. *By Sword and By Fire: Cruelty and Atrocity in Medieval Warfare.* London: Phoenix, 2009.

Neal, Derek G. *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Orme, Nicholas. *From Childhood to Chivalry: the Eduction of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530.* London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1984.

Penn, Thomas. *The Winter King: The Dawn of Tudor England.* London: Allen Lane, 2011.

Pollinitz, Aysha. *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Potter, David. *Henry VIII and Francis I: The Final Conflict.* Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2011.

Reddy, William. *The Making of Romantic Love: Longing and Sexuality in Europe, South Asia, and Japan, 900-1200 CE.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Rex, Richard. *The Tudors.* Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2012.

Richardson, Glenn. *The Field of Cloth of Gold.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Ridley, Jasper. *Henry VIII.* London: Constable, 1984.

Hilary Jane Locke

Saul, Nigel. *Chivalry in Medieval England.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Scarisbrick, J.J. *Henry VIII.* London: Methuen Paperbacks, 1976.

Schneider, Gary. *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700.* Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005.

Skidmore, Chris. *Bosworth: The Birth of the Tudors.* London: Phoenix, 2014.

Smith, Robert Douglas and Kelly DeVries. *The Artillery of the Dukes of Burgundy 1363-1477.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005.

Starkey, David. *Henry: Virtuous Princ*e. London, HarperPress, 2008.

_____. *Six Wives: The Queens of Henry VIII.* London: Vintage, 2003.

Strickland, Matthew. *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Taylor, Craig. *Chivalry and the Ideals of Knighthood in France During the Hundred Years War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Tin, Louis-Georges. *The Invention of Heterosexual Culture.* Cambridge, M.A.: The MIT Press, 2012.

Trigg, Stephanie. S*hame and Honor: A Vulgar History of the Order of the Garter.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Trim, D. J. *The Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

Vale, Malcolm. *War and Chivalry: Warfare and Aristocratic Culture in England, France and Burgundy and the End of the Middle Ages.* Athen, Ga.: The University Press of Georgia, 1981.

Wakeline, Daniel. *Humanism, Reading and English Literature 1430-1530.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Walker, Greg. *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Warnicke, Retha. *The Marrying of Anne of Cleves: Royal Protocol in Tudor England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Watts, John. *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Wollock, Jennifer. *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love.* Santa Barbara, Cali.: Praeger, 2011.

Journal Articles

Bartlett, Anne Clark. 'Translation, Self-Representation, and Statecraft: Lady Margaret Beaufort and Caxton's Blanchardyn and Eglantine (1489)'. *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22, no. 1 (2005): 53-66.

Bird, Sharon R. 'Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociality and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity'. *Gender and Society* 10, no. 120 (1996): 120-132.

Carlson, David. 'Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VIII'. *The Sixteenth Century Journal* no. 2 (1991). 253-279.

Bartlett, Anne Clark. 'Tranlsation, Self-Representation, and Statecraft: Lady Margaret Beaufort and Caxton's Blanchardyn and Eglantine (1489)'. *Essays in Medieval Statues* 22 (2005). 53-66.

Flood, Michael. 'Men, Sex, and Homosociality: How Bonds Between Men Shape Their Sexual Relations with Women'. *Men and Masculinities* 10, no. 399 (2007): 339-359.

Gillespie, James L. 'Richard II's Knights: chivalry and patronage'. *Journal of Medieval History* 13, no. 2 (1987): 143-159.

Gunn, Steven. 'The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England'. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5 (1995): 59-90.

Harvey, Karen and Alexandra Shepard, 'What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500-1950'. *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 274-230.

Heale, Elizabeth. 'Women and the Courtly Love Lyric: The Devonshire MS (BL Additional 17492)'. *The Modern Language Review* 90, no. 2 (1995): 296-313.

Irish, Bradley J. 'Gender and Politics in the Henrician Court: The Douglas-Howard Lyrics in the Devonshire Manuscript (BL Add 17492)', *Renaissance Quarterly* 64, no. 1 (2011): 79-114.

Kern, Darcy. 'Parliament in print: William Caxton and the history of political government in the fifteenth century'. *Journal of Medieval History* 40, no. 2 (2014): 209-224.

Lexton, Ruth. 'Reading the Adulterous/Treasonous Queen in Early Modern England: Malory's Guinevere and Anne Boleyn'. *Exemplaria*, 27 no. 3 (2015): 222-241.

Murray, Molly. 'The Prisoner, the Lover, and the Poet: The Devonshire Manuscript and Early Tudor Carcerality'. *Renaissance and Reformation* 35, no. 1 (2012): 17-41.

Shirley, Christopher. 'The Devonshire Manuscript: Reading Gender in the Henrician Court'. *English Literary Renaissance* 45, no. 1 (2015): 32-59.

Stevenson, Katie. 'Contesting Chivalry: James II and the Control of Chivalric Culture in the 1450s'. *Journal of Medieval History* 33, no. 2 (2007): 197-214.

Book Chapters

Barber, Richard. 'Malory's Le Morte Darthur and Court Culture under Edward IV'. In *Arthurian Literature XII* edited by James P. Carley and Felicity Riddy, 133- 156. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993.

Bonah, M. L. 'Political and Criminal Violence in Fifteenth Century England'. In *Violence in Medieval England* edited by Richard W. Kaeuper, 96-1o4. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000.

Downes, Stephanie. ''Je Hé Guerre, Point Ne La Doy Prisier': Peace and the Emotions of War in the Prison Poetry of Charles d'Orléans'. In *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature.* Edited by Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch and Katrina O'Loughlin, 60-76. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Broomhall , Susan and Jacqueline Van Gent. 'Introduction' .In *Governing Masculinities in the Early Modern Period: Regulating Selves and Others.* Edited by Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent, 1-22. Farnham: Routledge, 2016.

Bullough, Vern L. 'On Being a Male in the Middle Ages'. In *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages.* Edited by Clare A. Lees, 38-40. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Burton, Giles. 'From ars dictaminis to Ars conscribendi epistolis: Renaissance Letter-Writing Manuals in the Context of Humanism'. In *Letter Writing Manual and Instructions from Antiquity to Present.* Edited by Carol Poster and Linda C. Mitchell, 88-91. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2007.

Field, P. J. C. 'Malory and the Battle of Towton'. In *The Social and Literary Context of Malory's Morte DArthur.* Edited by D. Thomas Hanks Jr, 68- 93. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000.

Fox, John. 'Glanures'. In *Charles D'Orléans in England, 1415-1440.* Edited by Mary-Jo Arn, 89-108. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000.

Gunn, Steven. 'Chivalry and the Politics of the Early Tudor Court'. In *Chivalry in the Renaissance,* edited by Sydney Anglo, 107-128. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1990.

_____.'Prince Arthur Prepares for Kingship'. In *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Birth Death and Commemoration.* Edited by Steven J. Gunn and Linda Monkton, 7-19. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009.

Gunn, Steven and Antheun Janse, 'Introduction'. In *Court as a Stage: England and the Low Countries in the Later Middle Ages,* 1-12. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006.

Hoak, Dale. 'The Iconography of the Imperial Crown'. In *Tudor Court Culture.* Edited by Dale Hoak, 54-103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Hobbs, Timothy. 'Prosimetrum in Le Livre dit Grace Entiere sue le fair du government d'un Prince, the Governance of a Prince trestise in British Library MS Royal 16 F ii'. In *Littera Est Sensus: Essays on Form and Meaning in Medieval Friend Literature Presented to John Fox.* Edited by D. A. Trotter, 49-62. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1989.

Kaeuper, Richard. 'Historical Introduction'. In *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry,* 1-46. Philadelphia: University of Pensilvania Press, 2005

Love, Harold and Arthur F. Marotti, 'Manuscript Transmission and Circulation'. In *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature.* Edited by David Lowenstein and Janel Mueller, 55-80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Lipscomb, Suzannah. 'The Fall of Anne Boleyn: A Crisis in Gender Relations?' In *Henry VIII and the Court: Art, Politics and Performance.* Edited by Thomas Betteridge and Suzannah Lipscomb, 287-308. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013.

MacMahon, Luke. 'Chivalry, Military Professionalism and the Early Tudor Army in Renaissance Europe: A Reassessment'. In *Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism.* Edited D. J. B. Trim, 183-212. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003.

Mansfield, Lisa. 'Face-to-face with the 'Flanders Mare': Fama and Hans Holbein the Younger's Portrait of Anne of Cleves'. In *Fama and Her Sisters: Gossip and Rumour in Early Modern Europe.* Edited by Heather Kerr and Claire Walker, 115-135. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.

Piroyansky, Danna. 'Thomas, Earl of Lancaster: Christ's Knights' in *Martyrs in the Making: Political Martyrdom in Late Medieval England.* Basingstoke: Pan Macmillan, 2008.

Puch, T. B. 'Henry VII and the English Nobility'. In *The Tudor Nobility.* Edited by G. W. Bernard, 49- 110. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.

Ruddick, Andrea. 'God and England: Ecclesiastical Rhetoric and a Political Theory of Nationhood'. In *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Starkey, David. 'King Henry and King Arthur'. In *Arthurian Literature XVI.* Edited by James P. Carley and Felicity Riddy, 171-196. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1998.

Trim, D. J. 'Introduction'. In *Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism.* Edited by D. J. B. Trim, 1-38. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003.

Vale, Malcolm. 'Manuscripts and Books'. In *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. 7: c.1415-c.1500.* Edited by Christopher Allmand, 278-286. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Windeatt, Barry. 'Introduction'. In *Troilus and Criseyde.* Translated by Barry Windeatt, ix-xxxix. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Warnicke, Retha M. 'The Conventions of Courtly Love and Anne Boleyn'. In *State, Sovereigns and Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of A. J. Slavin.* Edited by Charles Carlton, Robert L. Woods, Mary L. Robertson, and Joseph S. Block, 103-118. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Web Sources and Primary Source Databases

Brown, Mark. 'A life in armour: how Henry VIII grew from L to XXXL: Close-fitting combat dress at Tower of London anniversary display shows Henry VIII's ballooning figure'. The Guardian, April 1. 2009. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2009/apr/01/heritage-monarchy-henry-viii.

'British History Online'. Institute of Historical Research, School of Advanced Study University of London. https://www.british-history.ac.uk.

'Digitised Manuscripts'. The British Library. https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/.

'Early English Books Online'. Bell and Howell Information and Learning. ProQuest Information and Learning Company. http://eebo.chadwyck.com.proxy.library.adelaide.edu.au/search.

Hilary Jane Locke

'State Papers Online, 1509-1714'. Gale, A Centage Company. https://www.gale.com/uk/primary-sources/state-papers-online.