

---

**Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte**  
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris  
(Institut historique allemand)  
Band 46 (2019)

**Jayne Wackett †**

**Capturing Kingliness: Chivalry and English Kingship**

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2019.0.83898

---

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

JAYNE WACKETT †

## CAPTURING KINGLINESS: CHIVALRY AND ENGLISH KINGSHIP

Chivalry is an interesting and complex term, which, while being strongly evocative of a whole series of people and qualities, is also hard to delineate. Maurice Keen famously wrote chivalry »is a word elusive of definition, tonal rather than precise in its definition«<sup>1</sup>. However, despite the difficulty the term »chivalry« presents for exact classification, primary and secondary sources identify several elements that consistently occur in response to the word: knights, nobility, honour, loyalty, piety, literature, courtly love, kings, queens, tournaments, the Crusades and the church<sup>2</sup>. Arguably, all of the elements on the above list can be strongly linked to kingship: for example, in literature, King Arthur and his knights were the embodiment of chivalry; while in real medieval society it was a king's right to create a new knight and that knight would be sworn to loyally serve the king<sup>3</sup>. The apparent success of English kings in the chivalric age was, in great part, based on how chivalric he was perceived to be.

Naturally, representation of kingship occurred in many forms in various media: architecture, literature, sculpture and images all worked together to create a greater picture of a chivalrous king at the summit of society. These modes of expression will play a part in the discussion, but this paper will concentrate on capturing the essence of chivalric kingliness through events in relation to kings. Two fourteenth-century events will be examined, the English coronation ceremony and the Smithfield Tournament of 1390.

### The Coronation

The coronation ceremony is an important event to consider in relation to a king as it is the occasion when his rule began; this article will specifically examine that ritual as a conscious representation of the chivalric nature of medieval kingship.

The Litlyngton Missal is a large and lavishly decorated English service book created at Westminster Abbey in 1383/84<sup>4</sup>. As an anomaly for a missal, the book contains three royal ceremonies: the coronation of a king and, if applicable, his wife; the coronation of a queen alone, when a marriage occurs after the reigning king's coronation; and funeral preparations for a king<sup>5</sup>. The

1 Maurice KEEN, *Chivalry*, Yale 1984, p. 2.

2 Non exhaustively: primary sources – Alexander, *Li Romans d'Alexandre*, ed. Heinrich MICHELAN, Stuttgart 1846; Geoffri de Chany, *Livre de Chevalerie*, in: *Œuvres de Froissart*, ed. Joseph Kervyn DE LETTENHOVE, t. 1, pt. 3, Brussels 1873; Ramon Lull, *The Book of the Order of Chivalry*, ed. Alfred T. P. BYLES, London 1926; secondary sources – Arthurian literature in the Middle Ages, ed. Roger Sherman LOOMIS, Oxford 1959; Richard BARBER, *The Knight and Chivalry*, London 1970; *La Noblesse au Moyen Âge*, ed. Philippe CONTAMINE, Paris 1976; KEEN, *Chivalry* (as in n. 1).

3 *Ibid.*, p. 68–69.

4 London, Westminster Abbey Library, MS 37 (hereafter, Litlyngton Missal): a monograph of the missal exists as an unpublished doctoral thesis (Jayne WACKETT, *The Litlyngton Missal: its patron, iconography and messages*, University of Kent, 2014).

5 Litlyngton Missal, fol. 206r–224v.

version of the king's coronation order in this manuscript reveals a definite development of the process from previous orders and, in point of fact, still forms the basis of the English coronation ceremony today<sup>6</sup>. This Litlyngton Missal version of the coronation order is the first to include detailed instructions on the preparations of the abbey, arrangements for the king's person and the assigning of specific duties to particular individuals, both clergy and nobility. The instructions which open the coronation order are lengthy and include details such as how and where a stage should be constructed in the abbey and where cushions and carpets should be placed. Most importantly for this discussion, the detailed instructions mean that we can understand the procedures, as well as the liturgy, of the ceremony.

Close examination of the rubrics and liturgy in the Litlyngton Missal reveals that there are strong links between the ceremonies of crowning a king and the dubbing ceremony for the creation of a new knight. Looking at the dubbing ceremony of the fourteenth century from the Roman Pontifical, which Keen uses for his elucidation of the ceremony<sup>7</sup>, on the night before the ceremony, the knight-to-be ritually bathed, he then spent the night in vigil. The next day, wearing particularly assigned clothes (a white belt, or perhaps gold tunic), he heard Mass during which a series of antiphons were sung. The officiating priest would give the knight a *collée*, a gentle blow, intended to remind the knight of his duties to uphold justice and to protect the church and the weak. The priest then prayed for a blessing on the knighthood. A sword was brought from the altar and girded around the knight by the priest, after which a layman fitted gold spurs to the knight's heels. At the king's coronation ceremony, as found in the Litlyngton Missal, the similarities are striking. On the day before the ceremony, the king processed from the Tower of London to the Palace at Westminster where he spent the night in vigil, and was bathed and clothed in spotless apparel to show his cleansed state. He was also left shoeless<sup>8</sup>.

Then the Litlyngton Missal coronation ordo gives details on who should carry which articles of regalia, in what order: special mention is made of swords and »the great gilt spurs«. The king swears a series of oaths to protect the church and his people, and special antiphons punctuate the various parts of the ceremony. He was then anointed at the high altar and clothed in specific regalia, girded with a sword by a bishop, received further regalia, then was anointed and crowned by the archbishop of Canterbury and received a ring, shoes and spurs. Interestingly the royal ceremonial sword of Curtana was offered to God on the altar, just as in the dubbing ceremony, and then collected by an Earl (a layman) and carried back to the king. The king was then presented with the sceptre and rod and Mass was said.

So, we see that all of the elements that appear in the dubbing also appear in the coronation, except for the *collée*; this is an understandable difference as it would not be fitting to strike God's chosen and anointed one. However, while not being physically struck, the king did have to prove humility by prostrating himself upon the cushioned floor before the altar in recognition of his subservience to God. While both the knight and the king swore oaths to protect the weak and the church, the *collée* from the priest showed that the church and its representatives still retained a higher power above the new knight, whereas the new king had a higher authority than the individual churchmen in his land. In effect, the coronation ceremony can be seen as

6 See particularly Percy Ernst SCHRAMM, *A History of the English Coronation*, Oxford 1937; L. B. WILKINSON, *Notes on the Coronation Records of the Fourteenth Century*, in: *English Historical Review* 70 (1955), p. 581–600. The coronation order in the Litlyngton Missal is very closely related to that in London, Westminster Abbey, MS 38, *Liber regalis*. The relationship is discussed by Schramm; Paul BINSKI, *The Liber Regalis: Its Date and European Context*, in: *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*, ed. Dillian GORDON, Lisa MONNAS, Caroline ELAM, London 1997, p. 233–246; and WACKETT, *Litlyngton Missal* (as in n. 4), p. 135–140.

7 KEEN, *Chivalry* (as in n. 1), p. 65–66.

8 A translation of the Litlyngton Missal/*Liber regalis* coronation order can be found in *English Coronation Records*, ed. Leopold Wickham LEGG, Westminster 1901, p. 81–120.

an exalted dubbing ceremony that placed the king as the very highest form of knight that it was possible to be and set him as an exemplar for all knights under his leadership. Crucially, what denoted the king as above the other knights was the vital element of being anointed, which is missing from a knight's dubbing ceremony.

Through his anointing and crowning, the medieval king formed a bridge between the religious and secular, taking on some of the qualities of a priest, in a way that an ordinary knight did not; like the king, an ordinary knight swore to uphold the church, but this did not make him part priest in the way that the king's anointing did<sup>9</sup>. Along with the powers and responsibilities that a king accepted, through a process of religious ritual, the monarch assumed rudiments of saintliness, particularly the power to heal. The healing power of kings had its origins in the legends of King Edward the Confessor who is described as being able to cure scrofula simply by the touch of his hand, and blindness by the application of water to sightless eyes whereof he had bathed his hands<sup>10</sup>. What this tradition, possibly rather strange to modern eyes, reveals is that the king was graced by dint of his holy anointing.

### Pictorial Representations of the Coronation

Having ascertained that the coronation ceremony as an event was, in itself, a representation of the king's exalted chivalric position, it is interesting to examine how the coronation was portrayed in pictorial form: i. e., how the chivalric event was shown within the chivalric era. Paul Binski made the point that English depictions differ from French ones as they are single representative images and are not documentary or instructional. In particular, he used the example of the Capetian order (BNF, MS lat. 1246) which has fifteen step-by-step pictures of the coronation process<sup>11</sup>. Most English representations of the ceremony tend to capture the symbolism in one image, which is usually a conflation of the most significant parts of the ceremony.

A comparison between iconographic features of nine scenes found in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century English manuscripts (see Table, p. 452) allows an overview of the visual pedigree that is associated with the coronation of English kings. The data clearly highlights that when crowning is shown it is executed by two mitred figures, traditionally the archbishops of Canterbury and York. The tradition originates from the accounts of the coronation of Edward the Confessor (1042), who was crowned jointly by the two archbishops<sup>12</sup>. Representations of the scene occurred on the walls of the painted chamber at the Westminster palace<sup>13</sup> and in Matthew Paris' illumination in the »Flores Historiarum«<sup>14</sup>. Although the practice of being crowned by both archbishops was never repeated in English history, the iconography of the shared crowning persisted, became the accepted norm, and is to be found in most English examples of coronation scenes in documents and books throughout the middle ages. The tradition is even retrospectively applied to representations of the coronation of David, such as in New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS Glazier 25, c. 1230, where two different bishops (one bearded,

9 The aspect of kingly priesthood is explored in detail by ERNST KANTOROWICZ, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, Princeton 1957, chapter three.

10 *The Life of King Edward: Who Rests at Westminster*, attributed to a monk of St Bertin, ed., trans. Frank BARLOW, London, New York 1962, p. 112.

11 Paul BINSKI, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200–1400*, New Haven, London 1995, p. 128.

12 Joanna FRONSKA, Cat.122: *Liber regalis*, in: Scot MCKENDRICK, John LOWDEN, Kathleen DOYLE (ed.), *Royal Manuscripts: The Genius of Illumination*, London 2011, p. 354.

13 For discussion of the chamber and reproduction of Charles Stodhard's 1819 watercolours, see Paul BINSKI, *The Painted Chamber at Westminster*, in: *Society of Antiquaries. Occasional Paper 9* (1986), p. 24–31.

14 Manchester, Feoffees of Chetham's Hospital and Library MS 6712, c. 1265–1320, fol. 5v.

and one not) simultaneously place the crown on him<sup>15</sup>. Many such miniatures show both archbishops, with the archbishop of Canterbury on the left, flanking the monarch, holding their respective sides of the crown in the act of placing it simultaneously onto the king or queen's head<sup>16</sup>. Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 20 (fig. 1) has the two bishops engaged not only in simultaneous crowning, but also a synchronised reaching for the chrisatories proffered in perfect symmetry to both men by assistants. In actuality, both the crowning and anointing was undertaken solely by the archbishop of Canterbury, or his chosen substitute if he could not attend.

In the images, the king's higher power is represented not only by the crown, but also through sceptres, which are a constant feature, appearing in all but one scene; orbs are used just twice. The king is usually seated on a bench throne, indeed, findings show that the now iconic Westminster Abbey symbol of the Coronation Chair of Edward I (1272–1307), »Hammer of the Scots« and a king esteemed for his chivalric qualities, simply did not form a part of the traditional coronation iconography<sup>17</sup>. There is an isolated incident when a similar throne is portrayed in Cambridge, Corpus Christi (CCC) MS 20 (fig. 1), yet it lacks the throne's uniquely defining feature of the repository built to house the Stone of Scone captured from the Scots in 1296<sup>18</sup>. Even so, Warwick Rodwell convincingly reasoned that there are too many similarities between the true coronation chair and the CCC MS 20 one to countenance coincidence<sup>19</sup>.

As well as easily conveying the idea of the king as head of the state, do the pictorial representations reflect the medieval social hierarchy? Much enlightening study has been undertaken on the hierarchy and structure of medieval society and how it was perceived in its own time<sup>20</sup>. In a simplified version of the erudite discussions of others, much of medieval Europe consisted of the *Tria genera hominum* or the Three Estates of Man: *oratores*, *bellatores* and *aratores* (those who pray, those who fight and those who plough: the ordained religious, the knightly class, and the peasants). As temporal and anointed consecrated head of a society, did the images of a king at his coronation make reference to the people over whom he ruled in their different estates?

Clerics or religious, *oratores*, are represented by the mitred archbishops, with their numbers often further bolstered by other tonsured figures (see Table). The presence of exclusively male higher order laymen, *bellatores*, is an important feature in the images with varying numbers of them appearing in all but two of the coronation images examined. The inclusion of noble lay figures obviously reinforces the idea of hierarchy, plus when there is a sword shown in the images, it is always held by a layman, thus incorporating the chivalric quality of knights into the coronation. Furthermore, the presence of *bellatores* also connects the new king to existing knights of the realm, who, after the coronation ceremony, swore their loyalty to him.

The only layman in the Litlyngton Missal miniature (fig. 2) stands to the extreme right of the image; he is bearded, bare-headed and he leans out past a bishop so as to view the scene more clearly. In his left hand he holds a large sword; presumably Curtana, representative of all the ceremonial swords used in the ceremony, the carrying of which in the coronation procession was the duty of the lay nobility<sup>21</sup>. Yet what of the *aratores*, the peasants? From the images exa-

15 E. g. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS Glazier 25, c. 1230.

16 Examples include: BL, MS Cotton Vitellius A XIII, 1280–1300, fol. 6r; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 20, c. 1330–39, fol. 68r; Pamplona, Archivo de Navarra MS 197, c. 1390, fol. 3 and fol. 19; and BL, MS Cotton Nero D VI, c. 1386–99, fol. 70r.

17 See Warwick RODWELL, *The Coronation Chair and Stone of Scone: Archaeology and Conservation*, Oxford 2013, p. 23–26.

18 The use of the more ornate throne coincides with the more architectural thrones depicted on great seals from the end of Henry III's reign.

19 RODWELL, *Coronation Chair* (as in n. 17), p. 23.

20 Notably, Georges DUBY, *Les Trois Ordres, ou L'imaginaire du féodalisme*, Paris 1978.

21 LEGG, *English Coronation Records* (as in n. 8), p. 115: »Then shall follow three earls clothed in

mined, only one (CCC MS 20) represents all three estates of man as present at the king's coronation. Close to the king inside Westminster Abbey are the *oratores* and *bellatores*, recognisable by their ecclesiastical headwear or noble clothing; held back behind a screen and very much on the outer limits of inclusion are dozens of faces pressing forward to see the king's coronation; these could be interpreted as the *aratores*. Their inclusion at a distance in the CCC MS 20 image, and their omission from all other coronation scenes, could be seen as a reflection of the nature of chivalry as an elite phenomenon, rarely relevant in any meaningful way in the lives of the ordinary men and women of society.

In summary, the representations of the coronation appear to be less overtly chivalric in nature than the ceremony itself. While the intrinsically chivalric symbol of a sword is often present, the equally iconic spurs are not. As for the images as a representation of the social structure based on *Tria genera hominum*, while *oratores* are always shown and *bellatores* mostly so, the reference to the king's chivalric oath to protect his weaker subjects, the *aratores*, is mainly pictorially absent.

### Tournaments and English Kingship: Context

Tournaments are an important component going towards making the composite picture that is represented by the term chivalry and they sit excellently well within the thesis of chivalry being represented by events. A deal of scholarship has been completed on tournaments, what forms they took and also how they changed over time<sup>22</sup>. In brief, the earlier periods of eleventh to thirteenth centuries saw tournaments that were less elite and somewhat rougher and more dangerous than those of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries<sup>23</sup>. In many ways these earlier tournaments, particularly the *mêlée*, were used as training for war; they fostered skills and experience with weapons, fighting in a team, reactions in hostile situation while fully armed and seated on a horse. Later tournaments, which considerably favoured jousting above *mêlée*, were, arguably, showpieces and occasions where the fashion of chivalry could be expressed.

The focus for this discussion is how the Smithfield Tournament of 1390 was used by Richard II in direct relation to his role as king and how he orchestrated this particular chivalric event to represent himself and his intentions. However, before moving to a close examination of this one event, it is important to understand some historical context to tournaments and their relationship to English kings. While in the popular consciousness, and indeed medieval romances and images, kings and tournaments are often closely associated one with the other, in reality there were periods when certain English kings discouraged or even banned them from taking place in the kingdom. King Stephen suppressed planned tournaments and his successor, Henry II (1154–89) forbade them completely in England; they were not permitted again for forty years until Richard I, a tournament enthusiast, reinstated them<sup>24</sup>. Even so, they were still tightly controlled and viewed with some suspicion. The reason for the mistrust was that tournaments provided occasion for the coming together of heavily armed men, which in times of political or social unrest was an unwise situation to engender. Furthermore, tournaments provided circumstance for plotting by political factions.

silk carrying swords. The Earl of Chester, who claims the chief right of carrying the sword called Curtana, shall bear the same.«

22 KEEN, *Chivalry* (as in n. 1), chapters 5 and 11; Juliet BARKER, *The Tournament in England 1100–1400*, Woodbridge 1986; Richard BARBER, Juliet BARKER, *Tournaments: Jousts, Chivalry and Pageants in the Middle Ages*, Woodbridge 2000; David CROUCH, *Tournament*, New York, London 2005.

23 BARKER, *Tournament in England* (as in n. 22), p. 17–44.

24 CROUCH, *Tournament* (as in n. 22), p. 9.

The perception of potential political and physical danger at tournaments is clearly illustrated in the »Statute of Arms« that was issued by King Edward I in 1292:

»It is ordained (...) that from henceforth no tourneyer, however wealthy he may be, may take as escort more than three squires to serve him. No knight or squire attending a tournament shall carry a pointed sword, nor a pointed knife, nor mace, nor sword with sharpened edges during the event. Those who carry the banners may be armed with a mail corselet, leggings, shoulder plates and helmet, but nothing else. If it happen that any earl or baron or other knight act against this statute, that offending knight should, for all his status, lose his horse and arms and be detained at the pleasure of my lord the king's brother. Those who come to watch the tourneying should be completely unarmed (...) no minstrels may carry concealed weapons<sup>25</sup>.«

The limitations on how many squires could attend one man and that no knight »for all his status« was exempt from the various strictures showed an anxiety by the king that a tournament presented the chance for rebel forces to converge under the legitimate cover of a contest. The statute even blocks the possible loophole of bringing extra men, beyond the limited squires, as banner holders by stating that the latter could not be armed. Edward I encountered difficulties in his reign in the 1290s<sup>26</sup> and having experienced the power of rebellious barons firsthand during his father's reign (Henry III, 1216–1272), he saw fit to limit their mustering ability at public occasions lest it be used against him.

However, as well as suppression of tournaments there are many examples when they were actively used by kings for their own purposes, such as when Edward III orchestrated a Round Table tourney at Windsor in 1344 with overt reference to King Arthur<sup>27</sup>. In such a way, Edward III used an event to remind his subjects of chivalric behaviours and qualities and harnessed the strength of the archetypal chivalric hero, King Arthur, to strengthen his political position.

## The Smithfield Tournament and King Richard II

The chivalric tradition was also used by King Richard II to make various political statements in 1390 at the Smithfield Tournament. There are various sources which record the event. Jean Froissart (c. 1337–c. 1405), the renowned court historian from the Netherlands, worked in England and France. His »Chronicles« are recognised as a rich historical source that needs to be treated with »circumspection«<sup>28</sup>. Froissart's account of the Smithfield Tournament is rich in information regarding the seven-day event and along with the »Westminster Chronicler's« version is the most detailed report that exists<sup>29</sup>. Two other English chronicles mark the event<sup>30</sup>, but English contemporary chronicler, Thomas Walsingham, does not note the event in any way,

25 Translated from an early seventeenth-century copy, British Library, MS Harley 60, fol. 17r: reproduced in CROUCH, *Tournament* (as in n. 22), p. 201–202.

26 Michael PRESTWICH, *The Three Edwards: War and State in England, 1272–1377*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., New York 2003, p. 5–38.

27 Julian MUNBY, Richard BARBER, Richard BROWN, *Edward III's Round Table at Windsor*, Woodbridge 2007.

28 Jean Froissart, *Chronicles*, ed., trans. Geoffrey BRERETON, London 1968, p. 16.

29 Book IV, chapter 23 of Froissart's *Chronicles* is dedicated to the Smithfield Tournament; see also, *The Westminster Chronicle, 1381–1394* ed., trans. Leonard Charles HECTOR, Barbara HARVEY, Oxford 1982, p. 432–440.

30 The »Brut« and the »*Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi*«: see Nigel SAUL, *Richard II*, Yale 1999, p. 352.



Fig. 1: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Parker Library, MS 20, fol. 68r (c. 1330).





Fig. 2: King's Coronation, Litlyngton Missal, Westminster Abbey, MS 37, fol. 206r (1383/84). © Dean and Chapter of Westminster, reproduced by their kind permission.

although for the same year he records the death of the earl of Pembroke who died as a result of wounds gained through »his wish to try his skill at a tournament«<sup>31</sup>.

In order to understand Richard II's specific intentions at Smithfield Tournament it will be valuable to consider the contextual historical background. Richard II was born in 1367, only son to the famous »Flower of Chivalry« the Black Prince, who died before becoming king in 1376. Richard II's grandfather, Edward III, died one year later in 1377, leaving Richard to inherit the throne aged only ten. As a minor there was a council of knights, many of whom were from the Black Prince's household, who ruled on his behalf. In 1381, still a child-king of fourteen, Richard had been faced with the Peasants' Revolt; the true denouement of this occurred at Smithfield where Richard confronted the leaders and convinced them to desist from their rebellious activities and to return home with impunity and with some of their demands met (false promises for many)<sup>32</sup>.

Richard was prone to surrounding himself with favourites, which caused problems to the extent that a body of five noblemen, called the Lords Appellant, set themselves up in 1387–88 to bring trial proceedings against the royal favourites as a reaction against unjust and capricious rule; these men included the king's own uncle, Thomas Woodstock<sup>33</sup>. The culmination of the Lords Appellant's actions occurred at the February parliament, known as the »Merciless Parliament«, where several of the king's favourites were accused of treason and executed<sup>34</sup>. Miri Rubin considered Richard II to be »a fatally wounded figure« after the execution of his followers<sup>35</sup>; certainly the authority of his kingship had been assailed. In 1389, Richard claimed his majority at the age of twenty-two, and with the assumption of personal rule of England reverted to a clique of court favourites and sought to assert independence from his old advisers. 1389 also saw a magnificent tournament in France for Queen Isabella's entry into Paris which Froissart reports that Richard wished to imitate<sup>36</sup>. Thus we arrive at the Smithfield Tournament of October 1390, with a young king eager to prove his kingly worth both in his own nation and abroad. Richard's motives for this event of magnificence in the fashionable chivalric vein could be adjudged as the following: it would show his own people and the French king that he could match foreign events of chivalric pageantry, thus proving power and honour; it would allow him to appear at the head of his knights/noblemen and to show authority over the Lords Appellant as reigning monarch in his majority; and a tournament would supply a popular occasion to win over different sections of society and provide a »ceremonial unity«<sup>37</sup>.

Taking each of these three main motives in turn, we can examine the tournament to adjudge the king's success. Beginning with the magnificence of the event, firstly, Richard chose the setting well; Smithfield was well-placed in London and had been the site of his greatest previous triumph, when he quelled the Peasants' Revolt. The Tournament was also widely-broadcast

31 Thomas Walsingham, *Chronica Majora*, trans. David PREEST, ed. James CLARK, Woodbridge 2005, p. 277: not the Smithfield Tournament.

32 Froissart, *Chronicles* (as in n. 28), p. 224–230; Walsingham, *Chronica* (as in n. 31), p. 128–131.

33 Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, the king's uncle; Richard FitzAlan, Earl of Arundel and of Surrey; Thomas de Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick; Henry Bolingbroke, Earl of Derby (the future king Henry IV); and Thomas de Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham.

34 *Historical Dictionary of Late Medieval England, 1272–1485*, ed. Ronald H. FRITZE, William Baxter ROBISON, Westport 2002, p. 205–207 (contr. James Edward MCGOLDRICK).

35 Miri RUBIN, *The Hollow Crown: A History of Britain in the Late Middle Ages*, London 2006, p. 131.

36 »(...) in imitation of this, the king of England ordered grand tournaments and feasts to be held in the city of London.« Froissart, *Chronicles of England, France*, tr. Thomas JOHNES, London 1806, p. 478.

37 Sheila LINDENBAUM, *The Smithfield Tournament of 1390*, in: *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 20 (1990), p. 1–20.

and well-attended; both the »Westminster Chronicler« and Froissart state that the Smithfield Tournament provided the nobles and gallant knights of many places with a reason for visiting London and that the call to partake was sent out internationally<sup>38</sup>.

The team heads, the Count of St Pol and William of Ostrevant came with their retinues. The tournament included a formal procession through the city, a frequent device when competitors processed from the Tower via Knightrider's Street (hence the name) and Creed Lane and out at Ludgate towards Smithfield<sup>39</sup>. Froissart's account shows the level of pageantry:

»This Sunday, according to proclamation, being the next to Michaelmas day, was the beginning of the tiltings, and called the feast of the challengers. About three o'clock, there paraded out from the Tower of London, which is situated in the square of St. Catherine, on the banks of the Thames, sixty barded coursers ornamented for the tournament, on each was mounted a squire of honour that advanced only at a foot's pace; then came sixty ladies of rank, mounted on palfreys most elegantly and richly dressed, following each other, every one leading a knight with a silver chain completely armed for tilting; and in this procession they moved on through the streets of London, attended by numbers of minstrels and trumpets, to Smithfield. The queen of England and her ladies and damsels were already arrived and placed in chambers handsomely decorated<sup>40</sup>.«

The inclusion of the ladies controlling the knights through means of a silver chain shows a true sense of theatre and is consistent with the fashion of »courtly love« and gallantry<sup>41</sup>. Richard renamed London *la neufu troy* for the occasion: this reference to Romantic literature fits with the chivalric ideal, and also harnesses some of the previous splendour of the classical age, just as his grandfather Edward III had emulated King Arthur in tournaments in order to connect himself to some of the power of that mythical figure. The combat took the form of *joustes à plaisance*, suitable for royal occasion, where individual knights rode from opposite ends of the lists to encounter each other with blunted lances. Knights fought for prizes of golden jewels and crowns awarded by ladies. In summation, the magnificence of the occasion seems not to have been lacking and Richard showed himself capable of matching foreign powers in pageantry and event. One of the strengths of the Smithfield Tournament is that there was a united team of Englishmen fighting against foreign visitors. Rather than individual opponents fighting against each other, Richard organised that national teams should compete. This enabled him to be the head of his own team of twenty *bellatores*<sup>42</sup>, which as well as including some his favourites, was also comprised of certain former Lords Appellant (e.g. Thomas Mowbray, lord marshal of England). Placing the king's favourites with their former enemies lent an outward portrayal of both mercy and unity and ultimately showed that Richard, as both their king and team leader commanded their loyalty. It was an elite group that participated, dubbed by Barker as the »tourneying society«, fighters of noble rank or from their households and retinues<sup>43</sup>.

Richard also stage-managed a very visual sign of unity and loyalty by dint of the fact that the twenty knights in his team all wore his own livery badge of an engorged white hart. There are two key points connected to this: firstly, that the English tourneyers did not wear indivi-

38 Froissart, *Chronicles of England* (as in n. 36), p. 478–479.

39 J. Stow, *Survey of London*, ed. Charles Lethbridge KINGSFORD, Oxford 1908, I, p. 245.

40 Froissart, *Chronicles of England* (as in n. 36), p. 478–480.

41 An anachronistic term originated by French medievalist Gaston PARIS in his article *Études sur les romans de la table ronde: Lancelot du Lac*, in: *Romania* 12 (1883), p. 459–534.

42 The »Brut« says twenty-four knights, meaning all of the Knights of the Garter: BARKER, *Tournament in England* (as in n. 22), p. 100.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 112, 134.

dual identifying badges, thus emphasising the over-lordship of Richard; secondly, it was highly likely that this was the first time that Richard used this badge over the previously preferred sunbursts that he had adopted from his famously strong grandfather, Edward III<sup>44</sup>. Therefore, we see Richard II bring together his knights under his own newly-formed identity rather than simply reminding them of his forebear's strength. The symbolism of the team and the livery mark proclaimed the national authority of the king. In a further symbolic gesture, the »Westminster Chronicler« relates that three days after the commencement of the tournament, Richard and his queen, Anne of Bohemia, celebrated the translation Mass of Edward the Confessor at Westminster Abbey during which the king sat in the choir with his crown. As suggested by Lynn Staley, this act »displayed the king as an icon, a pious prince, and as the heir to St Edward«<sup>45</sup>. The third motive proposed for Richard's staging of the Smithfield Tournament was that it would supply an occasion to increase his popularity with different sections of society and provide a ceremonial social unity. Richard understood the importance of being a popular king; the gruesome fate of his own grandfather would stand as a reminder of what could happen to unpopular ones<sup>46</sup>. Without doubt, tournaments were well-liked and well-attended<sup>47</sup>, but how much of a unifying measure was the Smithfield Tournament beyond English spectators from all sections of society supporting their shared team? It will be useful to understand the composition of the crowds, and examine how much the spectacle was a shared experience.

The location of Smithfield itself was important to various sections of society, as noted by Lindenbaum, who stated it was of an ambiguous legal status that seemed to belong to both the king and city at the same time; medieval documents call it the king's field and also common ground<sup>48</sup>. Being a suburban area on the edge of London meant that it was reachable for many and as Crouch discusses, from the earliest times higher and lower social classes of both genders were in tournament crowds<sup>49</sup>. Froissart is not concerned with the spectators at Smithfield beyond mentioning the higher echelons of »lords and ladies« although he does mention their servants. We do know from his account that ladies were important to the event, and not simply as spectators; they had a definite role in the procession in leading the knights on silver chains through the procession (see above extract from Froissart), but also had the role of awarding the prizes and acting as judges daily for the most gallant tilter<sup>50</sup>. As well as social division of *bellatores* and *aratores*, essentially the nobility and labouring classes, the Smithfield Tournament also encompassed the city and the court. Geoffrey Chaucer, as clerk of works at Richard's court, provided scaffolding for the royal party of the king, queen and her ladies; stands were also provided for the mayor, aldermen, their wives, and the »worshipfull« of the city<sup>51</sup>. Merchants and trades people would also have been involved on a commercial level. Unfortunately the specific financial accounts for Smithfield 1390 are lost, but artisans like the king's painters would have benefited, as would cloth merchants, carpenters, smiths and victuallers. Therefore, through a shared taste in sport and spectacle, courtiers, other nobles, civil servants, merchants, workmen and the general populace came together at Smithfield in October 1390. Yet does this truly constitute social unity under the king?

44 Ibid, p. 185, n. 102.

45 Lynn STALEY, Gower, Richard II, Henry of Derby, and the Business of Making Culture, in: *Speculum* 75/1 (2000), p. 68–96, at p. 89.

46 Edward II was deposed and then murdered in 1327: see, for example, Seymour PHILIPS, *Edward II*, Yale 2011.

47 CROUCH, *Tournament* (as in n. 22), p. 55–56.

48 LINDENBAUM, *Smithfield Tournament* (as in n. 37), p. 6.

49 CROUCH, *Tournament* (as in n. 22), p. 55–56.

50 Froissart, *Chronicles of England* (as in n. 36), p. 477–481.

51 Chaucer, *Life Records*, ed. Martin CROW, Claire OLSON, Oxford 1966, p. 472.

Lindenbaum posited that Smithfield was not inclusive of the city and lower classes, but was very much a courtly event<sup>52</sup>. In contrast to civic *feasts* elsewhere where citizens participated, for example in Valenciennes where citizens from the city impersonated knights and ladies attached by golden chains, at Smithfield the citizens simply watched knights and members of the court in a spectacle arranged by the king. Taking this further, it can be seen that the Smithfield Tournament enforced social divisions. The team of twenty knights was made up entirely of Knights of the Garter, so more exclusive even than simply being *bellatores*. Furthermore and as also noted by Lindenbaum, the different scaffolds imposed segregation between nobility and merchant class. Be that as it may, in terms of a show of chivalric magnificence for a king the occasion was a success and is a rich example of the importance of how chivalry could be represented through event and how chivalry could also cannily be used by a king for his own intentions. The bringing together of Appellants and king's favourites in one group branded with his own particular livery mark was indeed sharp of Richard and a reminder of the loyalty due to him and the authority of God's anointed chosen one.

Tournaments are probably more readily perceived as chivalric events than the medieval coronation ceremony, and yet, as seen, the fourteenth-century English coronation ceremony is remarkably similar in both concept and ritual to the contemporary dubbing service for the creation of a knight. Both the Smithfield Tournament and the coronation ceremony pivot on the king being the top knight; at Smithfield Richard was head of a team of knights and, in effect, the coronation ceremony placed the king as the leading knight of a realm and the exemplar of chivalric behaviour. It is therefore no coincidence that often the winner of a tournament would win a crown as his prize; it showed what a knight could aspire to in emulation of the king, the very peak of chivalry.

Table: Images of the Coronation of English Kings from 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Century Manuscripts

Manuscript	Date & Origin	King shown	Crowned by both archbishops	Oil	Type of throne	Sceptres: Type and number	Sword: number & bearer	Orb	Number of laymen	Number of clerics	Heraldry	Bearded king
Manchester, Chetham's Library, MS 6712, <i>Flores Historiarum</i> , fol. 53	c.1265–1320 Westminster Abbey	Arthur	Yes	No	Bench	1 x fleur-de-lis	0	0	1	4: 2 mitred 2 tonsured	No	Clean shaven
Manchester, Chetham's Library, MS 6712, <i>Flores Historiarum</i> , fol. 115v	c.1265–1320 Westminster Abbey	Edward the Confessor	crowning not shown	Yes, act of anointing shown	Bench	1 x dove	4 held by laymen	0	c.9	4: 2 mitred 1 tonsured 1 ?	No	Clean shaven
CUL, MS Ee.3.59, fol. 9 <i>Estoire</i>	c.1255 London?	Edward the Confessor	crowning not shown	Yes, act of anointing shown	Bench	1 x fleur-de-lis	0	0	4	6: 2 mitred 4 tonsured	No	Clean shaven
BL, MS Cotton Vitellius A. XIII, fol. 6	1280–1300 England	Henry III	Yes	No	Possibly with a back	1 x floral	0	0	0	2 mitred	No	Bearded
Cam. Corpus Christi Coll. MS 20, f. 68. Apoc. and Order	1330 (?)–1339	Possibly Edward III	Yes	Yes 2 x chrisamatory	Gable back throne (similar to Ed I's Chair)	1 x floral	0	Yes, with cross	13	7: 6 mitred 1 tonsured	No	Bearded
Westminster Abbey MS 38, fol. 1v <i>Liber regalis</i>	Late 14 <sup>th</sup> century Westminster	unknown	Yes	No	Low backed undecorated	0	0	0	2	2 mitred	No	Bearded
Litlington Missal, fol. 206r	1383–84 Westminster	unknown	No, only left figure	No	Bench	1 x floral	1 held by layman	0	1	4: 2 mitred 2 tonsured	Yes	Clean shaven
Archivo General de Navarra, MS 197, fol. 1 C <sup>n</sup> ation Order	Post 1383–84 Westminster	unknown	Yes	No	Bench	1 x floral	2 held by laymen	0	2	4: 2 mitred 2 tonsured	No	Clean shaven
BL, MS Cotton Nero D.VI, f. 70r Royal Docs.	1386–99 London	Richard II	Yes	No	Backed 3 slim pinnacles	1 x fleur-de-lis	0	Yes, with cross	0	2 mitred	No	Clean shaven

52 LINDENBAUM, Smithfield Tournament (as in n. 37), p. 17–20.