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ABSTRACT

FFORTO TELLEN ALLE THE CIRCUMSTAUNCES:
THE ROYAL ENTRIES OF HENRY VI (1431-32) AND THEIR MANUSCRIPTS

By Kristin Bourassa

Supervisors: Kouky Fianu
Andrew Taylor
Submitted 2010

In 1429, the seven-year-old Henry VI was crowned king of England. He was crowned king of France in Paris in December 1431, a few days after his tenth birthday. Part procession, part spectacle, the civic-organized royal entries accompanying these events began with the greeting of the king by the city’s officials outside the gates. The king was then led through the city, stopping to view pageants—often described by contemporaries as “mysteries”—along the procession route.

The only king to be crowned in England and France, Henry VI was also the only ruler to make royal entries as king into both London and Paris. This study examines both entries, considering the events themselves as well as the documents describing them. It asks, what was the function of the event of the fifteenth-century royal entry in Paris and London, as well as of the documents describing these events? It considers royal entries on both sides of the Channel from the perspectives of both history and literature, combining an examination of these entries and their manuscripts for the first time. These descriptions were produced by fifteenth-century writers for a fifteenth-century audience, and were as much a part of the royal entry as was the procession through the city. This study argues that civic officials used both the format of the royal entry itself and the written descriptions of entries to promote their city’s interests. Both London and Paris royal entry organizers used the event as a form of negotiation with the
visiting king, an opportunity to express the city’s expectations to the ruler. Although the themes and routes of successive entries could appear similar, the speeches and signs explaining individual pageants expressed very different sentiments. In London, civic officials used the documents describing entries to elevate their city, creating pro-London descriptions that were circulated in London-centric manuscripts. They deliberately used royal entry descriptions to promote their city.
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INTRODUCTION

OUT OF YOUR REALM OF FRANCE INTO YOUR REALM OF ENGLAND

Henry VI was crowned king of England in November 1429, a month before his eighth birthday. According to the chronicler Jean Chartier, in December 1431 passa la mer et descendit en France le roy d’Angleterre Henri VI du nom, filz du feu roy d’Angleterre, aussi nommé Henry, dont dessus est faicte mention, et de Katherine, fille de France, lequel estoit en l’aage de douze ans ou environ. Et s’en vint tout droit à Paris accompagnié du cardinal de Vicestre, du duc de Betheford, son oncle, du conte de Varuich et de plusieurs autres seigneurs d’Angleterre. Auquel lieu de Paris il fut reçue moul grandement et honnourablement en cryant Noel! pour sa venue et en faisant plusieurs mistères et jeux de personnages en plusieurs carrefours de ladite ville de Saint-Denis.

Following Henry VI’s procession through Paris, “furent faiz grans eschaffaulx de boys en l’église Nostre-Dame de Paris, et solemnnellement devant tout ledit peuple fut ledit roy Henry couronné à roy de France par ledit cardinal.” Having been crowned king of France—an achievement unprecedented and never repeated for an English ruler—Henry VI promptly returned to England: “yn Syn Volantynys day [1432] he come unto London; and he was worthely fette in to the cytte whythe the mayre and hys aldyrmen whythe alle the worthy comyns of the cytte and every crafte in hyr devys.”

1 Anne Curry, “The ‘Coronation Expedition’ and Henry VI’s Court in France, 1430 to 1432,” in The Lancastrian Court, ed. Jenny Stratford (Donington, Linc.: Shaun Tyas, 2003), 29.
2 Henry VI would in fact turn ten a few days after his Parisian entry.
4 Ibid., 131.
This London royal entry marked the young king’s dual coronations in England and France.

Henry VI could credit the 1420 Treaty of Troyes for his inheritance of the French throne. This treaty had established Henry V of England as the heir to France upon the death of the French king, Charles VI—disinheriting that king’s son, the Dauphin Charles.6 The deaths of both Henry V of England and Charles VI of France within a few months of each other in 1422 meant that, in theory, “the awesome inheritance of the crowns of both England and France [had fallen] into a baby’s cradle.”7 In practice, while the crown of England may have landed on the eight-month-old Henry VI, his supporters had a much more difficult time maintaining that the crown of France had followed it.

The Dauphin Charles refused to concede his throne to his young nephew, the king of England. Charles’ coronation at Reims in July 1429 was a severe blow to the now seven-year-old English king’s claims. The English nobles realized that, in order to nullify Charles’ claim, they would have to orchestrate Henry VI’s coronations as quickly as possible. He was crowned in London in November 1429. Although plans for a French coronation had begun as early as April of that year, the unstable situation in France resulted in considerable delay.8 An army began to be assembled in February 1430, and by April 1430 the king and his court had arrived in Calais. The original hope

6 Wolfe, Henry VI, 51-52.
8 Curry, “The ‘Coronation Expedition’ and Henry VI’s Court in France, 1430 to 1432,” 29.
was that the English would be able to capture Reims, traditional site of French coronations, from Charles VII. By December 1431 it became evident that this would not be possible, making a Parisian coronation the only option. Henry VI was therefore crowned in Paris in December 1431, a few days after his tenth birthday. Part procession, part spectacle, the civic-organized royal entries accompanying both the London and Paris coronations began with the greeting of the king by the city’s officials outside the gates. The king was then led through the city, stopping to view pageants—often described by contemporaries as “mysteries”—along the procession route.

The only king to be crowned in both England and France, Henry VI was also the only ruler to make royal entries as king into both London and Paris. A large number of documents recounting these two events survives. The Paris and London entries are both described in London Metropolitan Archives, MS Letter Book K. An anonymous Middle French description of the Paris entry appears on ff. 101v-103r of the manuscript, while a Latin letter by John Carpenter, common clerk of London, describes the London entry on ff. 103v-104v. Detailed descriptions of the Paris entry also survive in the chronicles of the anonymous so-called Bourgeois de Paris and of Enguerrand de Monstrelet. In addition, a Latin description of the London entry appears in London, Lambeth Palace

---

9 Henry VI’s entry into Paris may even have originally been intended as a stop on the way to a coronation at Reims. Curry, “The ‘Coronation Expedition’ and Henry VI’s Court in France, 1430 to 1432,” 39-44.


11 Blanchard, “Le spectacle du rite,” 476; see, for example, London Metropolitan Archives, MS Letter Book K (LBK), f. 101v: “lequel menoit et conduisoit le dit mistere.”

Library, MS Lambeth 12 f. 255r/v. John Lydgate’s Middle English poem on the London entry survives in seven known manuscripts. There are also twelve known Middle English chronicles containing prose descriptions of the London entry.\(^\text{13}\)

The unique circumstances of Henry VI’s Paris and London entries, combined with the large number of documents describing these events, provide a unique opportunity for comparison of royal entries on both sides of the Channel. Yet, much of the scholarship on Henry VI’s entries has to date addressed either the Paris or London event, and not both. The one extensive comparison between the two is Lawrence M. Bryant’s “Configurations of the Community in Late Medieval Spectacles: Paris and London during the Dual Monarchy” (1994).\(^\text{14}\) There has to date been no examination of these two royal entries that has taken into account the large number of documents available describing the events.

This study examines the Paris and London royal entries of Henry VI, considering both the events themselves and the documentation describing them. It uses the 1431 and 1432 entries to address the question: what was the function of the *event* of the fifteenth-century royal entry in Paris and London, as well as of the *documents* describing these events? Chapter 1, *Cele ville ainsi famee*: Civic use of the Royal Entry in Paris and London, addresses the function of the *event* of the fifteenth-century royal entry.

---


\(^{14}\) In *City and Spectacle*, ed. Barbara Hanawalt and Kathryn Reyerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 3-33.
Comparing with other contemporary entries—such as the 1484 and 1498 coronation entries of Charles VIII and Louis XII into Paris, the 1392 reconciliation entry of Richard II and the 1445 coronation entry of Margaret of Anjou into London, and Henry VII’s 1486 post-accession entry into York—this chapter considers the way the civic organizers of royal entries addressed the king and portrayed their own city during the entry procession. It argues that, although Parisians and Londoners used similar procession routes and pageant themes for successive entries, they used the speeches and written explanations accompanying the pageants to convey different messages. By adapting the content of the royal entry to address contemporary political concerns, the civic organizers of fifteenth-century Paris and London entries used these events as a tool for negotiation or dialogue with their royal visitor.

Chapter 2, Relating the Entry: The Evidence of a Genre, asks: what was the contemporary function of the documents describing the royal entries of Henry VI? Some of these descriptions are significantly more exhaustive than are others. Those that are particularly striking for their detailed content, as well as for the manuscripts in which they are preserved, are the two Letter Book K descriptions, as well as the Lambeth Palace manuscript and John Lydgate’s Middle English poem relating the London entry. These accounts all limit the scope of their content to the royal entry itself, remaining silent on the coronations that accompanied the events. They include the speeches and written explanations of the entry pageants. Moreover, these descriptions could circulate independently of thematically related material. The differences between these renditions and chroniclers’ descriptions, as well as administrative or financial records, demonstrate the application of a royal entry description genre in the fifteenth century.
Chapter 3, The King's Most Notable City: The Royal Entry Genre in London, asks: why were the London-centred descriptions of Henry VI's entries produced, and how were they used? It demonstrates that two leading Londoners—John Carpenter, common clerk of the city, and John Wells, mayor in 1432—collaborated both with each other and with the prominent poet John Lydgate to use the royal entry genre to London's advantage. John Carpenter, experienced in the manipulation of London's documentary culture, arranged for both his Latin description of the London entry and the anonymous description of the Paris entry to be copied into Letter Book K. The placement of these two descriptions in a London civic manuscript showcased London as the stronger and more worthy of the king's two capitals. John Wells commissioned John Lydgate to produce a poetic description of the event, ensuring the dissemination of a Middle English version that was used, like Carpenter's Letter Book, to promote the city of London. The work of these three men reminded their readers that, while Henry VI may have been crowned in his "Reeme of France," it was to his "blessed Reeme of Englond" that he returned.\footnote{Lydgate, "King Henry VI's Triumphant Entry into London, 21 Feb., 1432," 632.}

The premise of this study is that it is crucial to consider royal entries both as events and as documents, because each of these two elements had a contemporary purpose. Using the descriptions solely as evidence of what happened during the procession causes us to ignore the fact that these documents were produced by fifteenth-century writers for a fifteenth-century audience, and were as much a part of the royal entry as was the procession through the city. This study therefore uses an interdisciplinary approach, considering royal entries on both sides of the Channel from...
the perspectives of both history and literature. It combines an examination of royal entries and the documents describing them for the first time. By surveying the descriptions in their original manuscript context, and by considering the contemporary function of both event and manuscript, this study seeks to broaden our understanding of fifteenth-century royal entries. It argues that both London and Paris royal entry organizers used the event as a form of negotiation or dialogue with the visiting king, an opportunity to express the city’s expectations to the ruler. In London, the genre of the royal entry description was used in the same way. London civic officials created pro-London descriptions of both events. These accounts were circulated in London-centric manuscripts, and show a deliberate use of royal entry descriptions to promote the city of London.
CHAPTER 1

CELE VILLE AINSI FAMEE: CIVIC USE OF THE ROYAL ENTRY IN PARIS AND LONDON

What was the function of the royal entry in fifteenth-century Paris and London? This aspect of royal entries has been looked at in many different ways, with scholarship largely divided between those who see the entry as a dramatization of political hierarchy, and those who see it as a moment of negotiation or dialogue. For Gordon Kipling, for example, a “civic triumph” is not primarily “a series of pageant emblems designed by the citizens for their king with the purpose of articulating political ideas,” but rather an event in which “both king and citizens [perform] roles—both dramatic and ritual in nature—which they define by means of spectacular pageantry.”\(^1\) The royal entry is thus not primarily a political event, but rather a “serious late medieval art form.”\(^2\) Accordingly, Kipling organizes his study of royal entries ca. 1370-ca. 1550—Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph—not chronologically or geographically, but rather by theme, with chapter titles such as “The Christmas King” and “The Civic Triumph as Royal Epiphany.”\(^3\)

Similarly, in The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony: Politics, Ritual, and Art in the Renaissance, Lawrence M. Bryant “undertakes to show the way the celebrants of entry, from great officials to guildsmen, acted out their place in the ideal monarchical order and how, at the same time, the pageants along the entry

\(^{2}\) Ibid., 3.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., 3.
route portrayed this ideal.\textsuperscript{4} Again, this view is reflected in the structure of the book, which is organized by Parisian entry station, rather than chronologically.

Other scholars, however, view the royal entry as an opportunity for negotiation or political dialogue between the visitor and the event organizers. Lorraine Attreed, for example, argues that “spectacle and welcoming ceremonies endeavoured to establish peaceful relations with monarchs and nobles, to interest them in a town’s welfare, and to convince them to assist its borough liberties.”\textsuperscript{5} Likewise, for Joël Blanchard and Noël Coulet, the royal entry is a kind of reciprocal dialogue, a political discourse in which the king displays his sovereignty and the city expresses its loyalty as well as its expectations for the visitor.\textsuperscript{6} Blanchard defines the terms “ritual” and “ceremonial,” locating the royal entry somewhere between the two:

\begin{quote}
Le rituel est la réalisation d’une séquence de gestes grâce auxquels un individu ou un groupe d’individus passe d’un état à un autre. Le cérémoniel est la mise en scène de droits, de prérogatives qui le fait reconnaître comme tel dans la société, chacun manifestant sa place dans l’ordre juridique des choses.\textsuperscript{7}
\end{quote}

Without a fixed format or change of state, the entry cannot be a ritual. Nor is it simply a staging of the relationships between different political groups.

Similarly, for Bernard Guenée and Françoise Lehoux the civic organization of royal entries is crucial: it shows that civic officials were participants, not passive

\textsuperscript{4} Lawrence M. Bryant, The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony: Politics, Ritual, and Art in the Renaissance, Travaux d’humanisme et Renaissance (Geneva: Droz, 1986), 15.
\textsuperscript{7} Blanchard, “Le spectacle du rite,” 514.
witnesses, and that the event was used as a means of dialogue. R.M. Smuts argues that
the participation of the crowd in the royal entry demonstrates that the event dramatized
the reciprocal nature of royal entries and of kingship.

In order to determine the function of the fifteenth-century royal entry in Paris and
London, we must ask, who organized the event, and therefore decided on the entry
pageants and themes? Were these themes consistent from one entry to the next—
indicating a fixed format expressing idealized relationships between the city and the
ruler—or were they altered to suit the political climate? This question is especially
pertinent considering the highly unusual circumstances of Henry VI’s royal entries: a
child-king and the only English ruler to be crowned king of France, he was a foreign
king in his Parisian entry and a symbol of the dual monarchy for the post-coronation(s)
entry into London.

1. Comme ont fait les roys anciens: Admonishing the King in the Parisian Entry

Fifteenth-century Paris was administered by two bodies: the royally-appointed
prévôt de Paris, and the municipal prévôt des marchands—elected, along with four
échevins, by the bourgeois citizens of Paris. Even during the period of English rule,
there was little interference with the selection of these individuals, who were “purs

8 Bernard Guenée and Françoise Lehoux, “Introduction,” in Les entrées royales
françaises de 1328 à 1515 (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1968), 8.
9 R. M. Smuts, “Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: the English Royal Entry in
London, 1485-1642,” in The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour
of Lawrence Stone, ed. A. L. Beier, David Cannadine, and James M. Rosenheim
Parisians, qui ne devaient rien à la victoire anglaise.” It was these municipal officials, along with confraternities formed of Parisian merchants—not royal officials—who organized Parisian royal entry pageants. These pageants can, therefore, provide insight into Parisian attitudes towards their king. In a letter written to the mayor and aldermen of London ca. 1422, Parisians acknowledged the deaths of both Henry V of England and Charles VI of France, claiming to comfort themselves in this time with the reminder that God had seen fit to leave them “nostre souverain seigneur et le vostre, Henry, par la grace de Dieu Roy de Franche et d'Angleterre…” What were Parisian sentiments towards Henry by December of 1431, when their nearly-ten-year-old king finally reached his French capital? Were the images of ideal kingship presented on this occasion similar to those expressed in the entries of other French rulers? How did Parisian organizers conceive of their own role in the event—both as representatives of the French capital, and as individual groups living and working within it? What can this tell us about the function of the fifteenth-century Parisian royal entry?

A comparison between this entry and the coronation entries of the thirteen-year-old Charles VIII in 1484 and the adult Louis XII in 1498 demonstrates that Henry VI was, in fact, treated differently in his entry. This is evident in the reception of these

---


12 London Metropolitan Archives, MS Letter Book K (LBK), f. 2r.
three rulers outside the city gates, as well as the way each king was represented at the pageant station of the Châtelet, home of Parisian justice. According to Kipling, "the English looked to this triumph for a forthright demonstration of the capital’s allegiance. Obligingly, most of the... pageants concerned themselves with declarations of the city’s faith in its anointed monarch."  

Many of the 1431 entry pageants, however, treated Henry VI as a young and foreign ruler. They emphasized the city of Paris—perhaps out of a sense of rivalry with Henry’s English capital of London—and the young king’s unreadiness to rule. In the entries of Charles VIII and Louis XII, however, the kings were portrayed throughout as strong, capable rulers—despite the fact that Charles VIII had not yet reached the age of majority before the event took place. In presenting its entry pageants to Henry VI, Paris used the event to portray itself as a royal advisor, negotiating with and instructing its ruler. At the same time, individual Parisian groups such as the Parlement and the civic mysteries or guilds used their roles in the procession to negotiate for their own status.

The treatment of Henry VI as a young and foreign ruler is immediately evident in the pageants that took place outside the city walls. Before even entering the French capital, the young king was reminded of the importance of the city of Paris, and informed in no uncertain terms that he was doing an inadequate job of governing it and keeping it safe. In the first pageant, the king was approached by the goddess Fama, mounted on a horse draped with the arms of Paris. She was accompanied by the Nine Worthies and their nine female counterparts. The final pageant figure was “un herault vestu de robe vermeille et chapperon d’azur, et par dessus une tunique des armes de la

---

13 Kipling, Enter the King, 88.
The presence of a civic herald, and the association between the goddess and the city’s arms, make it quite clear that the Worthies were representatives of the city itself, rather than a mark of honour to the king. The Nine Worthies were a powerful group, comprised of three champions of chivalry of the Old Law...Joshua, David, and Judas; three champions of the pagan law, Hector, Alexander and Julius Caesar; and three champions of the new Christian Law, Arthur, Charlemagne and Godfrey de Bouillon.

The Nine Heroines, a later addition to the Worthies tradition, were usually all figures from Antiquity.

The association between the city of Paris and the Worthies is striking: these chivalric heroes seem more like royal than civic figures. Charles VIII’s entry into Rouen in 1485, for example, incorporated the king into the Worthies tradition by presenting him as a tenth Worthy. For Henry VI’s Parisian entry, however, the city asserted its own importance—not the king’s—with this imagery. In case of lingering doubt, the herald’s speech made this clear:

---

14 LBK, f. 101v.
16 Maurice Keen, Chivalry (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 121.
Les preux jadiz et renommée
Tendoient qui est figuré
Ci en dame et vous représente
Paris, qui de tout s'entente,
Sire, vous reçoit humblement.
Gardez-la amoureusement,
Car celle ville ainsi famee
Est digne d'estre bien gouverné.19

Moreover, the speech reminded the king that such a worthy city should be governed
well—a not-so-subtle indicator that he was failing in this task.

It is also important to note that these figures accompanied the king throughout
the entry, serving as a constant reminder of the city’s importance:

Et ce dit, icelui herault se leva et s’en vint avec ladicte deese et preux, et
chevauchans devant le dit seigneur, et venans en la dicte ville de Paris, en tres
belle ordonnance. Et en ce point chevauchèrent tout le dit jour audavent dudit
seigneur jusques an l’ostel des Tournelles ou il ala gesir.20

They then disappear from the narrative until the end of the procession: “le dit Roy
chevaucha juxques a la porte Baudoier. Et a l’endroit de la rue de Jouy recontra la
devant dicte deees et les preux, qui avoient esté jusques oudit hostel des Tournelles,
lesquelz estoient regiez en moult belle ordonnance.”21 The city of Paris, represented by
a herald and the chivalric heroes, presented itself as a cohesive body with the ability and
authority to reprimand the English king for his inadequate care of the French capital. It
was Paris, and not the king, who was at the centre of this pageant.

Similarly, the Saint Denis gate pageant also stressed the capital city: it featured
the ship of Paris, large enough to hold twelve passengers representing the city’s three
estates, that is, the University of Paris, the clergy of Notre-Dame, and the bourgeois

19 LBK, f. 102r.
20 Ibid., f 102r.
21 Ibid., f. 103r.
The passengers held out three hearts to the king, accompanied by a written explanation indicating that this was to signify that:

Les estas de ceste cite
Vous offeront, d'un contentement,
Leurs cuers, par vray humilite.
Recevez les benignement.²³

According to Kipling, this pageant expressed Parisian obedience to the king.²⁴ Despite the opening of Parisian hearts, however, the request that the king kindly receive his subjects, combined with the level of fear and anxiety in Paris during this period, suggests not an expression of loyalty, but rather one of grievance or dissatisfaction.

Parisiens sent letters to London, both before and after the 1431 entry, asking Henry’s English subjects to plead with the king on their behalf. The letter acknowledging Henry VI as king expressed this anxiety:

Si vous prions, tres chers freres et especiaulx amis, que pour le recouvrement d’aucunes parties de ce royaume que tiennent et occupent les ennemis...de nostre dit souverain seigneur et le vostre, vous veuillez tousjours travailler et solliciter ceulx que vous saurez avoir puissannce...de pouvoir et vouloir aider au bien de ce dit royaulme...et travailler pour nous comme si vous estiez en cas pareil, dont Dieu vous gart, vouldriez que feissions pour vous....²⁵

Apparently the Parisiens’ petition for Londoners to approach the king for help against “les ennemis” was unsuccessful. In March 1432, after Henry had returned to England, Parisians again wrote to London for help convincing the king to take their plight seriously:

²² Bryant, The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony, 126.
²³ LBK, f. 102r. The municipality’s financial records show payments for the decorations on the gate, but are silent on the other pageant details. Thompson, ed., “Appendix,” 244.
²⁴ Kipling, Enter the King, 88.
²⁵ LBK, f. 2r.
Tres chiers freres et tres especiaulx amis. Nous nous recommandons a vous tant affectueusement et cordialement comme plus povons...Vous supplions...que selon le contenu en nos dites lettres [au roi], vous plaise travailher et labourer ainsi que necessite...Car nous avons assez congnoissance que par le bien de vous et bonne poursuite, nous purreus estre alegiez des mauxl et douleurs que avons longuement et pacientement endurez soubz la seigneurie du roy nostre dit seigneur. Tres chiers freres et tres especiaulx amis. Nous nous prions que aiez nous et noz afferes en voz bonnes recommendacions. Et se pardeca vous plaise chose que faire puissions, faiets le nous assavoir et de tres bon cuer nous l’accomplirons...

A second letter dated in the same month pleaded:

Tres chiers sires freres et especiaulz amis. Nous nous recommandons a vous tant affectueusement et cordialement comme plus povons. Et vous plaise savoir que de puis que derniere ment avons escript au roy notre souverain seigneur et a vous...les ennemis du roy nostre dit seigneur et le votre font a toute diligence, assemblee de gens de guerre...pour porter dommaige a sa seigneurie...pour laquelle cause lui escripions [au roi] en la maniere qui s’ensuit....

Si voyz prions, tres chiers sires freres et especiaulx amis...que vueilliez trantiler et labourer pour le bien de ceste ville et du pays d’environ...car nous savons certainement que par le moyen de vous et bon pourchaz le roy, notre dit seigneur et le votre, sera en brief temps au plaisir de notre creator, seigneur paisiblement de son royaume de France...

Whether or not this level of Parisian fear was warranted, contemporary chroniclers also paint this period as one of “extrême violence:”

Sous leur plume, la violence des batailles et des armées en campagne se résume à des formules stéréotypées empruntées aux chansons de gestes et aux romans de chevalerie: il s’agit pour les hommes d’armes de fèrir, frapper, traire, ruer sus, jeter, abattre, occire et pour leur valets fourrageurs d’ardre, piller, rober.

The chronicler Jean Chartier’s extremely brief rendition of the Paris entry and coronation is framed by descriptions of battles.

The fifth pageant of Henry VI’s entry, which took place inside the city at the former Saint Denis gate, also expressed Parisian fear. The pageant featured a platform,

---

26 LBK, f. 96v.
27 Ibid., f. 101r.
decorated with tapestries, on which several actors depicted the three stories of Saint Denis. In this pageant, the city was portrayed as both advisor and storyteller to the king. The sign accompanying the pageant explained that

Pour notre foy multiplier
Vint saint Denis de Grece en France,
En preschant, la voult publier.
Comment: vecy la demonstrance.

The words “Comment: vecy la demonstrance” reminded the king that he was dependent on Parisians in order to learn this story. The written explanation of the pageant concluded:

Se les rois françois sont appellez
Pour le foy garder, tres cristiens
Defendez-la vous je me [jeune] roy
Comme ont fait les roy anciennes [anciens].

Here, the king was reminded that his young age allowed the city to act as an instructor or advisor to him, and that he should be aware of the tradition of French Christian kingship. As Kipling indicates, this pageant “admonishe[d] [Henry] to defend the faith which S[aient] Denis brought to France.” It presented a model for his behaviour. As Guy Llewelyn Thompson points out, contemporary chroniclers such as Enguerrand de Monstrelet expressed their awareness that “distinctly French traditions were being invoked for the foreigners.” These traditions included the claim to the title “très chrétien,” increasingly limited to French monarchs throughout the course of the

---

30 The municipal records indicate payment to “plusieurs pintres pour decorations ausdittes portes St-Denis et fontaine du Ponceau comme fleurs de lis, estoilles, trois istoires de la vie de St Denis.” Thompson, ed., “Appendix,” 244.
31 LBK, f. 102v.
32 Ibid.
33 Kipling, Enter the King, 98.
34 Thompson, Paris and its People under English Rule, 204.
fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{35} Contemporary political literature in France also held that one of the king’s primary duties was to provide peace: “[p]our un roi...point de plus bel éloge que le titre \textit{Pacifique}.”\textsuperscript{36} During the Hundred Years War, “les Français n’aspirent qu’à l’ordre,” and it was the king who was expected to provide protection to his people in return for their loyalty and support.\textsuperscript{37}

The Parisian entry organizers imploring Henry VI to defend their faith clearly did not believe the young king was upholding his part of the bargain. This appeal is reminiscent of the undated four-stanza “Complainte de Paris,” preserved on the same folio of Letter Book K as the end of the Parisian entry description. The second stanza addresses the problem of having such a young king during a period of war:

Tant que j’ay peu, j’ay gardé de faillir:  
Force n’est droit; il doit assez souffire.  
Se me faillez, il me fault defaillir  
Contre mon gré, je n’y puis contredire;  
De ma douleur, devez estre mon mire;  
Car notre roy, est trop jeune et peu fort  
\textit{D’age et de seinz: pour ce chiet le droit fot}  
[Sur?] vous seigneurs. De droit vous puis requerre  
Ses ennemys pourrez tantost conquerre  
Et me sauver, genz, aver et chavance;  
Secourrez-moy et faitez bonne guerre,  
\textit{Ou vous perdrez Paris et toute France.}\textsuperscript{38}

While Parisians did not quite dare to tell Henry VI directly that he risked the loss of “Paris et toute France,” the message was nonetheless made clear in his royal entry.

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 156.  
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 47, 165.  
Considering Parisian anxiety at the time of this entry, the request at the Saint Denis gate for Henry to kindly receive the offered Parisian hearts seems more likely an expression of complaint than one of loyalty. Through the combination of the pageant of the Worthies, that of the hearts of the Parisian estates, and the Saint Denis pageant, Parisians reminded the king of the importance of Paris and of their belief that he was not doing enough to protect it. In this sense, Parisians used the entry to express the very real fear and anxiety of the French capital during the Hundred Years War.

Charles VIII’s 1484 coronation entry also referred to the king as young, but certainly not as “[un] Roy...trop jeune et peu fort.” Charles came to the throne at the age of thirteen, successor to a father whom many had viewed as a tyrant. Charles VIII had not yet reached the majority age of fourteen before his coronation at Reims and his subsequent entry into Paris. His reception outside the walls was quite different from that given fifty-three years earlier to Henry VI. Instead of stressing the importance of Paris, Charles VIII’s welcoming pageant focused on the king himself. In this case, the city expressed neither apprehension nor dissatisfaction with the ruler, but rather hope for his future and that of Paris under his rule.

The pageant consisted of a stage decorated with draperies and a sun motif. On the platform was a fleur-de-lys, with a child representing the king at the centre. On each of the flower’s petals was a virtue: Justice, Mercy, Love, Knowledge, Reason, and Peace (28-29). The pageant stressed the necessity of these virtues for good kingship, and

---

portrayed the king as undoubtedly in possession of them. In fact, he was depicted as the source of virtue for his subjects; the poet tells us that the pageant indicated:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Q]}u'il \text{ ne peut bien gouverner} \\
\text{Se les vertus ne sont en luy} \\
\text{Ne seurement ne peut regner,} \\
\text{Ne le peuple qui est soubs luy,} \\
\text{Lequel doit, soubs son sauf conduit,} \\
\text{Estre en ses vertus gouverné... (30)}
\end{align*}
\]

Without the king, it was implied, the people of Paris would never be able to achieve these virtues. Unlike Henry VI, Charles VIII—an uncontested French king—did not need to be educated on the status of the French capital. Instead, his welcoming pageant stressed his own potential for good governance. As with Henry VI’s entry, the pageant choices for Charles VIII demonstrate the entry organizers acting on political reality: the succession of Charles VIII was a stable one, which allowed Parisians—no longer in danger of attack—to be more generous towards him than they had been to Henry VI.

The greeting that Parisians offered outside the city gates to the adult Louis XII in 1498 was similar to that given to his predecessor, Charles VIII. Like that of Charles VIII, Louis XII’s accession was relatively stable. Accordingly, Louis was not greeted by assertions of Parisian prominence or demands for better governance; instead, his greeting at the Saint Denis gate presented him as the source of virtue. The first pageant showed the king at the centre of a group of figures representing Nobility, Wealth, and Strength. Each was accompanied by a virtue, indicating that the nobleman ought to be humane, the rich man generous, and the strong man loyal. The pageant did not, however, offer instruction or advice on accomplishing these goals. Instead, the

---

placement of the king at the centre of the pageant indicated that Louis XII had already mastered the appropriate virtues. Before even entering the city itself, Henry VI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII were each given a strong message. While Charles VIII and Louis XII were both portrayed as capable kings who could lead their people to virtue, Henry VI was reminded of the importance of his French capital and instructed to govern it better.43

Among the pageants that took place inside the city walls, each of these three entries included displays at the Châtelet, the home of royally administered Parisian justice.44 The Châtelet pageants each featured a figure representing the king. Again, Henry VI was portrayed as needing assistance to rule, while the two later kings were depicted as admirable monarchs. The Châtelet pageant for Henry VI consisted of a stage with a child representing the king seated at the centre. To his right stood the peers of France, who were recognizable by their coats of arms; the equivalent English nobles gathered on the king’s left. These advisors reached up towards the French and English coats of arms, which were topped by two crowns suspended over the king’s head.45 A

43 Surviving descriptions of the 1437 Paris entry of Henry VI’s rival, Charles VII, do not include any pageant speeches, making comparison difficult. This entry does, however, appear to reflect its political circumstances: in recognition of the king they had previously refused to support, Parisians offered Charles VII the keys to the city during the greeting outside the gates: “[Le] prevost lui presenta les clefs de la ville de Paris, et le Roy leis bailla en garde au connestable de France.” The city’s submission was also expressed in the writing above the gate: “Tres exelent Roy et seigneur, les manans de vostre cite vous repcoivent en tout honneur et tres grande humilite.” Bernard Guenée and Françoise Lehoux, eds., “Premiere entree du roi Charles VII a Paris, Chronique d’Enguerrand de Monstrelet,” in Les entrées royales françaises de 1328 à 1515, (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1968), 76. See also Bryant, The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony, 88.
45 LBK, ff. 102v-103r.
contemporary chronicler described the gathered nobles as appearing to advise the young king.\footnote{Colette Beaune, ed., \textit{Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris, 1405-1449} (Paris: Librarie générale française, 1990), 306-07.}

Là [il y] avait un enfant de la grandeur [du] roi et de son âge, vêtu en état royal, housse vermeille et chaperon fourré, deux couronnes pendantes, qui étaient très riches à voir à chacun sur sa tête, à son côté dextre était tout le sang de France, c'est à savoir tous les grands seigneurs de France, comme Anjou, Berry, Bourgogne, etc., et un peu loin d'eux étaient les clercs et après les bourgeois, et à senestre étaient tous les grands seigneurs d'Angleterre, qui tous faisaient manière de donner conseil au jeune roi bon et loyal…\footnote{Ibid., 306-07.}

In this pageant, Kipling argues, the French and English lords are described as “kneeling and offering up their arms,” demonstrating that “their political homage takes the form of the Adoration of the Magi.” The image is made complete by the “two crowns which miraculously hover in the air over the boy’s head…Such a stagecraft miracle…declares the King’s divine election.”\footnote{Kipling, \textit{Enter the King}, 87.}

Contrary to this interpretation, however, the Châtelet pageant does not appear to present the king as a messianic or divinely elected ruler. Instead, the presence of the peers of France and England in the pageant was an accurate representation of political reality: others had been governing for Henry VI for nearly ten years. It was also a logical choice for the pageant organizers: the members of the Châtelet were royally appointed, and, based on the municipality’s financial records, this was probably the only pageant organized and paid for by royal officials.\footnote{Cheyette, “Châtelet,” 278; Mousnier et al., “Paris, capitale politique au moyen-âge et dans les temps modernes (environ 1200 à 1789),” 69.} Appropriately, it was also the only pageant to stress either the role of Henry VI’s advisors or the importance of the dual
monarchy. Despite this, however, the Châtelet pageant also admonished the king. The sign accompanying the display reminded Henry that he was still dependent on his advisors:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vous [vos] vraes subgiez françois} \\
\text{Vous ont la couronne gardee}, \\
\text{Et au plaisir du Roy des royes,} \\
\text{Vous sera par eulx conservé.} \\
\text{Et semblablement les Angloiz,} \\
\text{Garderont aussi sa compagne.} \\
\text{Dieu vous doint, si garder les drois} \\
\text{Des deux...}^{51}
\end{align*}
\]

The third stanza educated the king on the importance of the Châtelet as the seat of Parisian justice:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nous, qui exersons la justice,} \\
\text{Vous prions qu'elle soit gardé,} \\
\text{Ce vous sera chose propice;} \\
\text{Par elle, ont royaumes duree.}^{52}
\end{align*}
\]

Although the request was for Henry to “maintain” justice, the emphasis on “we, who exercise justice” indicated that it was the members of the Châtelet who would be undertaking this task. Without justice, they reminded the king, he would lose his kingdom. The verses ended with a return to the theme of the city itself:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Le peuple de toute sa puissance,} \\
\text{A moult peine d'entretenir} \\
\text{La ville en votre obeissance;} \\
\text{Si vous en vucills souvenir.}^{53}
\end{align*}
\]

The message here was clear: the king was reminded of the continuing importance of his advisors; instructed on the role of the Châtelet and on the dependence of his rule on the

---

50 Thompson, *Paris and its People under English Rule*, 199-204.
51 LBK, f. 102v.
52 Ibid, f. 103r.
53 Ibid, f. 103r.
maintenance of justice; and once again exhorted to acknowledge Parisian efforts to maintain the French capital as a part of his obedience, and not that of his rival, Charles VII.54

The message was made even more pointed by the presence of figures representing the rest of the capital city: on a second platform, “un peu plus bas que le dessusdit esscarfault,” was a figure representing the royally appointed prévôt de Paris, holding out a document to the king and gesturing to the people behind him.55 These figures are described in two groups, representing the royal administration of Paris, as well as its municipal government:

apres lui [le prévôt] estoient, en grant nombre, representans les estas du college dudit Chastellet. Et apres iceulx estoient autres gens en grant nombre, representans les prevost des marchans, eschevins, bourgois, laboureurs, gens de mestier et habitans d’icelle ville, tous aiains leur regard audit roy...Et si estoient tous iceulx personnages, sans mouvoir, samblans estre ymages...56

The representation of both royal and municipal officials in this pageant creates an idealized image of a unified Paris, collectively reminding the king of his duties. Despite having been organized by royal officials, this pageant bears a striking resemblance to the municipally-funded ones that preceded it.

The Châtelet pageant for Charles VIII in 1484, by contrast, continued the theme of the virtues introduced in his welcoming pageant:

55 Cheyette, “Châtelet,” 278.
56 LBK, f. 102v.
Et puis auprès du Chastelet
Y avoit un grand eschaffaut,
Ou illec un roy se seet
Par dessus les autres au plus haut,
Qui par engin subtil et caut,
Envoyoit au peuple d’en bas
Plus leger qu’on ne fait un sault
La vertu de Paix par soulas. (39)

After distributing Peace to the people, the king-figure went on to give Strength to the
nobility and Love to the church (40). Here, the king was shown not only possessing
these three key virtues, but also wisely allocating them to the appropriate groups. The
pageant did not imply that the king was in need of advisors to help him distribute these
virtues. Instead, the king was shown as the source of peace, strength, and love for his
people.

The Châtelet pageant for Louis XII in 1498 also portrayed the king in a position
of strength. It featured the portraits of nine previous kings of France, with Louis XII’s
own portrait at the top. In addition, there was a seated figure representing the king:

et a main dextre estoit Bon Conseil, et a senestre Justice; et soubz les piedz dudit
roy, Injustice couchée. Pereillement (sic) y estoit Puissance, armeé, tenant ung
voulge contre la poitrine de Division; et estoient a l’environ VI autres
personnages: l’Eglise, le Peuple, Seigneurie, Povoir, Union et Paix.57

This pageant clearly established Louis as one of an illustrious line of kings, already
possessing the virtues of kingship, such as good counsel, justice, and strength. He was
shown accompanied by the people of France, but not dependent on them.

The differences between these three pageants are remarkable due to their
superficial similarity. Each one took place at the Châtelet, and each one featured a
seated figure representing the king himself. To a spectator unable to see the signs

57 Guenée and Lehoux, eds., “Première entrée du roi Louis XII à Paris, Récit anonyme,”
133.
accompanying the tableaux, these three pageants may have seemed exactly the same.

Yet Parisians re-used the setting and staging of the Châtelet pageant station in a variety of ways.\(^58\)

This is especially striking considering what this display represented to Parisian spectators. The *Bourgeois de Paris* refers to Henry VI's Châtelet pageant as a "lit de justice."\(^59\) According to Sarah Hanley, this term was originally used to describe the canopy, backdrop, and velvet cushions—all decorated with fleurs-de-lis—used by French kings for their appearances in Parlement.\(^60\) Although there were no such royal appearances from 1413 to 1484, the term "lit de justice" survived, often in royal entry descriptions to show that the staging of the Châtelet pageant "symbolized royal justice, or judicial kingship."\(^61\) On the surface, the Châtelet pageants for Henry VI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII were all representations of French royal justice. The English king's ability to dispense such justice, however, was doubted.

Parisians used these three royal entries as an occasion to display images of ideal kingship—but in different ways. Henry VI's entry portrayed the ideal king as one who accepts advice from his counsellors, protects his capital city, and maintains justice in his realm. On the surface this seems quite similar to the entries of Charles VIII and Louis

---

\(^58\) This is similar to the treatment of the Confraternity of the Passion's Parisian pageant station. This civic group usually provided a Passion-themed pageant for royal entries. For the child-king Henry VI, who made his entry into Paris on the first Sunday of Advent, the Confraternity instead provided a Nativity-themed pageant. Although this does indicate a thematic change, the combined effect of the rest of the pageants seems to undermine this one's apparent attempt to "seek to invest the boy-king's entry into Paris with the imagery of Christ's Incarnation." Kipling, *Enter the King*, 84-87.


\(^61\) Ibid., 27-29.
XII, which stressed the importance of a virtuous rule. These two kings, however, were depicted as ideal rulers and the source of virtue, while Henry VI was treated as a young and foreign king who was not yet ready to govern. Parisians rebuked their English king for his lack of consideration for their city, simultaneously appealing for the king’s assistance and asserting their own preeminence through imagery such as that of the Nine Worthies. The city used the occasion of the royal entry to define its relationship with and expectations for the king.

At the same time, distinct groups of Parisians could also use the entry format as a political tool to further their individual aims. As Bryant shows, the Parlement of Paris used the entry of Henry VI to seek tangible advantage with the king. Similarly, the various Parisian mysteries used their role in the entry procession to assert their own importance and position.

The 1431 entry marked the first appearance of the members of Parlement—responsible for French royal justice—in the greeting of the king outside the city. This change, Bryant argues, would have been immediately evident, especially since they appeared in their robes of office. The participation of the members of Parlement was likely related to their ongoing negotiations with the king over back salaries owed to them. In November 1431, they had sent representatives to Henry’s court at Rouen to request the money. A series of pre-entry deliberations, beginning in June 1430 and

---


63 Bryant, The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony, 84.

64 Ibid., 86-87; Bernard Guènée and Françoise Lehoux, eds., “Première entrée du roi Henri VI à Paris, Délibérations des trois Chambres du Parlement relatives à l’entrée du
continuing in November 1431, shows the members of the court gathering “pour avoir avis et deliberacion en quel estat et en quelz habis ilz seroient au premier advenement du roy, que on atendoit prochainement a Paris.” The chief questions concerned the appearance of the Parlementaires in the entry, and which other groups might accompany them. In the end, “[t]he Parlement ordered the procession in such a way as to give itself the dominant position.” This was accomplished both by ensuring that the Parlementaires would march alone, and that they would appear in their robes of office:

\[
\text{ilz yorient au devant du roy a cheval, hors des portes, jusques a certain lieu qui seroit advisé, et seroient vestus tous les clercs, conseillers et officiers dudit Parlement de drap pers, en longues robes et chaperons fourrez, et les lays de drap vermeil.}
\]

According to Bryant, “[t]hey claimed to have turned to registers and chronicles for guidance in the solemnities and practices preserved in the entry and advent of kings at Paris, but they nonetheless came up with a largely novel reception.” The Parlementaires’ decision to use the entry as an opportunity to gain some negotiation leverage with the king is also evident in the institution’s records of the event:
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65 Guenee and Lehoux, eds., “Première entrée du roi Henri VI à Paris, Délibérations…” 60.
66 Bryant, The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony, 87.
67 “[P]our ce que aucuns des gens des Comptes avoient ymaginacion et volenté d’estre avec la Court ouïdit advenement du roy, fu conclud par la Court de dire ou faire dire ausdictes gens des Comptes qu’il sembloit plus convenable que chacune Court, College ou Université, uniement, a par soy, sans soy entremesler l’une parmy l’autre, feust au devant du roy.” Guenée and Lehoux, eds., “Première entrée du roi Henri VI à Paris, Délibérations…,” 60.
68 Ibid., 60.
69 Bryant, The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony, 87.
Et [le roi] enconterent entre la Chappelle Saint Denys et le molin a vent, accompagnié de ducs, contes, barons et grans segneurs d'Angleterre. Et après ce que luy eust esté dit par la bouche du premier president ce qui avoit esté délibéré d'estre dit en reverence et en humilite, et aprez la response convenable sur ce faicte, retournerent paisiblement sans presse au devant du roy, en l'ordre qu'ilz s'estoient partis, jusquez en la dicte chambre de Parlement.\footnote{Guenée and Lehoux, eds., “Première entrée du roi Henri VI à Paris, Délibérations…,” 62.}

The first president’s encounter with the king was apparently successful, as “[s]everal days later the royal council promised to pay the back salaries on conditions that the parlementaires swear a new oath to the king…”\footnote{Bryant, \textit{The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony}, 87.}

Similarly, the treatment of the canopy carried above the king’s head throughout the procession shows civic groups using the entry to lobby for immediate advantage. Monstrelet turns to the role of the canopy, or ciel, after his description of the pageant of the three hearts: “Et là tantost, le Prévost des Marchans et lesdiz eschevins apportèrent ung ciel d’azur semé de fleurs de lis d’or, et le mirent et porterent tout parmi la ville par desus le roy.”\footnote{Enguerrand de Monstrelet, \textit{La chronique d’Enguerrand de Monstrelet}, ed. Louis Claude Douët-d’Arcq (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1966), 5:3.} Although opinion is divided on the origins of the royal entry canopy, it was certainly an important mark of honour offered to the royal visitor.\footnote{On the canopy’s origins, see Bryant, \textit{The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony}, 101-103; Coulet, “Les entrées royales en Angleterre. Deux exemples,” 70; and Guenée and Lehoux, “Introduction,” 13-18.} Chroniclers observed the similarity between this canopy and that carried in Corpus Christi processions, and “the privilege of the sacramental canopy was consequently a jealously guarded one. Paris refused this honour to such foreign sovereigns as the Archduke of Austria, and Lyons denied it to the Duke of Bourbon…”\footnote{Kipling, \textit{Enter the King}, 27.} Entering Paris as king of France, the young Henry VI was accorded the honour of the canopy.
The description of the canopy makes it clear that, although its use honoured the king, it also honoured the civic groups privileged to carry it:

Et quant le dit Roy fu entire en ladite ville et il fu passé la dicte bastide, lesdiz eschevins et clerc d’icelle ville porterent un ciel pardessus le dit roy, fait de moul t riche drap d’or azuré a pantes de satin et a fleurs de liz d’or; et le doublé dudit ciel estoit de cendal azure, ouquel avoit une lune et un soleil d’or, semé d’estoilles d’or. Lequel ciel fut porté, tant par lez dessudiz comme par plusieurs autres bourgeois de la ditte ville, par plusieurs intervalles, tout parmi icelle ville, jusques audit hostiel des Tournelles; auquel lieu les sergens d’armes du roy prindrent icelui ciel, comme a eulx appartenant, a cause de leurs offices. Et le porterent et donnerent a l’esglise Saint Katherine du Val des Escoliers dont les rois de France et les sergens d’armes anciennement furent fonndeurs.  

The emphasis on “lesdiz eschevins et clerc” who first brought out the canopy, followed by “plusieurs autres bourgeois de la ditte ville” who changed places carrying the canopy “par plusieurs intervalles, tout parmi icelle ville,” followed by “les sergens d’armes du roy” who kept the canopy “comme a eulx appartenant, a cause de leurs offices” demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between the groups carrying the canopy. This is even more evident in the Bourgeois de Paris’ version, which returns to the canopy at each stage of its journey. The Bourgeois mentions the king explicitly in only five lines of text. He devotes a total of eighteen lines, however, to the canopy. At its first appearance, he observes that “aussitôt que le roi entra dedans la ville ils lui mirent un grand ciel d’azur sur la tête, semé de fleurs de lis d’or, et le portèrent sur lui les quatre échevins…” At each step of the progress through the city, the Bourgeois returns to the canopy by indicating which group of citizens was next to have the privilege of carrying it. At Saint Denis it was passed to the drapers; at the pageant of the stag at the fountain of the Innocents to the spice-merchants; at the Châtelet to the money-changers; after the viewing of the relics to the goldsmiths; at Saint-Denis-de-la-
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Châtre to the tailors; at the hôtel d’Anjou to the furriers; and at Saint-Antoine-le-Petit to
the butchers. Finally, the guardsmen were honoured by being allowed to keep the
 canopy at the end of the pageant.\footnote{Ibid., 306-308.}

For the \textit{Bourgeois de Paris}, the symbolism and significance of this canopy are
essential. He is not interested in it as a mark of honour to the king. To this Parisian
citizen, what was crucial to note was which of the civic groups was given the honour of
carrying the canopy over the king’s head. His final comment, “là prirent les sergents
d’armes le ciel, car c’est leur droit,”\footnote{Ibid., 307.} indicates the significance of this honour to the
citizens of Paris. For these civic groups, association with the king through the carrying
of the canopy was a way to gain prestige.

The Parisian royal entry of Henry VI was used as a political tool by its
organizers. On the one hand, they used it to shape an image of the city as a whole,
fashioning the urban institution—including both its royal and civic administration—into
an individual body that could negotiate with the king. The city created an image of itself
as advisor, counselor, and instructor to the king through the pageants outside the city;
the association between Paris and the Worthies; the pageant of Saint Denis; and the
representation of the king as young, foreign, and dependent on Parisians for the
maintenance of his rule. This entry, which expresses concern about the king’s lack of
care for his French capital, stands in sharp contrast with the entries of Charles VIII and
Louis XII. It is important to note that Henry VI’s youth was not the exclusive cause of
these differences. Charles VIII, too, was a child, and yet Parisians greeted him warmly
and depicted his youth as a positive, rather than a negative factor. The entries conveyed messages specific to the contemporary political climate.

Similarly, individual civic groups also used the entry format as a political tool to help convey their own messages and increase their own prestige. The members of Parlement used the entry of Henry VI to assert their institution's status within the city and to remind the king of the back salaries owed them. The commentary of the anonymous Parisian chronicler, the Bourgeois de Paris, demonstrates that the carrying of the canopy enabled members of civic groups to assert their status. The fifteenth-century Parisian royal entry was used as a political tool, allowing the city to express its expectations to the ruler—while simultaneously providing a vehicle for individual groups to assert their own status, whether to the king or to other Parisians.

2. Wisdom and Good Counsel: Instructing the King in the London Entry

Henry VI returned to London in February 1432, following a coronation expedition into France that saw him admonished by his Parisian subjects. Londoners, like the Parisian entry organizers, used Henry VI's royal entry as a form of negotiation or dialogue with the king. A comparison between this entry and other inaugural entries—that is, those celebrating a coronation or accession, representing the citizens' acceptance of their new sovereign—demonstrates that Henry VI was treated differently
The 1445 London entry of Margaret of Anjou celebrated her coronation as queen of England; Henry VII’s entry into York in 1486 marked the new king’s accession to the throne. While the 1432 entry portrayed Henry VI as a young, incapable ruler, both his bride Margaret of Anjou and Henry VII were

79 Kipling, Enter the King, 74. Henry VI’s London entry is often compared to the 1415 triumphal entry of his father, Henry V, following the English victory at Agincourt. Scott-Morgan Straker and Robert Zajkowski both contend that a comparison between these two entries shows that Henry VI was treated as a child, and as secondary to the city of London, in the 1432 entry. See Scott-Morgan Straker, “Propaganda, Intentionality, and the Lancastrian Lydgate,” in John Lydgate: Poetry, Culture, and Lancastrian England, ed. Larry Scanlon and James Simpson (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 98-128; and Robert Zajkowski, “Henry VI: the Ritual Education of an Adolescent Prince,” in The Premodern Teenager: Youth in Society, 1150-1650, ed. Konrad Eisenbichler (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2002), 111-29. This comparison is problematic because the two occasions were so different: the 1415 entry was a celebration of military triumph, while the 1432 entry was held to mark the king’s dual coronations. A comparison between the 1432 entry and two other inaugural entries therefore seems more appropriate.


81 The authorship of the verses for Margaret of Anjou has been the subject of considerable debate. They are preserved in London, British Library MS Harley 3869, preceding a copy of the Confessio Amantis (Carleton Brown, “Lydgate’s Verses on Queen Margaret’s Entry into London,” Modern Language Review 7, no.2 (1912), 225). Opinion has remained divided on whether or not the poem is the work of John Lydgate. Gordon Kipling, who assumes these verses are a script for the event, summarizes the debate to 1982. He concludes that “[w]e can say…with some certainty that Lydgate did not write this script. The assumption that he did depends wholly upon an unfounded and hesitant guess by John Stow which has been accepted and elaborated without investigation ever since. The script we have, in fact, contrasts sharply with Lydgate’s stylistic habits as a writer, stands at variance with his status as a commemorative describer rather than a deviser of civic triumphs, and contradicts what we know of the poet’s final years.” (Gordon Kipling, “The London Pageants for Margaret of Anjou: A Medieval Script Restored,” Medieval English Theatre 4, no.1 (1982), 7-13). Instead, Kipling views the verses as a “slightly jumbled transcript” of “the earliest extant script” for a London entry (6, 14). His edition seeks to “restore” the script to the state of its lost original by “mak[ing] adjustments for…misassigned speeches, omitted marginalia, and unidentified rubrics,” and by including the speakers’ names in the left margin “[i]n conformity with standard dramatic convention” (18-19). Reginald Webber argues that this is, in fact, Lydgate’s work: “The authorship of the poem has never been established, but one would be hard-pressed to find any political verses more typical of
welcomed as competent sovereigns. This is especially clear in the role of gift-giving and
the representation of wisdom in these royal entries.

Henry VI’s entry used a series of gift-giving pageants, in which no fewer than
nineteen “intangible gifts” such as mercy and truth were offered to him, to advise the
king. In the pageant of the three empresses, Grace, Nature, and Fortune each provided
the king with a gift to help him rule: Grace gave “Sciens” and “Kunynng”; Nature
presented him with “streth” and “ffeyrenesses”; and Fortune bestowed upon him
“prosperitee and richesse” (141-43). The three empresses were accompanied by seven
maiden, who presented the king with the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, represented by
seven white doves (179). The maidens prayed that God would “ffulfille” the king “with
intelligence/And with a spyrit off goostly sapience” (181-82). They also offered Henry
“streth..., konnyng..., drede..., pite and lowenesse” (176-86). By conferring upon
Henry these helpful qualities, the pageant implied both that these were crucial elements
of kingship, and that the young king did not already possess them. The role of the three
empresses and of the seven maidens was to help the king acquire these attributes. The

Lydgate....The reconciliation of truth and mercy, justice and peace which Queen
Margaret embodies, is a favourite Lydgatean allegory.” (Reginald Webber, “Late
Medieval Benedictine Anxieties and the Politics of John Lydgate,” PhD, University of
Ottawa, 2008, 280). Line references here will be to Carleton Brown’s diplomatic edition
(Brown, “Lydgate’s Verses on Queen Margaret’s Entry into London,” 226-31).
82 The verses for Henry VII’s York entry are preserved in a herald’s report of the
progress, London, British Library, MS Cotton Julius B XII. The city’s plans for the
event are also recorded in the York House Books. Both versions are printed in
Alexandra F. Johnston and Margaret Rogerson, eds., Records of Early English Drama:
83 Straker, “Propaganda, Intentionality, and the Lancastrian Lydgate,” 120.
84 John Lydgate, “King Henry VI’s Triumphal Entry into London, 21 Feb., 1432,” in The
Minor Poems of John Lydgate, ed. Henry Noble MacCracken (London: Early English
Text Society, 1934), 630-648. Line references are to this edition. John Carpenter’s
version lists the gifts as follows: “Natura scilicet, fortitudine et decore;/Gracia, sapientia
et intellectu; Ffortuna, divitiis et honoribus...” LBK, f. 103v.
perception of the king as being unprepared to rule alone was substantiated by the seventh gift, “goode counsaylle” (185). This reminded the king—and perhaps his advisors—that he was not yet ready to rule on his own.

The prevailing themes in the coronation entry of Margaret of Anjou, Henry VI’s queen, were presented in a different way. The entry pageants featured a variety of allegorical figures such as Grace, Peace, and Plenty, as well as Noah and the Ark and the castle of New Jerusalem. As with the entry of Henry VI, the contents of the pageants instructed Margaret on the role she was expected to play. The pageant speeches repeatedly hailed her as the bringer of grace and peace to England. Unlike Henry VI, however, Margaret of Anjou was not presented with any allegorical gifts to help her accomplish her task. Instead, she was represented as a gift-giver who was expected to bring peace. In the pageant of Noah and the Ark, for example, Margaret was compared to a dove bringing a branch of peace. Her presence was credited as the cause for the sun’s shining (24-29). It was Margaret who gave, not Margaret who received.

In the Leadeanhall pageant featuring the Four Daughters of God, Margaret was associated with Grace, reigning over Truth, Mercy, Justice, and Peace. Grace’s pageant speech expressed the hope that Margaret would live by these principles: “Grace conueie you forthe | and be youre gide/In good life longe | prosperously to Reyne” (33-34). Margaret was then reminded that, like Grace, her role was to bring peace: the citizens of London were “Trustynge that pees | schall floure and fructifie/By you

---

86 Kipling, Enter the King, 193. The Leadeanhall was acquired by the city in 1411 and used as a market and, in the 1450s, as a chapel and school as well. Caroline M. Barron, London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People 1200-1500 (Oxford, 2004), 54-55.
Pryncesse | and lady souereyne” (54-55). The Cornhill pageant depicting Saint Margaret also ended with a plea for the princess to bring “pees | betwixt Englanede and ffraunce” during “[t]his tyme of grace | by mene of Margarete” (74-75). The final three pageants focused on the theme of the Last Judgement, reminding England’s new queen that if she fulfilled her role to bring “Grace in this lyf” then she would be rewarded “aftirwarde” with “glorie” (77).  

The pageant organizers for Henry VI’s London entry used gift-giving to portray the king as a young monarch, in need of instruction and not yet possessing the critical qualities of a ruler. In contrast, Margaret of Anjou was praised for her ability to bring peace to England. While she was constantly reminded that she should use Grace in order to create such a peace, she was not offered advice on how to do so. As Cynthia Brown demonstrates for Parisian entries, the royal entries of queens often differed from those of kings because the two roles were accorded different expectations. Queens were presented as peace-bringers or mediators, and their entries often stressed the role of the family. Still, it is striking that Margaret of Anjou, a foreign queen—ready for marriage, but still only fifteen years old—was greeted as a powerful figure by the same city that had, thirteen years earlier, greeted Henry VI as an unprepared child.

The entry of Henry VII into York in 1486 employed a gift-giving pattern reminiscent of that used for Henry VI in London. In this case, however, symbolic gifts were given in recognition of the king’s admirable qualities, not as a method of instruction. Henry VII’s York entry was part of the first progress he made through England after winning the crown in the Battle of Bosworth field, in which Richard III

87 Ibid., 183.
was killed.\textsuperscript{89} The York entry was thus an inaugural entry, but was also a chance for York—a city which had previously supported King Richard—to plead for the new king’s benevolence.\textsuperscript{90}

According to the civic records of York, Henry VII’s procession through the city was intended to begin with a pageant portraying a garden with “treys and floures In the which shall spryng vp A rioall rich red rose” and a white rose, representing the union between Henry VII of Lancaster and his wife, Elizabeth of York.\textsuperscript{91} As the king approached, the rest of the garden was to bloom, with all the other flowers bowing to the roses in recognition that they were the “principall of all floures.”\textsuperscript{92} Next, the garden was to be replaced by “A Citie with Citisyyns” and the legendary founder of York, King Ebrauk.\textsuperscript{93} The plans for the second pageant featured a council of the six previous Henries of England, accompanied by King Solomon.\textsuperscript{94} The final two pageant figures were King David and the Virgin Mary.\textsuperscript{95}

As recorded both in the city’s plans and a herald’s description of the event, each one of the legendary or Biblical kings featured in a pageant presented Henry VII with a gift.\textsuperscript{96} These gifts, unlike those offered to Henry VI, were given as the homage of a lesser king to a greater. The first pageant speech featured King Ebrauk, legendary

\textsuperscript{89} Meagher, “The First Progress of Henry VII,” 46.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 47.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., 139.
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 139.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 141.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., 142.
founder of York, saying: “To you Henry I submitte my Citie kee & Coroune.” He then swore to “Nevir to this Citie to presume no pretence/But holly I Remytte It to your gounernance.”

Ebrauk’s speech was a recognition of both Henry’s legitimacy of rule and his superior kingship.

Similarly, the speech of King David also acknowledged in Henry VII a monarch greater than himself. He hailed the king of England’s deeds as “more noble” than those of Charlemagne before saying, “I Dauid submytte to you my Swerde of victory.” The surrender of the sword was a “military gesture of submission,” recognizing Henry as both superior to King David, and as the rightful ruler of York. The gift did not bestow the quality of kingship on Henry or instruct him on how he should behave; it rather recognized that he already possessed the characteristics necessary for rule.

The gift of the Biblical King Solomon also recognized Henry’s kingship. According to the city council’s plans for the event, the six previous king Henries were to present Solomon with a sceptre. The plans called for Solomon to “yelde vnto [the king] the saide Ceptour in tokining that in hym is widome and Iustice.” The herald’s account shows Solomon handing the sceptre to Henry, “[s]ubmytting” it to the king’s “soueraignetie.” The surrender of the sceptre and Solomon’s recognition of Henry’s “superior wisdom” were an expression of confidence from the people of York. Rather than instructing Henry to act wisely, they expressed their faith and hope that he would

---

97 Ibid., 147.
98 Kipling, Enter the King, 135-37
100 Kipling, Enter the King, 135-37
103 Kipling, Enter the King, 135-37
continue to do so. The gifts presented to Henry VII in this royal entry recognized his kingship and the submission of the city to him.

This is especially evident when the role of wisdom in the entry of Henry VII into York is compared with its function in the entry of Henry VI into London. While Henry VII was portrayed as superior in wisdom even to King Solomon, the young Henry VI was depicted as requiring advice both on the importance of wisdom and on how to achieve it. In his entry, the pageant of Lady Wisdom gave instructions in very general terms that were not attached to a specific relationship or reign. This pageant featured a tabernacle of wisdom, with Lady Wisdom represented surrounded by “the sevyn sciences called lyberall” (234), Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, Music, Arithmetic, Geometry, and Astronomy (237-55). The poem describes each of the seven arts in detail over a total of four verses, with each art accompanied by a classical figure such as Aristotle (241). Wisdom was qualified as the “chieff pryncesse” of all the liberal arts (258). In this entry, wisdom was associated with the subject of schooling, indicating that the young Henry VI still had much to learn.

The words of Dame Sapience insisted that Henry should rule through her, and thereby through the seven liberal arts. In John Carpenter’s Latin letter, we are told that “habebant namque dicta domina notulas illas allectivas proverbiorum capiti suo superscriptas: Per me Reges regnunt et gloriam sapientes possidebunt.” According to Lydgate,

---

105 LBK, ff. 103v-104r.  
107 LBK, f. 104r.
“Kynges,” quod she, “moste off excellence
By me they regne and most in ioye endure,
For thurh my helpe, and my besy cure,
To encrece theyre glorie and hyh renoun,
They shull off wysdome haue fful possessioun.” (260-64)

Here, the pageant organizers, through the figure of Lady Wisdom, reminded the king that he should rule with her help if he wanted to achieve glory and renown.

Significantly, the remarks were addressed to all “Kynges.” The lesson that the achievement of glory depended on wisdom was presented as important for all rulers.

The pageant ended with a reminder to the king that this was an especially important lesson for him to learn: “To yonge kynges seyynge in this wyse,” “Vnderstondith and lernyth off the wyse...” (268-69) Unlike Henry VII, Henry VI was not portrayed as a wise monarch; he was instead treated as being still “in the nursery,” in need of instruction on the basics of kingship.

The wisdom of King Solomon also played a different role in the entry of Henry VI than it did in the York entry of Henry VII. In this pageant, a child dressed as the king was surrounded by three women representing Mercy, Truth, and Clemency. 

108 Carpenter has “Et ante prefatas sciencias et doctores in fronte Tabernaculi scriptum erat illud exhortatorium Davidicum juvenibus Regibus congruum: Et nunc Reges intelligite erudimini qui judicatis terram.” LBK, f. 104r.

109 Straker, “Propaganda, Intentionality, and the Lancastrian Lydgate,” 120.

110 Or perhaps Memory, Truth, and Clemency. While Lydgate refers to “A lady, Mercy...A lady, Trouthe...[and] [t]he lady Clemens,” (279-83), Carpenter and the Lambeth Palace version both indicate “dominam Memoriam in dextris et dominam Veritatem in Sinistris, assistentes dominam eriam Clemenciam...” LBK, f. 104r. (In Lambeth, the words “dominam eriam” are reversed.)
For, by the sentence off prudent Salamon,  
Mercy\(^ {111} \) and Riht kepyn evry kyng,  
And Clemence kepte by Resoun  
His mythy throne fffrom myschieff and ffalyng,  
And makith yt stronge with lange abydyng  
For I darr say thes sayde ladyes three  
A kyng preserve in lange prosperityee. \((286-92)\)

According to Solomon, Mercy and Right are necessary for “evry kyng.” Again, this was presented as a lesson to Henry VI, complete with a warning that if he did not display these qualities, his mighty throne would be threatened. The allegorical figures of Mercy, Truth, and Clemency were present to help support Henry and “[t]he Kyngis thronestronglytoenbrace” \((277-85)\). As Scott-Morgan Straker has argued, here the king was shown to be “not yet governing but governed, dependent on female virtues for his inner character and on male expertise for his public office.”\(^ {112} \) At ten years old, Henry VI was not a ruler in full possession of his powers. He was a “younge kynge” in need of guidance, still developing “the inner and spiritual qualities that he would need to be a good king to his people.”\(^ {113} \)

While the royal entries of Henry VI in London, Margaret of Anjou in London, and Henry VII in York all had a didactic function, these functions were not approached in the same way. Margaret of Anjou was represented as the bearer of grace, bringing the gift of peace between France and England. The entry of Henry VII into York characterized the king as a wise and rightful monarch, and requested that he be kind to

\(^ {111} \) In Carpenter’s version, it is memory and truth that keep the king—“Memoriaet Veritas custodiunt Regem, et Clementia roboratur thronus ejus”—while Lambeth, like Lydgate, refers instead to mercy and truth: “Misericordia & veritas custodiunt Regem & clemencia roborabitur tronus ejus.” LBK f. 104r; Lambeth Palace Library, MS Lambeth 12 f. 255r col. b. For the Biblical source of this pageant scripture, see Richard H. Osberg, “The Lambeth Palace Library Manuscript Account of Henry VI’s 1432 London Entry,” *Mediaeval Studies* 52 (1990), 258-59.

\(^ {112} \) Straker, “Propaganda, Intentionality, and the Lancastrian Lydgate,” 120.

\(^ {113} \) Kipling, *Enter the King*, 163.
the citizens of the city. The gifts presented to him were an act of homage, the giving of which stressed York’s recognition of his inherent wisdom, justice, and good rule. Each of these two entries focused on very specific requests for the monarch. Expectations and hopes were presented to these two rulers without an accompanying sense of doubt in their ability to fulfill them. Henry VI, however, was represented not only as a king, but also as a child, needing to learn such virtues as strength, cunning, pity, humility, intelligence, and wisdom. Like Parisians reminding the king that he should behave as did the ancient French rulers, Londoners used the royal entry pageants to convey their expectations to the king.

A second important part of this message was the way the city portrayed itself. The organizers of Margaret of Anjou’s entry depicted London as welcoming the new queen with open arms and an outpouring of joy. While the Last Judgement pageant did contain a warning to Margaret that she would be judged after death, it focused more on the rewards she would enjoy for bringing peace than the possibility of punishment if she did not. Neither the city nor the princess was portrayed as superior to the other.

The York entry of Henry VII, however, shows the extent to which the civic officials of York felt threatened by the royal presence. The continued emphasis on the king’s right to rule, and on the submission of the keys of the city, the crown of its legendary founder, David’s sword of victory, and Solomon’s sceptre of wisdom, reveals York’s concerns. Had the city’s loyalty to the king already been established, this show of submission would not have been necessary.

In this sense, the 1486 York entry is reminiscent of the 1392 entry of Richard II into London. In May 1392, Richard had removed the royal administration from London to York. He replaced the mayor and sheriffs of the city with a royal warden and his own
chosen sheriffs, and seized the city’s liberties. Forced to comply with the king’s requests in order to regain their privileges, Londoners staged a reconciliation entry on August 21, 1392.\(^{114}\) Like the citizens of York in 1486, fourteenth-century Londoners portrayed themselves as submitting to the king’s mercy, saying:

> “En, rex, cuius ut est nimium metuenda potestas,
> Sic et amanda nimirum, nec reverenda minus:
> En, humiles cives, vestris pedibus provoluti,
> Reddunt se vobis et sua cunta simul.
> Clavibus hiis gladioque, renunciat urbs modo sponte:
> Vestre voluntati prompta subesse venit.”\(^ {115}\)

Here, London is humbled before the king’s power, surrendering to his will. The advice given to Henry VI in his 1432 London entry stands in sharp contrast to this vision of a supplicant London. In the 1432 entry, the pageant organizers felt sufficiently secure to cast themselves in the important role of advisor to the king. The mayor and aldermen of the city were represented as the providers of the “goode counsaylle” that the king was advised to employ. Henry was reminded that “Kynges…of excellence” should apply the recommendations given to him by London, the “Citee of Citees” (510).

In casting itself as the king’s advisor, London tapped into an existing tradition of advice to rulers: medieval advice literature, for example, was often used as a safer method of criticism than addressing the king directly.\(^ {116}\) Even the advice manuals

---


115 Translated as: “Your majesty, whose awful power is to be feared/And also to be loved, and equally revered./Behold: your humble citizens, beneath your feet/Surrender all they have and their own selves to you./With keys and sword the city gives up willingly:/It comes all ready to surrender to your will.” Maidstone, Richard Maidstone: Concordia, 136-41.

themselves addressed the theme of advising the ruler, arguing that in order to rule well, a
king must in turn be ruled—by taking good advice.\textsuperscript{117} The discourse surrounding the
depositions of Richard II and Edward II was preoccupied with the theme of advice,
accusing the kings of having trusted the wrong counselors.\textsuperscript{118} In 1432, Londoners took
this tradition one step further by portraying the king as a child and themselves as the
stronger power in the king-capital relationship, the providers of good counsel.

London’s strength was also implied through the pageant figures chosen to
represent the city. By virtue of offering Londoners’ advice to the king, these allegorical
and Biblical figures were associated with London and spoke with the city’s voice. These
figures included a powerful combination of the seven liberal arts; two groups of seven
celestial virgins; Nature, Grace, Fortune, Mercy, Truth, Clemency, and Pity; Wisdom
herself; Enoch and Eli; several judges and sergeants; and a giant carrying a sword.
Collectively, these impressive figures appeared to have gathered together at London’s
behest for the sole purpose of instructing the king.

London’s portrayal of itself as the king’s trusted advisor is especially evident in
the treatment of the giant which greeted Henry VI on his arrival at London Bridge. In
Carpenter’s version, the giant is described as follows:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., 39-40.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 67-88.
\end{flushright}
Et deinde equitando per medium Burgi de Suthwerk pervenit ad exteriorem fenem Civitatis prope pontem ubi parabatur machina, satis pulcra, in cujus medio stabat Gigas mire magnitudinis, vibrans et extendens gladium in hostes regie magesstatis, hac proinde scriptura circumcunctus: *Inimicos ejus induam confusione.* Ex utroque quidem latere ipsius Gigantis in eadem pagina eriebantur duo animalia vocata Antelops que Regnorum Anglie et Ffrancie arma vexillatim fulgentia patule supportabant.

According to Lydgate,

> Ther was a pyler reysed lyke a tour
> And ther-on stoode a sturdy champeoun
> Off looke and chere sterne as a lyoun,
> His swerde vp rered proudely gan manace,
> Alle fforeyn enmyes ffrom the Kyng to enchace.
>
> And in deffence off his [e]state ryall
> The geaunt wolde abyde eche aventure;
> And alle assautes that wern marcyall,
> For his sake he proudly wolde endure,
> In toke whereof he hadde a scripture
> On eyther side declarying his entent,
> Which seyde thus by goode avysement:

> “Alle tho that ben enemyes to the Kyng,
> I shall hem clothe with confusioun,
> Make him myhty with vertuous levying
> His mortall foon to oppressen and bere adoun,
> And him to encresen as Cristis champioun,
> Alle myscheffes ffrom hym to abrigge
> With the grace of God at thentryng off the Bridge.” (71-91)

---


120 LBK, f. 103v. Translated as: “There was a device which was made ready, rather fine, on the middle of which stood a giant of amazing size, brandishing and thrusting his sword against the enemies of the King’s Majesty, and girdled with this text, ‘I shall clothe his enemies in confusion.’ On either side of the giant himself, in the same pageant, were set up two animals called ‘antelopes,’ which supported the arms of the kingdoms of England and France, shining forth like a banner.” Caroline M. Barron, “Pageantry on London Bridge in the Early Fifteenth Century,” in *‘Bring furth the pageants’: Essays in Early English Drama presented to Alexandra F. Johnston* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 100.
This particular giant is clearly intended to protect the king: it will be his champion and
confuse his enemies. It represents a London that is more powerful than its royal visitor.

This is especially significant considering that the presence of a giant at this
pageant station was quite common: there is evidence for one in 1413 for Henry V’s
 coronation entry, in 1415 for the same king’s Agincourt triumph entry, and in 1421 for
Catherine de Valois’ coronation entry. Yet these giants did not always convey the
same message. The 1415 pageant featured a giant waiting to greet Henry V “with
abundant praise”:

[C]um ventum est ad turrium in introitu pontis, quasi ad introitum in potencias
civitatis, sita est superius in culmine turris statua mire magnitudinis gigantea, que
respiciens in faciem Regis ferebat, velut duellio, securim magnum in dextra,
sinistra vero claves civitatis in baculo pendentes, ut ianitor. In cuius dextro latere
stetit effigies, non multum minoris magnitudinis, muliebris, clamide coccinea et
feminalibus ornamentoe induta, quasi vir et uxor qui in apparatibus culciornbus
domini sui faciem desideratam viderent et reciperent plena laude...et habuit a
fronte hanc elegantem et convenientem scripturam impressam parieti: Civitas
Regis Iusticie.

This giant couple welcomed and acknowledged Henry V, rather than offering him
protection. Similarly, the 1421 giant expressed London’s obedience to its new queen: it

122 Frank Taylor and John S. Roskell, trans., Gesta Henrici Quinti: The deeds of Henry
the Fifth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 103. Translated as: “When the tower at the
entrance of the bridge was reached, there was seen placed high on top of it, and
representing as it were the entrance into the city’s jurisdiction, an image of a giant of
astonishing size who, looking down upon the king’s face, held, like a champion, a great
axe in his right hand and, like a warder, the keys of the city hanging from a baton in his
left. At his right stood a figure of a woman, not much smaller in size, wearing a scarlet
mantle and adornments appropriate to her sex; and they were like a man and wife who,
in their richest attire, were bent upon seeing the eagerly awaited face of their lord and
welcoming him with abundant praise....this choice and appropriate legend [was]
inscribed on the wall: Civitas Regis Iusticie.”
"appears to have been able to move so that as the queen arrived it bent its head in obeisance to her."\textsuperscript{123}

Hiis & aliis gaudiois regina ducebatur in urbem, quam inventit non modo terrestrem civitatem, ymmo quasi novam, monilibus ornatam, de coelo ad tempus prolapsam, ubi istac immensae staturae gigantes, artificii mirabilis, quasi vividi, portarum conservantes aditus, introiunti reginae, submissis sictis cervicubus, & flexis poplicibus, obsequia sua videbantur offere.\textsuperscript{124}

The 1432 giant, then, is unusual in that it represents a London that is stronger than the king—and is therefore in a position to advise him. How the city depicted itself was just as important as the messages given to the king in the pageant speeches and scriptures.

The London entry of Henry VI portrayed a different set of expectations for the ten-year-old king than did the entries of adult rulers. In recognizing that this dual monarch was still a child-king, the London officials who planned the event articulated both the qualities they hoped Henry would learn, and their own privileged position as members of the English capital. As Noël Coulet argues, the English royal entry had an important role in "le système de communication de la monarchie."\textsuperscript{125} That role was just as important for the English city. English royal entries were held for a number of purposes: reconciliations between king and city, as with Richard II in 1392 and Henry VII in 1486; military triumphs, such as Henry V's 1415 entry; and inaugural events, such as the post-coronation(s) entry of Henry VI, the arrival of queens such as Catherine de Valois and Margaret of Anjou into the country, and the accession of Henry VII. The employment of these events for multiple purposes suggests that they were used as a communication tool that could be adapted to a variety of circumstances. This is even more evident when we consider the fact that even entries planned for similar purposes—

\textsuperscript{123} Barron, "Pageantry on London Bridge in the Early Fifteenth Century," 95.
\textsuperscript{124} Thomas Hearne, ed., \textit{Vita & Gesta Henrici Quinti} (Oxford, 1727), 297.
such as the inaugural entries of Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou, and Henry VII—adapted common pageant stations and themes to suit the organizers' purposes. Elements such as wisdom, gift-giving, and even the presence of a giant on London bridge might remain the same from one entry to the next. The pageants, however, were altered in such a way as to present the city as a supplicant, a welcome recipient of grace, or the king’s trusted advisor, depending on the political circumstances. The adaptation of pageant routes and themes to convey specific messages to specific rulers shows that royal entries were employed as a form of communication that could be used in and adapted to a wide variety of circumstances.

This highlights the importance of studying each royal entry individually, rather than using a purely thematic approach. Focusing on the liturgy and on the royal entry as an art form, Kipling centres on the imagery of the Saint Denis gate pageant, seeing the opening hearts as an expression of Parisian loyalty. He considers the crowns held over Henry VI’s head in the Châtelet pageant as a “stagecraft miracle...declar[ing] the King’s divine election.” Yet the speeches and signs accompanying these pageants, the political circumstances of the period, and the different applications of similar themes in other entries suggest a very different message. English entry organizers, too, re-used concepts and themes such as wisdom and giants on London Bridge. Considering these elements in isolation from their accompanying explanations, or in isolation from the pageants preceding or following them—for example, as expressions of the “ideal monarchical order”—risks ignoring the individuality of fifteenth-century entries.127

126 Kipling, Enter the King, 87.
127 Bryant, The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony, 15.
CHAPTER 2

RELATING THE ENTRY: THE EVIDENCE OF A GENRE

The civic organizers of Henry VI’s Paris and London entries used these processions as a vehicle for political communication. Their audience included entry participants and spectators, as well as the king and his party. Our knowledge of these two events depends on a series of detailed descriptions in Latin, Middle English, and Middle French. What was the contemporary function of these documents? This is an important question considering how many of them remain. London Metropolitan Archives, MS Letter Book K (LBK) contains both a French account of the Paris entry (f. 101v-103r) and a Latin letter—written by London’s common clerk, John Carpenter—describing the London entry (f. 103V-104V).¹ Other descriptions of the London entry include John Lydgate’s Middle English poem, likely based on the LBK description and surviving in seven manuscripts, as well as twelve prose chronicle descriptions that, in turn, may or may not be based on Lydgate’s version.² A second Latin description of the


London entry survives in Lambeth Palace, MS Lambeth 12 (f. 255r-v) (Lambeth).

Although its relationship to the longer LBK version is unknown, the wording of both Latin versions is nearly identical where their content overlaps. The Paris entry is also described in Middle French by two chroniclers, Enguerrand de Monstrelet and the anonymous so-called Bourgeois de Paris. In addition, the Parisian municipality’s financial records contain details of spending on the entry pageants. The Parlement de Paris also recorded its deliberations on the procession.

Recent historiography has recognized the importance of considering both the contemporary usage and material structure of medieval documents. Paul Strohm, for example, reminds us that while a historical text may contribute to a study of history, it is important to ask “the history of what?” On historians’ use of the term “source,” Joseph Morsel argues that

---


Quant à “source,” elle fait du document un point de départ, alors qu’il s’agit en premier lieu d’un point d’arrivée: que le document soit éventuellement le point de départ du travail de l'historien ne doit en aucun cas faire disparaître le fait qu’il est d'abord non seulement le produit de sa société, mais un object produit. 7

Similarly, Stephen G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel stress the importance of studying manuscripts themselves, rather than considering only the texts the manuscripts preserve:

Arguing that the individual manuscript contextualizes the text(s) it contains in specific ways, materialist philology seeks to analyze the consequences of this relationship on the way these texts may be read and interpreted. More particularly, it postulates the possibility that a given manuscript, having been organized along certain principles, may well present its text(s) according to its own agenda...Far from being a transparent or neutral vehicle, the codex can have a typological identity that affects the way we read and understand the texts it presents. The manuscript agency—manuscript kind or identity—can thus offer social or anthropological insights into the way its texts were or could have been read by the patron or public to which it was diffused. 8

In a similar manner, Brigitte Bedos-Rezak considers French charters ca. 1000-1230 to be “processes” as well as “products” that provide desired information. 9 In order to understand medieval documents, we must understand “their operations within the society that produced them...” 10 Most importantly, we must remember that “any source is primarily a source about itself.” 11

---

11 Ibid., 333.
There is growing recognition of the potential value of using royal entry
descriptions as “sources about themselves.” Sheila Lindenbaum reminds us that
medieval dramatic texts are often preserved in ways that suggest they were intended for
readers, not performers. It is therefore important to consider the articulation and
transmission of these texts, in addition to considering their treatment of dramatic
events.\textsuperscript{12} Sarah Tolmie, for example, argues that the verse account of Henry V’s royal
entry into London in 1415 “was intended to join a corpus of texts for the dissemination
of propaganda, the records of historians, the determination of protocol, even perhaps for
the study of scholars.”\textsuperscript{13} For Cynthia Brown, illuminated manuscript descriptions of
royal entries add a new dimension to the event, “celle de la lecture.”\textsuperscript{14} Manuscripts such
as those describing the royal entry and funeral of Anne of Brittany (1504 and 1514)
functioned as “cultural artifacts,” and were clearly used for a specific purpose.\textsuperscript{15} The
presentation of the queen in the text and in the miniatures of the entry description
indicate that the manuscript “obviously constituted part of the royal public relations
effort to control the very image that was transmitted to the king’s subjects.”\textsuperscript{16} Its focus
on the queen differed from the event’s emphasis on the city and its guilds.\textsuperscript{17} Brown
shows that this manuscript was used after the entry had occurred, in order to create a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Sheila Lindenbaum, “Drama as Textual Practice,” in \textit{Middle English}, ed. Paul Strohm
\item \textsuperscript{13} Sarah Tolmie, “Quia hic homo multa signa facit: Henry V’s Royal Entry into London,
November 23, 1415,” in \textit{The Propagation of Power in the Medieval West: Selected
Proceedings of the International Conference, Groningen 20-23 November 1996
} (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1997), 377.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Cynthia J. Brown, “Introduction,” in \textit{Les entrées royales à Paris de Marie
\item \textsuperscript{15} Cynthia J. Brown, “Books in Performance: The Parisian Entry (1504) and Funeral
\item \textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 80.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 81-82.
\end{itemize}
specific memory of the event—in this case, a memory that favoured the monarchy.

Extending the argument to printed entry descriptions in France, Joël Blanchard argues that the development of these printed texts gave the entry both a cultural and a social function, in which entry descriptions were deliberately contrived to construct a specific memory of how the event occurred. Only after the event could a commentary be created that would impose a definitive view of the entry.\(^1\)

Despite the increased focus on studying royal entry documents, work on the descriptions of Henry VI’s royal entries remains ambivalent. For historians and for scholars of medieval drama, descriptions such as John Lydgate’s Middle English poem are to be avoided because they either provide inaccurate representations of what happened during the event, or do not adequately account for the full experience of the crowd during the entry. R. M. Smuts, for example, argues that “the elaborate allegorical schemes recorded in printed accounts of royal processions often bear little relationship to what most spectators actually saw.”\(^1\)

Focusing on the published accounts of entries,

---

\(^1\) Joël Blanchard, “Le spectacle du rite: les entrées royales,” *Revue historique* 305, no.627 (2003), 479. For the role of writing in the royal entry event itself, see Cynthia J. Brown, “From Stage to Page: Royal Entry Performances in Honour of Mary Tudor (1514),” in *Book and Text in France, 1400-1600: Poetry on the Page*, ed. Adrian Armstrong and Malcolm Quainton (Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2007), 49-72. This royal entry was organized by Pierre Gringore, who also produced a book description the event. Brown argues that “Gringore’s entry theatres, as defined through his account of them, were essentially decorated book folios which the queen ‘read’ as she made her entry through Paris in 1514. By the same token, the illuminated manuscript account that Gringore dedicated to Queen Mary Tudor contained its own codicological dramas, including the painted reproductions of Gringore’s *tableaux vivants* and the artistic *mises-en-scène* of poetic texts that had originally been exhibited on stage or orally transmitted. In this sense, both the entry theatres and their manuscript reconstructions can be defined as ‘books in performance.’”

he argues, results in neglect of the full experience of the event.\textsuperscript{20}

Similarly, Gordon Kipling discounts Lydgate’s poem for its likely inaccuracy in describing the 1432 entry:

Most references to this triumph assume that the poet John Lydgate devised it. Over eighty years ago, however, H. N. MacCracken pointed out that Lydgate’s poem merely versifies a letter written by the London town clerk, John Carpenter. A glance at the poem shows that Lydgate probably did not personally witness the civic triumph. [Furthermore, at least three other] important reports all depend in great measure upon Lydgate.\textsuperscript{21}

Kipling concludes that “only Carpenter’s [version] and the Lambeth Palace manuscript have any significant authority,” and his discussion therefore “draws mainly from [LBK and Lambeth]... Occasionally, however, Lydgate’s verse serves as a convenient representation of Carpenter’s letter.”\textsuperscript{22} In discounting Lydgate’s authority, however, Kipling simultaneously highlights Lydgate’s contemporary appeal. Whether or not the poet witnessed the event, it was his account that informed subsequent descriptions of it. Contemporaries, it would seem, also found Lydgate’s poem to be a “convenient representation” of the entry. It is precisely because of the disconnect between “what most spectators actually saw” and what the more detailed accounts of entries present as having occurred that we should study these descriptions—if not as perfect witnesses to the events they purport to describe, then as documents with a contemporary function.

So far, of the descriptions of Henry VI’s entries, only Lydgate’s poem has been studied for its contemporary role as a literary work, rather than solely as a source of

\begin{flushright}
20 Ibid., 65-67.
\end{flushright}
information about the event. For C. David Benson, for example, Lydgate’s version of the 1432 entry is one of the poet’s “civic” works. Scott-Morgan Straker uses the poem’s civic focus to argue that Lydgate was not a Lancastrian propagandist, while Reginald Webber sees the poem’s contents as a combination of royal propaganda, civic propaganda, and Lydgate’s own preference for peace. Maura Nolan argues that in the poem, Lydgate “combines…secular exemplarity, with…[a] historical understanding of the Roman past, with medieval spectacle” and that in so doing “he sutures together a specifically literary tradition with the social and cultural practice of a king’s entry...” The result is an address to a new form of public: “[s]uch a form of address does not imagine an audience of everyone...but it does imagine a wider, and smarter, audience than ever before.”

The remainder of the entry descriptions for Henry VI, however, have not been looked at in a similar way. Although LBK, Lambeth, and the chronicle descriptions have all been used as sources for the events they describe, the contemporary function of

---

these documents has not been explored. This is despite the fact that the unusual grouping of two entry descriptions in one manuscript—LBK—has been known since at least 1847, when Jules Delpit edited and printed them both in the same volume.\textsuperscript{27} Searching English archives for documents related to French history, Delpit wrote that the Paris entry description in LBK was “le document le plus curieux, relatif à l’histoire de notre capitale…”\textsuperscript{28} He found it so curious that he also included Carpenter’s letter describing the London entry in his \textit{Collection générale des documents français qui se trouvent en Angleterre}. The LBK unit entered English-language scholarship in Henry Thomas Riley’s 1861 translation of John Carpenter’s \textit{Liber Albus}. Commenting on “a fact of some interest that has not, it is believed, been hitherto remarked,” Riley called attention to John Carpenter’s “lengthy and curious description” of the London entry of Henry VI, located “after his Coronation at Paris” in LBK.\textsuperscript{29} The existence of a London manuscript containing descriptions of both Henry VI’s Paris and London entries has, therefore, been widely available knowledge since at least 1847.

Despite this, however, the LBK descriptions have to date only been used as sources about the events they describe. They have also only been treated separately, and never as a unit. This is perhaps due to the tendency to discuss Henry VI’s Paris and London entries as entirely separate events. Bernard Guenée and Françoise Lehoux’s \textit{Les entrées royales françaises de 1328 à 1515}, for example, is a collection of primary material on French royal entries. It includes an edition of the LBK Paris account with no

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., CLX.
mention of the fact that the manuscript in question also contains a description of Henry VI's entry into London.\textsuperscript{30}

It is this edition that is used by Lawrence M. Bryant in *The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony: Politics, Ritual, and Art in the Renaissance* (1986).\textsuperscript{31} In his 1994 article comparing the Paris and London entries of Henry VI, however, Bryant includes among his sources Delpit's edition of the Paris LBK account. Despite this version's inclusion of pageant speeches, and despite Bryant's interest in those speeches, his discussion of the Paris entry relies heavily on the chronicle *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris* in its English translation.\textsuperscript{32} He makes only indirect reference to the Paris LBK account.\textsuperscript{33} Although he uses both Carpenter and Lydgate as sources for the London entry, Bryant does not acknowledge that Carpenter's letter is also in LBK, or that Lydgate's version was in turn dependent on that letter. Bryant's use of Delpit's edition, which clearly indicates that both the Paris and London entry descriptions are from the same manuscript, demonstrates that Bryant had access to this information.

Similarly, Gordon Kipling uses both LBK descriptions when discussing the entries of

\textsuperscript{31} Lawrence M. Bryant, *The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony: Politics, Ritual, and Art in the Renaissance* (Geneva: Droz, 1986), 84-87, 127.
\textsuperscript{33} Lawrence M. Bryant, “Configurations of the Community in Late Medieval Spectacles: Paris and London during the Dual Monarchy,” in *City and Spectacle*, ed. Barbara Hanawalt and Kathryn Reyerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 3-33. Bryant provides a note Delpit's edition of the Paris LBK account in his discussion of the role of the Parlement in the entry (16n69). His discussion of the “a personification of Fama,” refers to a detail of the Paris pageants found only in the LBK description (24). Bryant’s reference to a pageant speech in the Paris entry comes from Polydore Vergil's 1532 *English History*. Bryant observes that “I have not found any contemporary reference to this speech...[o]bviously, more research is required” (15n67). See also Thomas J. Schoenberg, ed., “Polydore Vergil, 1470?-1555,” in *Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800*, (Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2005), 349.
Henry VI; Kipling, however, treats the Paris and London entries in two separate chapters, and therefore does not acknowledge the common origin of two of his sources. The approach of both Bryant and Kipling to the LBK descriptions neglects to consider the way these descriptions were transmitted. Their analysis does not account for the possibility that where a document is kept may contribute to its meaning.

What, then, can the multiple descriptions of Henry VI’s royal entries tell us about contemporary attitudes to these documents and events? What can their content, format, and method of production, preservation, and dissemination tell us about the function of the royal entry description in fifteenth-century Paris and London? The surviving descriptions of the entries of Henry VI can be divided into three categories: administrative documents, concerned with the logistics of the event; narrative chronicles, which describe the procession through the city in the context of other contemporary events; and descriptions such as John Lydgate’s poem, which treat the royal entry as a literary genre with specific conventions. These also include the LBK unit of entry descriptions, as well as the Lambeth Palace account of the London entry. While the administrative documents—in this case records of the municipality of Paris and of the Parlement—and the chronicle descriptions were created with specific goals, neither one of them treats entry descriptions as a separate literary genre with its own “particular form, style, or purpose.”

The descriptions’ contents and the ways they were preserved and circulated indicate that contemporaries saw Lydgate’s poem, the

---

34 The Oxford English Dictionary defines “genre” as a “particular style or category of works of art; esp. a type of literary work characterized by a particular form, style, or purpose.” “Genre,” in Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
Lambeth Palace manuscript, and the LBK descriptions as having a function beyond providing a description of the event itself.

For chroniclers, a royal entry was part of a larger narrative of events. Rarely, if ever, do they treat the entry as separate from the coronations or banquets that accompanied it. An anonymous London chronicler, for example, introduces the royal entry of Henry VI without once calling it a “royal entry”:

This same yere, the xvij day of Decembre, G beynge the dominical lettre, kyng Henry the vj te was crowned kyng of Fraunce at Parys, in the chirche of Notre Dame, with gret solempnyte and rialte; and anoon after he turned ayen into Engelond, and landed at Dovorr the ix day of Feverer’, and come to London the xxj day of the same month, where he was ryally rescyved, alle the craftes rydynge ayens hym all in white.35

The chroniclers for the Parisian entry open their descriptions in a similar manner; the Bourgeois de Paris begins:

Item, le jour Saint-André, darrain jour de novembre, vint gésir Henry, âgé de neuf ans ou environ, en l’abbaye de Saint-Denis en France, à un vendredi, lequel se nommait roi de France et d’Angleterre. Item, le dimanche ensuivant, premier jour des Advents, vint ledit roi à Paris par la porte Saint-Denis, laquelle porte devers les champs avait les armes de la ville...36

Neither one of these chroniclers separates the royal entry description from the rest of the narrative.

For Enguerrand de Monstrelet, too, Henry VI’s entry into Paris and his coronation afterwards were all part of the same event. He describes both in one chapter, which opens: “Environ l’issue du mois de novembre, vint le josne roy Henry, de


Pontoise à Saint-Denis en France, sur l’intencion d’aler à Paris pour lui faire enoindre, sacrer et couronner du royaume de France.”

Having introduced his subject matter, Monstrelet proceeds to describe both entry and coronation, without distinguishing between the two. His description of the final pageant leads directly into his account of the coronation:

Et à l’entrée de la porte de Chastelet avoit encore ung eschafault sur lequel avoit en personage ung petit enfant en samblance du roy, vestu de fleurs de lis, deux couronnes sur son chief. Et à son costé dextre estoit, en personnage, le duc de Bourgonge et le conte de Nevers, qui lui présentoient l’escu de France. Et au costé senestre, le duc de Bethfort, son oncle, et les contes de Warwick et de Salsebéry, qui lui présentoient l’escu d’Angleterre. Et estoient tous vestus, par personnages, des cotes d’armes des desusdiz seigneurs. Et de là, s’en ala au Palais...Et puis fut mené à l’ostel aux Tournelles, pour prendre son repos....Et lendemain fut mené au Bois de Vicennes où il fut jusques au XVe jour dudit mois de décembre, qu’il retourna au Palais. Et le XVe jour se partit de là, à tout grand seigneurie, tant de gens d’églises comme de séculiers, et s’en vint en l’église de Nostre-Dame de Paris pour estre sacré.

For the London chronicler, the anonymous Bourgeois de Paris, and Enguerrand de Monstrelet, there was no distinction between coronation and royal entry.

Lambeth, Lydgate, and LBK, however, treat the entry as completely distinct from the coronation or other events that accompanied it. These descriptions both begin and end with the entry itself. On the Paris entry, for example, the LBK account begins: “L’an de grace mil IIIIe XXXI, le dimenche deuxiesme jour du mois de decembre, primer jour de l’Advent, vint et fist son entré en la ville de Paris Henry, par la grace de Dieu roy de France et d’Angleterre...” The use of the phrase “son entré en la ville” shows that the author considered the entry to be a distinct event. Accordingly, this

38 Ibid., 5:4-5.
39 London Metropolitan Archives, MS Letter Book K (LBK), f. 101v.
account ends with the culmination of the procession, and not the beginning of the coronation:

Et dela, chevaucha jusques au dit hostel des Tournelles, ouquel il feu recue moult honorablyment par madame Anne de Bourgoingne, duchesse de Bedford... Et estoit ce dit jour toutes les rues par ou le dit roy passa tendues et parees de moult riches tapisseries en plusieurs lieux, et la plus grant partie tendues a ciel, et avoit en icelles rues, pour icelui jour, tant de peuple que a peine se povoit on contournier.40

The LBK description is framed by Henry’s entrance into the city and his disappearance from sight as he entered the duke of Bedford’s palace.

Similarly, John Carpenter’s letter and the Lambeth Palace description are both bookended by Henry’s entry into London and his exit from the city to Westminster, outside London’s walls.41 Both open by introducing the subject matter: “Inter cetera que nobilis illa Civitas Londoniensis ordinavit pro gaudio reventus suppremi domini sui Regis Henrici Sexti...”42 The Lambeth Palace version ends with the last pageant: “illud propheticum emitet Longitudine dierum replebo eum pro primo Et ostendam illi salutare meum pro secundo. Explicit,” while Carpenter’s includes the civic officials’ visit to Westminster on the following day, when they presented the king with a gift of £1000.00:

Et post hec die sabbati vicesimo secundo die ffebruarii tunc proximo, prefati maior et aldermani una cum certis aliiis de notabilioribus Civitatis, assumptis secum mille libris auri purissimi positis in quodam eminenti vaso aureo ad modum sportule artificiose composito accesserunt ad eundem dominum Regem in palacio suo antedicto.... A quo versa vice grates uberes et favores regios amplissimi recuperunt, reversi sunt ad propria cum ingenti gaudio et honore.43

40 Ibid., f. 103r.
42 LBK, f. 103v. Lambeth opens: “Inter cetera que nobilis illa civitas London ordinavit pre gaudio reuentus supreme domini sui Regis Henrici sexti...” Lambeth Palace Library, MS Lambeth 12 (Lambeth), f. 255r col. a.
43 Lambeth, f. 255v col. b; LBK, f. 104v.
Neither one of these versions describes the events that took place before or after the king entered London, processed through it, and ended at the royal seat of Westminster.

Lydgate's poem, too, treats the entry as a discrete event. It opens with a stanza describing the fair weather in London on the occasion of the entry, and continues:

The stormy reyne off alle theyre hevynesse
Were passed away and alle her olde grevaunce,
For the vjte Herry, roote off here gladnesse,
Theyre herits ioye, theyre worldis suffisaunce,
By trewe dissent crovnyd kyng off Fraunce,
The hevene reioysyng the day off his repayre
Made his komyng the wedir to be so ffayre. (8-14)

His description of the event ends, like Carpenter's letter, with the presentation of the city's gift to the king:

The which giffte they goodly haue dysposyd,
Toke an hamper off golde that shene shone,
A Ml pounde off golde ther-inne yclosyd;
And ther-with-all to the Kyng they goone
And ffylle on knees to-forn him euerychoone... (503-7)

These accounts of the entries of Henry VI, unlike the chronicle descriptions, consider the royal entry to be an event with a clearly defined beginning and end. Treating the royal entry as a discrete event is one of the conventional forms and styles of the royal entry genre.45

These descriptions of Henry VI's entries also differ from the narrative and administrative accounts in the scope of their content. Lydgate, Lambeth, and LBK focus

44 Following this, Lydgate also includes another three stanzas praising the city of London, and an envoi in praise of John Wells.
45 Theresa Coletti's "Reading REED" suggests that one of the difficulties with the selection process of the Records of Early English Drama project is that it artificially creates "dramatic" texts, removing these dramatic descriptions from their original context. See "Reading REED," in Literary Practice and Social Change in Britain, 1380-1530, ed. Lee Patterson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 267-68. Royal entry descriptions, however, appear to have already been arranged as distinct dramatic texts.
on describing the entry pageants themselves, including any speeches made, descriptions of the pageant actors, and the text of signs displayed during the event. Sometimes, these accounts also offer interpretations of what the pageants were intended to signify.

Chronicles, however, "almost invariably pay less attention to parables than to the sheer spectacle of the court as it moved along public thoroughfares." On the pageant of the Worthies in the Paris entry, for example, Enguerrand de Monstrelet tells us that accompanying the civic officials:

\[\text{estoient grand nombre des plus notables bourgeois de Paris, vestus et affublés de vermeil. Et après qu'ilz eurent faite la révérence, virent au devant dudit roy les IX preux et les IX preuses, à cheval, chascun et chascune armés et armées des armes à lui appertenans. En après virent le Chevalier du Guet, le Prévost des Marchans, avec eulx les officiers de la court, tous vestus de pers et chapperons vermaulx.}\]

Similarly, the Bourgeois de Paris relates that "Item, devant lui avait les neuf preux et les neuf preuses dames, et après foison chevaliers et écuyers, et entre les autres était Guillaume qui se disait le Berger..." Neither of these two authors elaborates on the identity, appearance, or significance of the Worthies. By contrast, the LBK account describes the pageant as follows:

\[\text{en approchant la dicte bonne ville de Paris, vint audevant dudit seigneur une deesse nommée Fima [Fama], moult richement aourne, monté sur une coursier couvert des armes de la dicte ville de Paris; c'est assavoir: de champ de guelles a chief de France et une neif d'argent envoillé. Et estoit icelle deesse accompagnée de personnages representans les anciens IX preux et IX preuses, dont les noms s'ensuivent.}\]

The author then proceeds to list all eighteen worthies, in two columns, before describing their appearance:

---

47 de Monstrelet, La chronique d'Enguerrand de Monstrelet, 5:2.
49 LBK, f. 101v.
Iceulx preux et preuses, tous armés et montés sur coursiers, tous couvers de fins bougrans batus d’or et d’argent aux armes que les dessudiz portoient en leurs plaines vies. Et audevant dicelle deesse et preux chevauchoit un herault vestu de robe vermeille et chapperon d’azur, et pardessus une tunique des armes de la dicte ville de Paris, lequel menoit et conduisoit le dit mistere. Et si tost qu’il apperceust le dit roy, mist pee a terre et lui fist la reverence par trois foiz; et ce fait lui presenta icelle deese et preux en disant ce qui s’ensuit:

Les preux jadiz et renommee
Tendoient qui est figure
Ci en dame et vous represente
Paris, qui de tout s’entente,
Sire, vous reçoit humblement.
Gardez-la amoureusement
Car cele ville ainsi famee
Est digne d’estre bien gouverné.\(^{50}\)

The chroniclers describe this entire pageant in only a few lines. The LBK version, however, names each of the pageant characters and describes their clothing; identifies the city as the pageant organizer; and records the content of the speech accompanying the pageant. This description, unlike the chronicle versions, provides the reader with the city’s interpretation of the pageant figures as representatives of Paris—“une tunique des armes de la dicte ville de Paris”—and as reminding the king of the city’s renown.

The pageant of the three empresses in the London entry receives similar treatment in Carpenter’s letter, the Lambeth Palace version, and Lydgate’s poem. In Carpenter’s version, we are informed that:

Super ipsum vero pontem speciosa fabrica splendoris eximii relucebat, in qua tres imperatrices et domine mirabilis splendore choruscantes: Natura suple (sic) Gratia et Ffortuna consedebant. Et assurgentes in adventu Regis, ipsum pretereuntem suis bonis beatis munerabant: Natura scilicet, fortitudine et decore Gracia, sapientia et intellectu; Ffortuna, divitiis et honoribus, habentes illud davidicum pedibus suis antescriptum Intende, prospere, procede, et regna. Quasi dicerent: Intende prospere per fortunam; procede longene per naturam et regna virtuose per gratiam.\(^{51}\)

\(^{50}\) Ibid., f. 102r.
\(^{51}\) Ibid., ff. 103v-104r.
Both Latin descriptions continue with the appearance of seven virgins alongside the three empresses, the presentation of seven more allegorical gifts to the king, and the welcome song that ended the pageant.

Lydgate begins his description of this pageant in a similar way, informing us that

Nature gaff him [Henry] eke strenth and ffeyrenesse,
Forto be lovyd and dredde off euery wiht;
Fortune gaff him eke prosperite and richesse,
With this scripture apperyng in their siht,
To him applyed off verrey dewe riht,
"First vndirstonde and ioyfully procede
And lange to regne" the scripture seyde in dede.

This ys to mene, who-so vndirstonde a-riht,
Thow shalt be Fortune haue lange prosperite;
And be Nature thow shalt haue strenth and myht,
Forth to procede in lange ffelicite;
And Grace also hath graunted vnto the,
Vertuously lange in thy ryall cittee,
With septrre and crovne to regne in equyte. (141-54)

Lydgate's description—including the seven virgins and their seven gifts—is a total of eighteen stanzas long. Like the LBK description of the Paris entry, and both Latin versions of the London entry, Lydgate provided script-like detail. Unlike the chronicles—where pageant descriptions are brief and almost take second place to the movement of the procession—this provides detail of the pageant figures and their actions.
Finally, while narrative or administrative descriptions may also discuss the reactions of the crowd or of the king and his party, Lydgate, LBK, and Lambeth focus more on the pageants themselves. The financial records of the municipality of Paris, for example, record the reaction of the king’s company to the wine provided from the Ponceau fountain; it was apparently enjoyed by “plusieurs chevaliers et gens darmes qui estoient en la compagnie du roy.” On the same pageant, the Bourgeois de Paris describes the king’s reaction to the presence of three mermaids in the fountain:

“Item...et en ce point [le roi] vint à Paris et regarda moult les sirenes du Ponceau-Saint-Denis, car là avait trois sirenes moult bien ordonnées...”

The LBK version of this pageant, however, merely notes that “au ponceau Saint Denis...avoit trois seraines moult belles et gettoit icelle fontaine, parmi un liz, vin, ypocras et eaue a tous venans.” For these versions, the king’s reaction to the pageant is immaterial. What matters is the pageant itself: the mermaids, the fleur-de-lis, and the fountain of wine. The focus is on the civic production, not the king’s reaction to it.

Likewise, on the pageant of Saint Denis, the chronicler Monstrelet writes, “[e]t sur la porte fut jouée la légende de Saint Denis; et fut voulentiers veue des Anglois.” The LBK version, however, is silent on the reactions of the crowd or of those participating in the procession:

Et a l’ancienne porte Saint Denis, y avoit un escarfault a revers...sur lequel estoient...personnages vifz, remonstrans par contenance et sans mouvoir trois histories de saint Denis...Et dessus a l’endroit de chacun histoire, estoit escript en bien grosse lettre en table aux ce qui s’ensuit:...
This version also contains four four-line stanzas of verse that are not included in either the chronicles or the municipality’s records. For LBK, Lambeth, and Lydgate, the focus is on the pageants of the procession, and not the experience of witnessing the entry or of planning it. These versions recognize the content of the entry procession as the subject of interest.

Descriptions treating the royal entry as a genre also differ from administrative records and narrative accounts in the way they were preserved and circulated. When London mayor John Wells commissioned John Lydgate to write a poem describing the 1432 entry, he did much more than to hire someone to publicly praise his own role as a “noble Meire” (29). In turning to Lydgate, Wells commissioned a well-known poet, one who had previously written for both court and city patrons. In 1412, the Prince of Wales—later Henry V—had commissioned from Lydgate a translation of Guido della Colonna’s *Historia Destructionis Troiae*, known as the *Troy Book*.⁵⁷ For Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, Lydgate had produced the *Serpent of Division* (ca. 1422); an “immense translation of *The Fall of Princes*, based on Laurent de Premierfait’s version of Boccaccio’s *De Casibus virorum illustrium,*” which he began in 1431; and the poem known as “On Gloucester’s Approaching Marriage.”⁵⁸ Lydgate was also known for a number of “Lancastrian” works praising the dual monarchy of Henry VI. Among these poems were the “Title and Pedigree of Henry VI,” commissioned by Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick (1426); “A Prayer for King, Queen, and People”; the “Roundel for the Coronation of Henry VI”; and the “Ballade for the Coronation [of

Henry VI].”

Lydgate’s civic works included a series of mummmings for the mercers, the goldsmiths, and the sheriffs of London (1429-30), as well as the Dance of Death at St Paul’s.

John Wells hired a poet who was known to both court and city, and who had experience producing verse for specific occasions. Wells was seeking someone who could turn Henry VI’s entry into London into a poem, one that focused solely on the entry and that would circulate independently. Although it is unlikely that John Lydgate witnessed the entry, it is his poem describing the event that shaped later perspectives of it. The poem survives in seven known manuscripts. Five of these are London chronicles, in which Lydgate’s poem is used to describe the 1432 entry. One of the other two manuscripts contains a chronicle, although it does not incorporate Lydgate’s poem into the main text; the final manuscript is a volume of poetry. The poem was seen as an independent object that could circulate alone. The royal entry descriptions of


the *Bourgeois de Paris* and Enguerrand de Monstrelet, by contrast, are woven into their larger narrative.

The proliferation of Lydgate’s version also demonstrates the immense popularity of this form of royal entry description. Although the poem was based on John Carpenter’s letter, rather than on personal experience, it “established the prevailing ‘reading’ of the 1432 London pageants.” As Maura Nolan has argued,

> [a]t the very least, it is clear Lydgate was substantially involved in disseminating an account of the entry that was used by some chroniclers as an historical account and that presents itself as a firsthand narration of a quintessentially public event.

Lydgate was so successful at presenting his verses as “a firsthand narration” that they were used by later generations as a model for royal entries. As Sidney Anglo demonstrates, the 1547 coronation entry of the nine-year-old Edward VI borrowed speeches and themes directly from Lydgate’s version of the 1432 entry. This is especially interesting considering that

> [a]pparently the pageant stages for Henry VI’s entry had only brief written ‘scriptures’ posted for spectators to read, but Lydgate’s poem sometimes presents these as if they were actual speeches, an invention that seems to have inspired…the form of Renaissance entries.

The devisers of the 1547 entry treated Lydgate’s version as though it were an eyewitness account, making their own plans based on this poem. Lydgate’s version, then, “shape[d] the *historical* interpretation of Henry VI’s entry,” accuracy of that interpretation
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notwithstanding.\textsuperscript{67} In this case, the use of the royal entry description as a genre came full-circle to affect the planning of later events.

Like Lydgate's poem, the Lambeth Palace manuscript version of the London entry appears to have circulated independently. This, combined with this description's treatment of verb tenses, demonstrates that the Lambeth Palace version also approaches the royal entry as a genre. The relationship between the Lambeth Palace manuscript and the extremely similar LBK version is unknown. Richard H. Osberg notes that Lambeth, the shorter of the two, was once thought to be "an abbreviated copy of Carpenter's letter."\textsuperscript{68} He concludes, however, that Lambeth is "[n]ot, in fact, a copy of Carpenter's letter," but that it rather provides an authority independent of both Lydgate's poem and Carpenter's letter, from which it differs in two significant ways: in a number of instances, Lambeth reproduces more accurately than Carpenter the Vulgate language that underlies both accounts, and in one case it affords an independent and better pageant 'scripture'...than either Carpenter or [Lydgate].\textsuperscript{69}

Despite these differences, and despite Lambeth's omission of several elements present in Carpenter's version—such as the speeches offered by Londoners to the king\textsuperscript{70}—the numerous similarities between both versions suggest either that one is based on the other, or that the two share a common source. Where they describe the same parts of the entry, Lambeth and Carpenter are nearly identical. For example, Carpenter opens:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{67}] Nolan, \textit{John Lydgate and the Making of Public Culture}, 235.
\item[\textsuperscript{68}] Osberg, "The Lambeth Palace Library Manuscript Account of Henry VI's 1432 London Entry," 255-56, 256n5.
\item[\textsuperscript{69}] Ibid., 256.
\item[\textsuperscript{70}] For further discussion of these differences, see Chapter 3, "The King's Most Notable City: The Royal Entry Genre in London."
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Inter cetera que nobilis illa Civitas Londoniensis ordinavit pro gaudio reventus supræmi domini sui Regis Henrici Sexti, qui nuper hereditario jure abiit in Regionam longiquam accipere sibi Regnum Ffrancie et reverti taliter est prouisum...

Similarly, the Lambeth Palace version begins: “Inter cetera que nobilis illa civitas London ordinavit pre gaudio reuentus supremi domini sui Regis Henrici sexti qui nuper abiiit in regionem longinquam accipere sibi regnum & reuerti taliter est prouisum...”

The first pageant is also nearly identical in both versions. Carpenter describes the antelopes on London Bridge as follows: “Ex utroque quidem latere ipsius Gigantis in eadem pagina erigebantur duo animalia vocata Antelops que Regnorum Anglie et Ffrancie arma vexillatim fulgentia patule supportabant.” Similarly, Lambeth says: “…Ex vtroque quidem latere ipsius gigantis in eadem pagina erigentur duo animalia vocata Antelopes que Regnorum Anglie & Ffrancie arma vexillatim fulgencia patule supportabunt…”

Although its relationship to the other description of the London entry cannot be determined, the survival of this version in MS Lambeth 12 demonstrates the fifteenth-century use of royal entry descriptions as independently circulating documents.

Lambeth 12 has no other items related to royal entries, the city of London, or Henry VI.

71 LBK, f. 103v.
72 Lambeth, f. 255r col. a.
74 LBK, f. 103v. Translated as: “There was a device which was made ready, rather fine, on the middle of which stood a giant of amazing size, brandishing and thrusting his sword against the enemies of the King’s Majesty, and girded with this text, ‘I shall clothe his enemies in confusion.’ On either side of the giant himself, in the same pageant, were set up two animals called ‘antelopes,’ which supported the arms of the kingdoms of England and France, shining forth like a banner.” Caroline M. Barron, “Pageantry on London Bridge in the Early Fifteenth Century,” in ‘Bring furth the pageants’: Essays in Early English Drama presented to Alexandra F. Johnston (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 100.
75 Lambeth, f. 255r col. a.
The bulk of the manuscript is “the third volume of a fine copy of [John of] Tynemouth’s "Historia aurea" from the late fourteenth century...” The "Historia aurea," named in imitation of the "Legenda aurea," is “a universal history on the largest scale.” This compilation chronicle was based on the version of the "Polychronicon" ending in 1327; the "Historia aurea" became, in turn, “the source of a new version of the "Polychronicon." Tynemouth’s "Historia" survives in three sets of manuscripts: Lambeth Palace, MSS Lambeth 10-12; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MSS 5 and 6; and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 240.

Of the Lambeth Palace manuscripts, MS 10 covers the period from the beginning of the world to the emperor Nero; MS 11 continues to the year 605; and MS 12 covers the years 602-1347, ending with the capture of Charles of Blois and a “short notice...announcing the capture of Calais...” The final quire of Lambeth 12, which is in several later hands, contains saints’ lives which, “with slight variations, are those
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78 Galbraith, “Extracts from the Historia Aurea and a French ‘Brut’ (1317-47),” 203-05.
80 Ibid., lv.
given in [Tynemouth’s] Sanctilogium” (ff. 248-54). The Latin description of Henry VI’s entry into London is the final item in the manuscript (f. 255r/v).

Little is known about the circumstances under which this royal entry description was copied onto the final leaf of the Historia aurea. The manuscript likely originally belonged to the Durham Cathedral Library, and may have been transferred to Durham’s college at Oxford in the late fourteenth century. Osberg suggests that the manuscript was still at Oxford when the royal entry description was copied into it.

The Lambeth Palace entry description’s placement in this manuscript suggests a fifteenth-century interest in reading the description for pleasure, rather than as a factual account of a historical event. Unlike Carpenter’s letter and the chronicles containing Lydgate’s poem, the Lambeth Palace entry description appears to have been preserved rather arbitrarily. While Carpenter’s and Lydgate’s versions appear chronologically in London-centred manuscripts, the Lambeth description appears with completely unrelated content. In this way, the treatment in Lambeth resembles that in Rome, English College MS A. 347, which contains Lydgate’s poem. The manuscript is a collection of poetry, mostly Lydgate’s, and includes items such as Life of Our Lady, “A Pageant of Knowledge,” “Four Things That Make a Man to Falle,” “Ballad of Good Counsel,” “The Pain and Sorrow of Evil Marriage,” “The Dietary,” and a version of the Dance of Death titled “The Daunce of Machabre.”

Dated by watermarks to ca. 1436-

81 Ibid., lv.
82 National Church Institutions Database of Manuscripts and Archives, Lambeth Palace Library MS 10, MS 11, MS 12.
56, this manuscript shows contemporaries using Lydgate’s version more as a poem than as a memorial or description of the event itself.\(^{85}\)

There is a second feature of Lambeth that suggests it may have been considered to be primarily leisure reading material: its verbs are in the future tense. This could be explained by Lambeth’s being a prescriptive text or script to aid in planning the event. Based on the vocabulary used, however, this does not seem to be the case. The pageant of the giant on London Bridge, for example, opens:

\begin{quote}
In primo Ad exteriorem finem pontis londoniarum erigetera machina satis pulcrae In cuius medio stabit Gigas mire magnitudinis vibrans & extendens gladiu in hostes regie maiestatis hac proinde scriptura circumamictus Inimicos eius/induam confusione.\(^{86}\)
\end{quote}

The use of abstract adjectives like “magnitudinis” would not be concrete enough to help plan the giant pageant; nor does this seem to refer to a predetermined giant figure with which the pageant organizers and actors would already be familiar. Similarly, the pageant of the three empresses opens: “Super ipsum vero pontem speciosa fabrica splendoris eximii construetur in qua tres imperatrices & domine mirabili splendore chorustantes Natura suple Gracia & ffortuna.”\(^{87}\) Again, abstract adjectives such as “speciosa” would not be able to provide concrete instructions to pageant organizers or actors. The use of these adjectives suggests that the description was meant to be read, not used as a script.

Explanations offered for the scriptures presented during the entry also seem to be directed more at readers than at pageant actors. The Lambeth Palace version informs us that:

\(^{85}\) Boffey and Edwards, \textit{A New Index of Middle English Verse}, 254; Renoir and Benson, “Bibliography: XVI. John Lydgate,” 2117. 
\(^{86}\) Lambeth, f. 255r, col. a. 
\(^{87}\) Ibid.
duo iudices & octo legispariti iudicium & iusticiam corporis politice representantes per hec rescripta prophetica Honor regis iudicium diligat iusticia & iudicium correctio sedis eius necnon Deus iudicium tuum regi da & iusticia[m] tuam filio Regis figurantes que quod Reges & principes bonos & iustios & scientificos viros in iudicis ferendis consilis prebendis & rebus publicis gubernandis semper disponent & ordinarent etc.\(^88\)

An explanation such as “ffigurantes que quod Reges & principes bonos & iustios & scientificos viros...semper disponenter & ordinarent etc” would not be necessary for pageant actors, but may have provided clarification for readers.

Finally, the treatment of pageant speeches in Lambeth indicates that this version is not likely to have functioned as a script for the event, despite the fact that it is in the future tense. Unlike Carpenter’s version, Lambeth omits the speeches offered by London citizens to the king—with the exception of the first two lines of the welcome song on London bridge, which Lambeth records as “Souereyne lord to 30ure Cytee/Welcom Welcom Welcom 3ee bee et cetera.”\(^89\) In Carpenter’s version, the song is a total of sixteen lines long.\(^90\) It seems highly unlikely that Lambeth, which omits most of the song, could have been used as a royal entry script. The Lambeth Palace version, then—while certainly based on the event of Henry VI’s royal entry into London—seems to have functioned primarily not as a memorial of the event itself, but rather as a genre of reading material much like the saints’ lives preceding it in the manuscript.

The LBK entry descriptions also treat the royal entry as a textual or literary genre. The placement of Paris and London entry descriptions in a Letter Book—a book of London civic governance—is highly unusual. It demonstrates a conscious fifteenth-century effort to compare not only the two entries of Henry VI, but also the descriptions

\(^88\) Ibid., f. 255v, col. a. Emphasis added.
\(^89\) Ibid.
\(^90\) For Carpenter’s use of this song, see Chapter 3, “The King’s Most Notable City: The Royal Entry Genre in London.”
of them. LBK, a former London Guildhall manuscript now held at the London Metropolitan Archives, is one of fifty London Letter Books covering the period from the reign of Edward I to the close of the reign of James II. These are the only royal entries described in a Letter Book of this period. Other contemporary entries include Richard II’s 1377 coronation entry and his 1392 reconciliation entry upon the restoration of London’s privileges; the triumphal entry of Henry V following his victory at Agincourt; and Margaret of Anjou’s entry on her arrival in England to marry Henry VI. Although descriptions of these events do survive, they are not to be found in the city’s Letter Books.

The second reason that this unit is so unusual is for the inclusion of a Parisian entry description in a London civic manuscript. Given the unusual nature of the LBK unit, it would be unsurprising to discover that these two descriptions were—or that even one of them was—added to the Letter Book at a later period. This is not, however, the
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case; rather, the royal entry unit is a part of the original structure of LBK. The description of the Paris entry is on ff. 101v-103r, with Carpenter’s letter following on ff. 103v-104v. These folios come mid-gathering, which comprises ff. 98-105. The description of the Paris entry ends slightly before the end of f. 103r, and the space has been filled with the *Complainte de Paris*, a series of verses pleading:

```
Jeo suis Parys qui ne fait que languir  
Loing de secours, en douleur et martire;  
Loups ravissans me viennet assaillir  
De jour et nuyt, qui me veulent occire.93
```

Each of the four stanzas ends with the warning that the king must send help, “Ou vous perdrez Paris et toute France.” These verses, in a different hand, are “an interpolation in the Letter-Book and may have been composed” at a later date.94 The entry descriptions are in the same hand, and the mostly chronological order of the manuscript is compromised to allow for the descriptions’ placement one after the other. The juxtaposition of the two entries in LBK was deliberate. This indicates that these two events—and the descriptions of them—were considered by contemporaries to be worth comparing.

Considering the surviving descriptions of Henry VI’s Paris and London entries as “sources about themselves” demonstrates that the fifteenth-century royal entry description—just like the royal entry event—had familiar elements and was recognized by contemporaries as a defined genre. Lambeth, Lydgate, and both LBK descriptions limit their content to the royal entry itself, not mentioning the other royal events or civic concerns accompanying it. The circulation of these four accounts illustrates their contemporary role as independent and discrete descriptions. Lambeth’s usage of the
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93 LBK, f. 103r.
future tense and preservation with an unrelated chronicle imply a disconnect between
this version and the event it purports to describe. Lydgate’s poem was treated both as a
“convenient representation” of the London entry—by the compilers of the London
chronicles—and as a poem more appropriately preserved with other poems, as in Rome,
English College MS A. 347. The LBK unit shows a systematic juxtaposition between
two royal entry descriptions. An examination of the production and use of the LBK unit,
as well as of John Lydgate’s poem, will demonstrate how these examples of the royal
entry genre were used in fifteenth-century London.
CHAPTER 3

THE KING’S MOST NOTABLE CITY:
THE ROYAL ENTRY GENRE IN LONDON

1. The King and the City Clerk: Royal Entries, John Carpenter, and Letter Book K

The most complete description of Henry VI’s royal entry into Paris—the only one to preserve the speeches and the pageants presented to the king—survives not in Paris, but in London’s Letter Book K (LBK). The Letter Book is unique, not only for its grouping of royal entry descriptions from two different cities, but also for the inclusion of two such descriptions in a civic manuscript. Who was responsible for this unusual grouping? Why were these descriptions placed in the Letter Book? Finally, what can LBK tell us about the function of the royal entry genre in fifteenth-century London?

John Carpenter, common clerk of the city of London from 1417 to 1438 and therefore responsible for the production of the city’s Letter Books, was probably the deviser of the LBK unit of royal entry descriptions. ¹ He was also the author of the Latin description of the London entry found in the Letter Book. An “expert at manipulating various registers of documentary culture,” Carpenter used this expertise—gained through his work on projects such as the Liber Albus and the London Dance of Death—

¹ Caroline M. Barron, London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People 1200-1500 (Oxford, 2004), 187; C. David Benson, “Civic Lydgate: The Poet and London,” in John Lydgate: Poetry, Culture, and Lancastrian England, ed. Larry Scanlon and James Simpson (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 153. The author of the Paris entry description is unknown, and the hand of these folios has yet to be identified. John Carpenter was responsible for deciding what was recorded in the Letter Books, but he would have had several clerks working for him, all able to closely imitate his hand. I would like to thank Dr Estelle Stubbs for sharing this information.
to create a document that used the royal entries of Henry VI for civic purposes.\footnote{For Carpenter and London’s documentary culture, see Amy Appleford, “The Dance of Death in London: John Carpenter, John Lydgate, and the Daunce of Poulys,” Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 38, no.2 (2008), 292-94.} The content of the two descriptions, combined with their placement in the Letter Book, privileges the relationship between the king and his capital cities, and emphasizes both London’s superiority to Paris and the importance of the English capital to the young king.

The Letter Books were civic manuscripts: they were produced by London authorities, and they contain information about London governance and notices of matters that might affect the capital city. They were also consulted by contemporaries as records of the city’s customs; Andrew Horn and John Carpenter both used the Letter Books in the compilation of their customaries, the Liber Horn and the Liber Albus.\footnote{Barron, London in the Later Middle Ages, 187; Reginald R. Sharpe, “Introduction,” in Calendar of Letter-Books Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: Letter-Book A. Circa A.D. 1275-1298 (London: Corporation of London, 1899), II. Available online at http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=171.} As common clerk, John Carpenter was aware of the importance of documents such as the Letter Books to the city of London, and of the way these documents could be used to privilege civic interests. As Sheila Lindenbaum has argued, late medieval London records were about more than record keeping: London’s documentary culture was also used to promote the city. “[T]he merchant elite [of London was] primarily...a political group whose textual activities served to regulate behaviour, produce social distinctions and ensure the survival of oligarchic rule.”\footnote{Sheila Lindenbaum, “London Texts and Literate Practice,” in The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature, ed. David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 285.} The role of written documents was considered to be so important that during the mayoral conflicts of the 1370s and 1380s,
rival claimants Nicholas Brembre and John of Northampton accused each other of “abuses in the realm of documentary practice.”\(^5\) Northampton’s municipal reform proposals, for example, were accompanied by an accusation that his opponents had “issued documents under the city’s common seal for ‘their own private advantage.’”\(^6\) In addition, Northampton produced a new customary, a written collection of London records known as the *Jubilee Book*. To Northampton’s rivals, the book was “associated with [Northampton’s] new reforms. [Nicholas] Brembre insisted on his authority over the civic records to such a degree that he...[caused] the Jubilee Book to be expurgated and eventually burned...”\(^7\) Brembre also used documentation to personally attack Northampton: he “inserted vituperative personal letters to Northampton’s patron John of Gaunt into the public record...”\(^8\) The use—or perceived abuse—of documentation in London could be considered a political threat.

The importance of writing and documentary culture in London is crucial to understanding the creation of the LBK unit of royal entry descriptions. Following the late-fourteenth century crises in London’s government, Londoners of the early fifteenth century turned to writing to increase their legitimacy: “like the new royal house of Lancaster...London’s governors needed to make their regime seem unquestionably legitimate, as if it were the inevitable order of things, and for this they needed the skills
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\(^5\) Ibid., 287-88.

\(^6\) Ibid., 287-88.


of literate professionals."⁹ John Carpenter was the most influential of these "literate professionals" who created the idea of London as a "corporate personality," stressing the legitimacy of the city's oligarchic rule.¹⁰ One of the ways this goal was achieved was through Carpenter's creation of a new customary, similar in concept to the burned Jubilee Book. Carpenter's Liber Albus was authorized by mayor Richard Whittington, and it was created as an attempt to collect London's scattered records into one volume.¹¹

In his introduction, Carpenter explains his reasoning behind committing the city's customs to writing, and organizing them into one book:

Forasmuch as the fallibility of human memory and shortness of life do not allow us to gain an accurate knowledge of everything that deserves remembrance....it has been long deemed necessary...that a volume...should be compiled from the more noteworthy memoranda that lie scattered without order...throughout the books [and] rolls, as well as the Charters of the said city.¹²

Lindenbaum describes the Liber Albus as a "comprehensive guide to the charters, market regulations, and ordinances for public order that underwrote the power of the oligarchy."¹³ This book, in which Carpenter promotes London's jurisdiction against the claims of church and king, demonstrates not only the common clerk's commitment to written records, but also his understanding that these records could be used to assert the city's privileges.¹⁴

Carpenter's involvement in the London Dance of Death project—which he commissioned ca. 1430¹⁵—demonstrates the common clerk's ability to manipulate a
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⁹ Ibid., 293.
¹⁰ Ibid., 294-95.
¹¹ Ibid., 294-95.
¹⁵ Ibid., 287.
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combination of the written word and its material support to the city’s advantage. The London Dance of Death, also known as the Daunce of Poulys, consisted of a set of paintings hung on the cloister walls of the Pardon Churchyard at St Paul’s Cathedral—the most important religious building of late medieval London. The paintings were accompanied by John Lydgate’s translation of the earliest known (1424-25) Dance of Death, from the Parisian cemetery of the Holy Innocents. In the poem, the figure of Death asks various characters, each representing an order of society, to dance. Death “targets...the sources of comfort, ease, and power” of each of these figures through his conversations with them.

In Lydgate, Carpenter found a poet who was accustomed to writing for different jurisdictions. In this case, Lydgate “translat[ed] [the poem] from Paris to London, from aristocratic to civic patronage, from French to English, from wall to text to wall.” Carpenter and Lydgate created a specifically civic version, identifiable as such from its
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18 Simpson, Reform and Cultural Revolution, 54.
19 Ibid., 60.
20 Ibid., 59-60.
contents, but also from its location in the Pardon Churchyard. As Amy Appleford indicates, Lydgate produced two translations of the Parisian original:

The A version...is a fairly close translation of the French poem....The B version, which I take to be Lydgate’s revision for the Daunce of Poulis project (not least because it bears the title Daunce of Poulis in two manuscripts)...omits several characters from this version while adding eight new ones, seemingly with a powerful London civic audience in mind....The B version also reworks several figures, both secular and ecclesiastic, that belong specifically to an urban community...The character of the Canon doubles to become the Canon Regular and Dean or Secular Canon...and these figures are joined by a nun or semi-religious, the Woman Sworn Chaste; the Man of Law turns into the Sergeant of Law and is joined by the Doctor of Canon or Civil Law. The Merchant is joined by his competing craft category of Artificer or artisan, and the category of civic government (absent in the French and the A version) is represented by the figure of Mayor and a city servant, the Famulus...

Thus the *Dance of Death* commissioned by John Carpenter was crafted for a civic audience, with figures immediately recognizable to Londoners.

For John Carpenter, however, turning the *Dance of Death* into a London production involved a second step: the displaying of both poem and paintings in the Pardon Churchyard. Civic involvement at St Paul’s was not a new phenomenon: the cathedral already held, for example, a chapel dedicated to Adam Berie, a fourteenth-century mayor and alderman of London. Most importantly, perhaps, the Pardon Churchyard was also an important part of civic processions, especially those celebrating the election of a new mayor. Every October 28,

---

the new mayor would ride in procession to Westminster, where he would take his oath...and be formally accepted in the king’s name...After returning to the city...the mayor would process...from the Church of St. Thomas of Acon...to St. Paul’s....Then [the mayor and civic officials] would process to the [Pardon] [C]hurchyard...Variations of this procession concluded with a visitation of the Becket tomb in the Pardon Churchyard on no fewer than seven other days of the year...24

According to Appleford, Carpenter’s decision to display the *Dance of Death* in the churchyard was a response to its recent enclosure by the cathedral authorities:

> conflict between St Paul’s and the city regarding land use and access to the yard was an old problem, especially regarding issues of enclosure of property once held common....The mayor’s procession [through the churchyard] extend[ed] the liberty of the city into ecclesiastical territory, insisting on the city’s claim to rights of way within the precinct walls.25

The collaboration between Carpenter and Lydgate on the *Dance of Death*, then, “made the civic a part of this enclosure, both in the...sense that the *Daunce of Poulys* was a specifically civic contribution, and...that the *Daunce*...literally limned the church’s territorial claims.”26 Carpenter’s work on the *Dance of Death* illustrates his use of “multimedia” projects to assert London’s privileges.27 Through his collaboration with the poet John Lydgate, and his efforts to display the results of this collaboration in the Pardon Churchyard, the common clerk of London “extended his reach into the domain of vernacular poetics and, through it, reached a wider civic audience.”28

Carpenter’s *Liber Albus* and the *Dance of Death* utilized writing and its material context to London’s advantage. In creating the LBK unit of royal entry descriptions, Carpenter used this same expertise: he placed two descriptions of civic events one after the other, using the juxtaposition between Henry VI’s two capitals to emphasize civic

---

25 Ibid., 304.
26 Ibid., 305.
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affairs. The content of the London description shows that the king’s English capital had a special relationship with the crown, while the comparison with the Parisian entry description draws the reader’s attention to the similarities between the two cities as royal capitals, but also to London as the most highly prized of the two.

The content of Carpenter’s description of the London entry in LBK stresses London’s privileged position in the realm. This is especially evident when Carpenter’s version is compared with the Lambeth Palace manuscript version of the event.

Carpenter expands significantly on civic matters—matters on which Lambeth is silent.²⁹

Both Lambeth and Carpenter’s letter open by introducing the event:

Inter cetera que nobilis illa Civitas Londoniensis ordinavit pro gaudio reventus supræmi domini sui Regis Henrici Sexti, qui nuper hereditario jure abiit in Regionam longinquam accipere sibi Regnum Francie et reuerti taliter est prouisum…³⁰

The two versions then diverge in what follows. Lambeth shifts the reader’s attention to the procession itself by turning immediately to the London Bridge pageant, while Carpenter includes the civic officials’ greeting of the king outside London. He describes in detail the clothing worn by the mayor and aldermen; the presence of the sheriffs of the city and 12,000 London citizens and foreign merchants, all identified by the mark of their trade; and the king and the various noblemen who accompanied him. He thus draws the reader to the royal entry as a civic welcome: it begins outside the capital, and showcases the strength of London’s government and trades.

³⁰ London Metropolitan Archives, MS Letter Book K (LBK), f. 103v. Lambeth opens as follows: “Inter cetera que nobilis illa civitas London ordinavit pre gaudio reuentus supræmi domini sui Regis Henrici sexti qui nuper abiit in regionem longinquam accipere sibi regnum & reuerti taliter est prouisum…” Lambeth Palace Library, MS Lambeth 12 (Lambeth), f. 255r col. a.
Carpenter also includes the content of the English speech given by the citizens to the king before the London bridge pageant:

Soveraigne lord as wel come be ye to your noble Roialme of Englond and in especial unto your notable Cite London over wise called your Chambre as en [ever] was cristen prince to place or people, and of the good and graciox achevyng of your Coronne of Ffrance, we thanke hertlich our lord almyghty which of his endles mercy sende you grace in joye and prosperite on us and all your other people long for to regne.31

This speech is absent in Lambeth. By including it, Carpenter again reminds the reader that the royal entry was, in effect, the city’s show. The content of the speech stresses London’s privileged position: while Henry may be returning from being crowned king of France, the reader’s attention is drawn to London, the king’s “notable Cite...over wise called [his] Chambre.”

The metaphor of London as the royal chamber developed out of the identification between the king’s bedchamber and the privy purse, and was used both by the king—as in the case of Edward III asking for the city’s support against the Earl of Lancaster—and by the city—for example, in reminding Richard II that London’s concerns also ought to be the king’s concerns.32 On the occasion of Richard II’s reconciliation entry into London in 1392, the citizens expressed their subjugation to the king through the use of this metaphor:

---

31 LBK, f. 103v.
The speech greeting the king also stressed London’s role as the royal chamber:

“En, rex, cuius ut est nimium metuenda potestas,
Sic et amanda nimis, nec reverenda minus:
En, humiles cives, vestris pedibus provoluti,
Reddunt se vobis et sua cunta simul.
Clavibus hiis gladioque, renunciat urbs modo sponte:
Vestre voluntati prompta subesse venit.
Hoc rogat assidue, lacrimis madefacta deintus,
Mitis ut in cameram rex velit ire suam.
Non laceret, non dilaniet pulcherrima regni
Menia, nam sua sunt, quicquid et exstat in hiis.
Non oderit thalamum sponsus quem semper amavit;
Nulla subest causa cur minuatur amor.” (136-47)

That there was some truth to this special relationship between the king and London is evident in the attempts by other cities, such as York and Coventry, to lay similar claims
to being the royal chamber. By including this speech in his description, Carpenter reminds the reader of the importance of this relationship.

The common clerk of London continues to emphasize the importance of the English capital’s prestige in his pageant descriptions. Again, both Lambeth and Carpenter agree on the basics of the pageant details. It included a song of welcome, which Lambeth summarizes as “Souereyne lord to 3oure Cytee/Welcom Welcom Welcom 3ee bee et cetera”  

Carpenter, however, includes the lyrics:

```
Souveraigne lord, to your cite
With alle venerence Welcome ye be

Thanked be god of his goodnesse
That you hath kept from hevynesse
And brought you ayen Wt gladnesse
Thanked be ye wt alle lowenes
Tha nought wolde spare youre tendrenes
And brought you ayen Wt gladnesse

London your Chambre for to se.

To worship your London in eche degre.

The piler of worship That ye be.

The piler of worship That ye be.

The piler of worship That ye be.

Wherfor god that ys full of myght

Hap holpe you atteyneyour right
And crouned twyes Wt gemes bright.

London be glad Wt alle thy myght

Ffor god hap sent unto the sight
Thi lord thi prince thi kyng by right
Souveraigne lord to your Cite
Wt alle reverence Welcome ye be.
```

Carpenter’s inclusion of the song’s lyrics draws the reader away from the allegorical pageant figures and from the king. Instead, we are reminded of the importance of Londoners in the entry itself—and, of course, of the city’s crucial position as the king’s

---

36 Lambeth, f. 255r col. b.
37 LBK, f. 104r. For the original layout of this song, see Appendix A. Thank you to Professor Paul A. Merkley for explaining the layout of this song. It is likely a lyric insertion of a carol, with the lines grouped together by brackets sung to the same music. For fifteenth-century English carols, see also Geneviève Barbara Bazinet, “London, British Library, Egerton 3307: Passions, Patronage, Carols and Music for Holy Week,” MA, University of Ottawa, 2007, 45-48.
“Chambre.” Lambeth’s use of the words “et cetera” implies an awareness that the Londoners’ song continued. While the reason behind the omission of the rest of the lyrics cannot be determined, it is clear that by including them in his version, Carpenter keeps the reader’s focus on London and its citizens.

The last substantial difference between Lambeth and Carpenter comes after the final pageant. Lambeth ends its description immediately after the pageant of the Jesse Tree at St Paul’s: “salutarem illud propheticum emitet Longitudine dierum replebo eum pro primo Et ostendam illi salutare meum pro secundo. Explicit.”38 Here, the entry ends with the final pageant, but mid-procession. It is Carpenter who informs us of what occurred next: he continues his account past the Jesse Tree pageant, including the approach of the Archbishop of Canterbury; the procession into St Paul’s; the king’s ride to Westminster Palace; the crowds in the streets and the people looking out their windows to see the procession go by; and, finally, the gift of £1000.00 given by the mayor and aldermen to the king on the day following the entry.39 Again, Carpenter is careful to include the speech made by the civic authorities regarding this gift:

Most cristen prince the good folk of your notable Cite of London, otherwise cleped your Chambre, besechen in her most lowely wise, that they mowe be recomaund unto your hynesse ant it can like youre noble grace to resceyve this litell yefte yoeven with a good will trewe and lovyng hertis as euer any yefte was yoven to eny erthly prince.40

It is important to note that all three of Carpenter’s references to London as the king’s chamber are found in the dialogue—or, perhaps more accurately, monologue—of his

38 Lambeth, f. 255v, col. b.
40 LBK, f. 104v.
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description. He does not simply inform the reader that London is the king’s chamber. Instead, the inclusion of this metaphor in the speeches of the entry tells the reader that Londoners asserted their city’s importance to the king himself. By including the contention that London is the king’s chamber in the speeches given during the royal entry, Carpenter creates a relationship of mutual obligation between the city and the king. He also insists on London’s unique status in the realm.

In part, Carpenter’s focus on the importance of the entry to the city of London is likely due to his Londoner’s perspective. In this sense, his point of view is similar to that of the anonymous Bourgeois de Paris, who focuses on the importance of the Parisian entry to various civic groups. For the Bourgeois, what matters most in the entry is which civic group had the honour of carrying the canopy over the king’s head: he devotes fourteen lines to the explanation of how it was passed from one group of citizens to another. In the Bourgeois de Paris’ description of the Parisian entry, it is the city and its citizens that are given pride of place. The king himself is explicitly mentioned in only five lines; the canopy and its bearers, in a combined total of eighteen lines. The pageants designed by the city are described in thirty-four lines. A comparison between the amount of text devoted to the king and the amount devoted to the city of Paris makes it clear that the Bourgeois considered the meaning of the event for the citizens of the city to be most significant.

Carpenter’s civic focus, however, is more deliberate than that of the Bourgeois. He also draws the reader’s attention to the importance of London by preserving his description in a civic manuscript, and by placing it immediately following the Parisian

entry description. The contents of LBK, which opens with the death of Henry V in 1422 and ends in 1460-61,\(^{42}\) reflect its civic origins and purpose. Of its contents, 786 items are directly related to the administration of the city (such as elections, admissions to the mysteries, and guardianship of orphaned children); 188 items concern London’s relations with the Crown (such as summonses to Parliament, royal processions and funerals, taxes, and loans to the king); thirty-four items discuss London’s relations with other cities. Of these, six items address the situation in Paris.

John Carpenter appears to have used LBK as a vehicle for asserting London’s special relationship with the crown. It was during his tenure as common clerk that a lengthy description of the mayor of London’s role in the king’s coronation was entered into the Letter Book.\(^{43}\) The Letter Book does not contain a description of the event; instead, it records the proclamation asking everyone with a right to serve at the coronation to report to the Duke of Gloucester, and provides the city’s response. An entire folio is dedicated to this reply, which states that:

> according to the liberties and customs of the City aforesaid, that the said Mayor, by virtue of his office of the Mayoralty, may serve in his own person the lord the King, on the day of his coronation...for a reward of a royal cup of gold, and when he retires from the feast of the said lord the King may have and carry away with him the said cup together with a ewer of gold for his fee...\(^{44}\)

While the author of this note is not known, it was certainly placed in the Letter Book under Carpenter’s direction. It ignores the coronation ceremony itself, which featured


\(^{44}\) Ibid., 103-04.
the king and the noblemen of the realm, and instead focuses on the role of the Mayor of London. There is even a small sketch of the “royal cup of gold” in the margin of the description. This entry in the Letter Book carefully creates a memory of the event that focuses exclusively on London’s role and importance. In contrast, the London entry of Margaret of Anjou—which took place after Carpenter’s death in 1442— is not recorded in LBK.

![Figure 1: LBK, f.70r. There is a drawing of the mayor’s cup in the right margin.](image)

Carpenter’s decision to preserve the royal entry descriptions in LBK also casts both events as primarily civic affairs. In another manuscript, it might be possible to see these descriptions as an effort of the royal council to promote the dual monarchy. After all, the king’s English subjects, just like his French subjects, needed to be convinced that Henry’s claim to the throne of France was both legitimate and beneficial to them. The English, in particular, needed to be reassured that England would remain independent, in order to be induced to finance the king’s claims to France. The LBK unit, however, was produced by a London official and in a London manuscript. It focuses exclusively on the urban portions of the French coronation expedition, describing neither one of the

---
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king's coronations—only the royal entries, which were organized by civic officials. The focus of these entry descriptions thus becomes not the promotion of the dual monarchy of Henry VI, but rather the relationship between the king and the city, and a juxtaposition between the king’s two capitals.

By comparing the Paris and London entries of Henry VI, John Carpenter could use the relatively troubled state of the king’s French capital—which had used the occasion to remind the king to protect his beleaguered yet worthy city—to promote London’s interests. Carpenter insisted not only on London’s special status as compared with other English interests, but also on London’s superiority to Henry’s French capital of Paris. While Carpenter’s description of the London entry places the city in a position of strength—privileged as the king’s chamber and able to speak directly to the ruler in the voice of a “hereditary vassal”\(^{47}\)—the Paris entry description portrays the king’s French capital as by turns pleading and combative. The speeches given to the king on this occasion, as well as the written explanations that accompanied the Parisian pageants, portray a fractured relationship that is a far cry from the intimacy of being the king’s chamber.

The pageant of the Nine Worthies, for example, reminded the king that “celle ville ainsi famee/Est digne destre bien gouverné.”\(^{48}\) Although the city professes to receive the king humbly, in this pageant it also demands that he both recognize Paris’ status and improve his governance of the French capital. This is different from Carpenter’s insistence on London’s place as the king’s chamber; while the London entry description reminds the king of London’s privileged position, the speeches do not

---

\(^{48}\) LBK, f. 102r.
explain why London deserves to be called the royal chamber. Paris, however, is incapable of making such claims without supporting them with the assertion that it is a famed city, and associated with the Worthies.

A similarly pleading note is evident in the sign that accompanied the presentation of three symbolic hearts—representing the three Parisian estates—to the king on his entrance into the city. This sign proclaimed that

Les estas de ceste cite
Vous offeront, d'un contentement,
Leurs cuers, par vray humilite.
Recevez les benignement.\(^{49}\)

This is no assertion of special privilege for the city of Paris: rather, the request is for the king to acknowledge the citizens' efforts by receiving them kindly and, presumably, by improving his governance of the city.

Even in those portions of the Parisian entry where the city does portray its strength, the result is completely different from London's assertion of privilege as the king's chamber. Instead, Paris asserts its importance in a manner that is almost combative towards the king. The sign explaining the Châtelet pageant, for example, ends with:

Nous, qui exersons la justice,
Vous prions qu'elle soit gardé,
Ce vous sera chose propice;
Par elle, ont royaumes duree.

Le peuple de toute sa puissance,
A moult peine d'entretenir
La ville en votre obeissance;
Si vous en vueills souvenir.\(^{50}\)

\(^{49}\) LBK, f. 102r.
\(^{50}\) Ibid, f. 103r.
Here, Paris defines its responsibilities—to maintain French justice—while simultaneously reminding the king that he ought to ensure that justice is maintained, presumably by allowing Parisians to continue to do so. The insistence that the Parisian people have held the city under the king’s obedience, similarly, does not establish a relationship of privilege between city and king. Instead, it creates hostility: the king is reminded pointedly of Parisian efforts, and cautioned that he depends on Paris for the maintenance of his realm.

This same kind of uneasy relationship between the English king and his French capital is evident in the other Parisian items preserved in LBK—all of which date to the period in which Carpenter was clerk, from 1417-38. The first and last Parisian items frame the king’s relationship with the city. The first, undated, is a letter from the Parisian government to London, acknowledging the death of Henry V and assuring Paris’ allegiance to his son.\(^51\) The last, dated May 1435, is a letter from the duke of Burgundy to the citizens of Paris, referring to the possibility of a treaty between Charles VII and Henry VI, to whom he now refers as “l’adversaire de monseigneur le roy et le nostre.”\(^52\)

In between, there is a series of items showcasing Paris’ weakness, in which Parisians ask the English capital to intervene with the king on their behalf. The first two, on ff. 96v and 101r, are letters from the Parisian municipality which enclose the content of letters forwarded to the king. The pleading character of these communications leaves no doubt about which of the king’s two capitals is in the stronger position:

\(^51\) LBK, f. 2r.
\(^52\) Ibid., f. 172b.
Si voys prions, tres chiers sires freres et especiaulx amis, tant affectuesement et de cuer comme plus povons, que selon le contenu en icelles noz lettres vueilliez trantiler et labourer pour le bien de ceste ville et du pays d'environ ainsi que en vous en avons parfaite fiance, car nous savons certainement que par le moyen de vous et bon pourchaz le roy, notre dit seigneur et le votre, sera en brief temps au plaisir de notre createur, seigneur paisiblement de son royaume de France...

Finally there is the *Complainte de Paris* on f. 103 immediately following the entry into Paris, and probably written after the duke of Bedford had left France in 1433. The poem opens as follows:

Jeo suis Parys qui ne fait que languir  
Loing de secours, en douleure et martire;  
Loups ravissans me viennet assailir  
De jour et nuyt, qui me veulent occire.  
Jeo pers mes gens, mon mal toujous empire;  
Et si, ne trevz qui me donne confort.  
Long temps desja que le due de Bethfford  
S'en est alle pour moy en Angleterre,  
Devers son Roy et le mien, secours querre,  
Qui pas ne vient, dont je perds esperance:  
Seigneurs Angloiz, renvoie-le bon erre,  
Ou vous perdrez Paris et toute France.

Combined with the royal entry descriptions, these Parisian items, placed in LBK under John Carpenter’s direction, present a weak Paris, one that needs London’s help in order to acquire protection and consideration from the king. The result is to privilege the relationship between the king and his capital cities, but also to present London as the more powerful of the two.

Carpenter’s LBK unit demonstrates the way royal entries could be used as documents, as well as events, in order to accomplish a specific purpose. In London, this use of the royal entry was harnessed by civic officials working in an increasingly documentary culture—not by the royal officials who might be expected to have used.

---

53 Ibid., f. 101r.  
54 Sharpe, *Calendar of...Letter-Book K*, f. 103.  
55 LBK, f. 103r.
descriptions of Henry VI's entries as a way to promote the dual monarchy. The way John Carpenter contrived LBK seems to express a specific relationship between the king and the city; his description of the royal entry into London highlights this relationship and, by omitting a description of the coronation, completely erases the relationship between the king and the nobility. John Carpenter's LBK is a manuscript with "agency," one "organized along certain principles,...present[ing] its text(s) according to its own agenda, as worked out by the person who planned and supervised the production of the manuscript." Carpenter used LBK to create "une mémoire du passé...un passé choisi et construit par ses auteurs pour le futur." While royal entries may have functioned as a form of negotiation between city and ruler, Carpenter appears to have been one of the first civic officials to ensure that the city's role in royal entries would be remembered in civic records. In doing so, Carpenter transformed the event of the royal entry into a document, one that he used to make the relationship between king and capital the only one that mattered.
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2. John Wells, John Lydgate, and the London Chronicles

John Lydgate’s “Ordenaunces ffor the Kyng made in the Cite off London” was also used to promote the city. Commissioned by John Wells, mayor of London—not by the royal council—the poem’s contents and its survival in London-centric manuscripts show that, like LBK, it was used to further London’s interests.

John Lydgate’s poem was written for a civic patron and based on a civic document—John Carpenter’s Latin letter describing the event. Remarkably, it was not the royal council who hired the poet, although he had previously produced works promoting the dual monarchy. Lydgate had, for example, written a poem about the king’s English coronation banquet—at which even the pastries served stressed the king’s dual claims. In the same course, there was both a custard with an English leopard upon it, and a fritter shaped like a sun with a fleur-de-lis on top. Lydgate was also commissioned to translate into English the French poem commissioned by Bedford “to accompany and explain a picture illustrating Henry’s genealogical tree” in Notre Dame cathedral. Other similar efforts by the royal council to promote the dual monarchy included posting open letters in public places and producing coinage portraying Henry

61 B. H. Rowe, “King Henry VI’s Claim to France in Picture and Poem,” The Library s4-XIII, no.1 (1933), 78.
as the saviour of the French.\textsuperscript{62} A French bishop was invited to the English coronation, in order to demonstrate the link between the king’s two realms.\textsuperscript{63} Clearly, this was a royal council accustomed to finding ways to convince the public to support the dual monarchy.

Equally clearly, the royal entry events were used for this precise purpose. Henry VI’s coronation as king of England at the age of seven was not a reflection of the young king’s ability to rule, but was rather part of a “counterstroke” to the coronation of Henry’s French rival as Charles VII at Reims in July 1429.\textsuperscript{64} In order to counter Charles VII’s claims in France, the duke of Bedford and the rest of the royal council needed to arrange for Henry’s coronation in France as quickly as possible.\textsuperscript{65} The English coronation was brought on by necessity: “it was unthinkable that [the French coronation] should take place before [Henry’s] crowning in England; Englishmen had already expressed fears lest their country be subordinated to an English régime in France.”\textsuperscript{66} The royal council thus had two public relations goals with the dual coronations of Henry VI: the French had to be convinced that Henry’s claim to the French throne was legitimate, and the English had to be convinced of the same—as well as of England’s continued independence from France.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{63} Griffiths, \textit{The Reign of King Henry VI}, 190.
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 189; Anne Curry, “The ‘Coronation Expedition’ and Henry VI’s Court in France, 1430 to 1432,” in \textit{The Lancastrian Court}, ed. Jenny Stratford (Donington, Linc.: Shaun Tyas, 2003), 29.
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid.,189.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.,189.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., 217.
Considering the importance of these goals for the royal council, it seems remarkable that the entry descriptions appear to have been solely produced and disseminated by civic officials. It was Londoners—through both LBK and Lydgate’s poem—who used the genre of the royal entry description. They used it to promote not the king and his two crowns, but themselves and their own position in the realm. The result of the collaboration between poet, town clerk, and mayor on the poetic description was a rendition that draws attention to the city of London and its mayor rather than to the king. If Carpenter’s letter and its placement in the Letter Book create an urban memory of the event, Lydgate’s version even more clearly stresses its mayoral patronage. The poem is Lydgate’s longest work about London, and it is a “fundamentally civic work….insist[ing] upon [the king’s] social obligations to London and its citizens.”\(^{68}\) As C. David Benson points out, in the poem it is mayor John Wells who has the most active role. Lydgate’s use of the mayor’s surname as a pun, for example, has no precedent in Carpenter’s version:\(^ {69}\):

O! how thes welles, who-so take goode hede,
With here likours moste holsome to atame,
Affore devise[ed] notably in dede
Forto accorden with the Meirys name;
Which by report off his worthy ffame
That day was busy in alle his gouernaunce,
Vnto the Kyng fforto done plesaunce. (342-48)

In Lydgate’s poem, the fountains—or wells—providing the wines of Mercy, Grace, and Pity (335-41) were included in the pageant in order to accord with the mayor’s name.

---

\(^{68}\) Benson, “Civic Lydgate,” 151-52.

While stressing the role of London, its citizens, and its mayor, Lydgate simultaneously lessens the role of the king. Whereas Carpenter’s version mentions the large number of nobles accompanying the ruler, Lydgate completely ignores this section. Carpenter’s description of the meeting between civic and royal officials at Blackheath tells us that:

> Cumque per modicum spacium pausassent et expectassent ibidem, dictus illustriissimus Rex venit a manerio suo de Eltham versus Civitatem antedictam cum ingenti multitudine ducum, Comitum, Baronum, procerum, magnatum ac militum et armigerorum se sircumdantium...  

For Lydgate, however, the important figures of this meeting are not the various dukes, counts, and barons accompanying the king; the crucial participants are, instead, the representatives of the city. Lydgate describes the spectacle of the waiting citizens over the course of three stanzas before devoting two to the figure of the mayor:

> To the Blake-heeth whanne they dydde atteyne
> The Meire, off prudence in especyall,
> Made hem hove in rengis tweyne,
> A strete bitwene eche partye lyke a wall,
> Alle cladde in white, and the moste princypall
> Afforn in reede with theire Meire rydyng
> Tyl tyme that he sauh the Kyng komyng.

> Thanne with his sporys, he [the mayor] toke his hors anoon,
> That to beholde yt was a noble siht,
> How like a man he to the kyng ys goon
> Riht well cherid, off herte gladde and liht;
> Obey[i]ng to him as him ouht off riht:
> And after that he konnyngly abrayde,
> And to the kyng even thus he sayde. (50-63)

Here, the king’s retinue has completely vanished from the scene, drawing the reader’s attention instead to the two rows of white-clad citizens, led by John Wells.

---

70 LBK, f. 103v.
The erasure of the king extends even further: in Carpenter’s version, the king responds graciously to the mayor’s welcoming speech: “Quo facto ab ipso domino rege gratiosissime et benignissime sunt accepti.” The Lydgate/Wells collaboration, however, eliminates the king’s response entirely, moving directly from the speech to the London Bridge pageant. Moreover, Lydgate does not limit his emphasis on the city to removing the king from the action. As Richard H. Osberg notes, in some areas the role of the king is also altered, removing the messianic qualities attributed to Henry in Carpenter’s version. Lydgate is “more reticent than Carpenter” in Biblical references. While Carpenter’s letter, for example, indicates that the characters in the Lady Wisdom pageant offered a crown to the king, Lydgate’s poem does not. In his version, “there seems to be a deliberate distancing—the crown of glory, Lydgate hints, remains a consummation to be wished for.” In Lydgate’s version the king is a much less powerful figure.

Lydgate’s pageant descriptions also emphasize the role of the city of London more than do Carpenter’s. This is largely achieved by sheer length. The pageant of the empresses Nature, Grace, and Fortune, accompanied by seven maidens who present the king with a host of gifts, is described in sixteen lines in Carpenter’s letter. Lydgate’s description involves no fewer than seventeen stanzas, focusing on the wonders London has produced. It begins:

---
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CHAPTER 3 | THE KING’S MOST NOTABLE CITY:
THE ROYAL ENTRY GENRE IN LONDON

Ferthermore, so as the Kyng gan ryde,
Midde off the Brigge ther was a tour on loffte,
The Lorde of Lordes beyng ay his guyde,
As He hath be and yitt wole be fful offte;
The tour arrayed with welvettes soffte,
Clothis off golde, sylke, and tapcerye,
As apperteynyth to his regalye. (99-105)

The compounded effect of verse after verse, focusing on the soft velvets and cloth of
gold displayed by the city, underlines London’s position, power, and wealth.

The same careful cutting and expanding is also evident towards the end of the
poem. In Carpenter’s version, the gift of £1000.00 to the king is followed by the king’s
thanks: “A quo versa vice grates uberes et favores regios amplissime recuperunt, reversi
sunt ad propria cum ingenti gaudio et honore.”77 Lydgate, however, passes over Henry’s
response in favour of civic praise:

Be gladde, O London! be gladde and make grete ioye,
Citee of Citees, off noblesse precellyng,
In thy bygynnynge called Newe Troye;
For worthynesse thanke God off alle thyng,
Which hast this day ressyved so thy Kyng,
With many a signe and many an obseruaunce
To encresse thy name by newe remembraunce.

Suche ioye was neuere in the Consitorie,
Made ffor the tryvympe with alle the surplusage,
Whanne Sesar Iulius kam home with his victorie;
Ne ffor the conqueste off Sypion in Cartage;
As London made in euery manere age,
Out off Fraunce at the home komyng
In-to this citee of theyre noble Kyng. (510-23)

Lydgate’s praise of London as the New Troy is accompanied by what Maura Nolan
views as an ambivalent reference to Julius Caesar, which allows Lydgate to “transform
the youthful king into an exemplary figure much like his father.”78 At the same time, it

77 Ibid., f. 104v.
is a reminder of Lydgate’s treatment of Caesar in the *Serpent of Division*, “a prose history of the civil war of Caesar and Pompey designed to warn of the dangers of civil strife.”\(^79\) In the *Serpent of Division*, Lydgate attributes Caesar’s desire to conquer Rome to the city’s refusal to stage a triumph for him.\(^80\) According to Nolan, “Lydgate’s insertion of a reference to Caesar inevitably calls to mind the double sense in which spectacle might function as a unifying mechanism or divisive engine.”\(^81\) While the praise of the king is ambivalent, the city itself is unequivocally the city of cities, New Troy, and the royal chamber.

Civic praise continues with a reminder, reminiscent of Carpenter, of London’s status as the king’s chamber:

> Off sevyn thinges I preyse this citee:  
> Off trewe menyng, and ffeythfull obseruance,  
> Off rihtwysnesse, trouthe, and equyte,  
> Off stablenesse ay kepte in lygeaunce;  
> And ffor off vertue thow hast such suffisaunce,  
> In this lande here and other landes alle  
> The Kyngis Chambre of custume men the calle. (509-30)

In Lydgate’s version, the king and the city are intertwined—the king’s role is reduced to his relationship with London, his chamber.

It seems, however, that John Wells also had other motives in commissioning this poem. In addition to exalting the role of London in the king/capital relationship, Wells and Lydgate used the poem as a vehicle to push for specific requests: that the king favour England, and especially London, over France and Paris, and also that the king arrange for peace between his two realms. In this sense, the poem extends or continues

\(^{81}\) Ibid., 232.
the dialogue established during the entry itself. In the mayor’s speech of welcome, for example, Lydgate emphasizes both the otherness of France and the special relationship between London and the king. Carpenter records the speech as follows:

Soveraigne lord as wel come be ye to your noble Roialme of Englond and in especial unto your notable Cite London oPer wise called your Chambre as en [ever] was cristen prince to place or people, and of the good and graciuox achevyng of your Coronne of Ffrance, we thanke hertlich our lord almyghty which of his endles mercy sende you grace in joye and prosperite on us and all your other people long for to regne.82

Lydgate’s alterations are subtle, but significant:

Soveryn Lorde and noble Kyng, ye be welcome out of youre Reeme off Fraunce into this your blessed Reeme of Englond, and in speciall vnto your moste notable Citee off London, othir wyse called youre Chaumbre; We thankyng [thanne] God off the goode and gracious arenyng ofyoure Crovne off Fraunce. Beseching his Mercyfull Grace to sende yow prosperite and many yeers, to the conforte off alle youre lovyng peole.83

By stressing that the king has arrived out of his realm of France to be greeted by the loving people of London, Lydgate insists on the importance of the city of London for the blessed realm of England. He simultaneously establishes France as an other—a realm worthy of a visit, perhaps, but not of the king’s sustained attention.

The same juxtaposition is evident in Lydgate’s version of the welcome song on London Bridge. In Carpenter’s letter, the song is recorded thus:

---

82 LBK, f. 103v.
83 Lydgate, “King Henry VI’s Triumphal Entry into London, 21 Feb., 1432,” 632, emphasis added.
Carpenter’s version allows a role to both London, the king’s city, and the king himself. Here, Henry is acknowledged as having been “crouned twyes,” and as “[t]hi lord  þi prince  þi kyng by right.” Lydgate, however, makes some changes to this song:

Sovereyne Lorde, welcome to youre citee;
Welcome,  oure love, and  oure Herits Plesaunce,
Welcome,  oure Gladnesse, welcome,  oure Suffisaunce,
Welcome, welcome, riht welcome mote ye be.

Syngyng to-fforn thy ryall Mageste,
We say off herte, withoute variaunce,
Sovereyne Lorde, welcome, welcome ye be.

Meire, citizenis and alle the comounte,
At youre home komyng now out off Fraunce,
Be grace releveyd off theyre olde grevaunce,
Syng this day with grete solempnyte,
Sovereyne Lorde, welcome to youre citee. (211-222, emphasis added.)

Here, the repetition of “youre citee,” as well as the reference to the mayor and citizens of London and their joy at the occasion, accentuates the role of the city in the entry and in the king’s realm as a whole. The king is welcomed “home...out off Fraunce,” a

84 LBK, f. 104r.
statement that is so ambiguous it could refer to a simple diplomatic visit, rather than a coronation expedition and a royal entry into Paris itself. Again, the focus is on London, its relationship with the king and with England, and its importance compared to that of Paris or France.  

More specifically, Wells and Lydgate used the poem to stress the city’s crucial message to the king: the hope that the dual coronation would somehow help bring peace between England and France. Benson has indicated that “Lydgate’s poem inform[s] the king what he must do to ensure that London remains his chamber” by stressing the “values of London’s burgesses”—in this case, values of peace and prosperity. On the antelopes supporting the arms of England and France at the entrance to London bridge, Carpenter simply informs us that “Ex utroque quidem latere ipsius Gigantis in eadem pagina erigebantur duo animalia vocata Antelops que Regnorum Anglie et Francie arma vexillatim fulgentia patule supportabant.” Lydgate and Wells, however, use this section of the pageant to stress Londoners’ desire for peace:

Twoo antelopes stondyng on eytheyr syde
With the armes off Englond and off Fraunce,
In tokenyng that God shall ffor hym provyde,
As he hath tytle by iuste enheritaunce
To regne in pees, plente and plesaunce;
Seysyng off werre, that men mow ryde or goon,
As trewe lieges, theyre hertes made both oon. (92-98)

85 Londoners used their association with the king to assert their privileges as the king’s chamber in a metaphor that extended to the city as a whole. In Paris, proximity to the king—through the carrying of the canopy—was used to assert the importance of individual groups, rather than of the city.
87 Delpit emends “pagina” to “machina.” Delpit, ed., “Relation de l’entrée de Henri VI à Londres,” 245
88 LBK, f. 103v.
The decision to interpret the English and French arms as a symbol of the king’s just inheritance highlights the pageant organizers’ interest in peace. It stresses the hereditary legitimacy of Henry’s claim, not “just conquest” or even a “just treaty” such as the Treaty of Troyes. This desire for peace is further stressed in the following three lines, in which it is hoped that Henry’s reign over England and France by just inheritance will result in peace and plenty, the termination of war, and the ultimate achievement of an England and France whose hearts have been made one.

Similarly, where Carpenter only briefly mentions the genealogical tree pageant at St Paul’s, Lydgate tells us that:

\[
\text{The [pe]degree be iuste successioun,} \\
\text{As trewe cronycles trewly determyne,} \\
\text{Vnto the Kyng ys now dessended down} \\
\text{From eyther partye riht as eny lyne;} \\
\text{Vpon whos heede now ffresshely done shyne} \\
\text{Two riche crovnes most sovereyn off plesaunce} \\
\text{To brynge inne pees bitwene England and Fraunce. (405-411)}
\]

Here again, Lydgate and Wells express the hope that Henry’s just succession to the crowns of England and France will bring peace between the two realms.

The continuation of the Jesse tree pageant description clearly shows that Wells and Lydgate deliberately used the poem as a form of public relations damage control. As Osberg has indicated, the messianic theme of the association between the royal genealogy and the Jesse tree may not have met with a favourable reaction from the crowd. The “identification of the child-king Henry with the flos of Jesse’s rod [led

---

89 Osberg, “The Lambeth Palace Library Manuscript Account of Henry VI’s 1432 London Entry,” 262-65
Lydgate's defence that, after all, the Jesse tree faced the cathedral, not the approaching king. Lydgate defends the Jesse tree pageant as follows:

And why the Iesse was sette on that partye,
This was the cause in especyall,
For next to Paulis, I dar well specefye,
Is the partye moste chieff and princypall,
Callyd off London the chirche cathederall,
Which ought off resoun the devyse to excuse,
To alle thoo that wolde ageyn yt ffroune or muse. (419-25)

Apparently, Wells considered the pageant sufficiently important that it could not be omitted from the poem altogether; instead, Lydgate tried to dispel objections to it.

Finally, the Lydgate/Wells collaboration also stresses the independence of London by emphasizing the king's residence at Westminster, outside the city. Lydgate describes the king's progress to Westminster as follows:

And affter that, this ys the verrey soothe,
Vnto his paleys off kingly apparaylle,
With his lordes the Kyng [anon] fforth goothe
To take hisreste after his travaylle;
And than off wysdome, that may so mych avaylle,
The Meire, the citezenis, which alle this dyd se,
Ben home repeyred into hire citee. (489-68)

By characterizing Westminster as the king's palace, and London as home for the mayor and citizens, Lydgate insists on London's jurisdiction within its walls. The citizens of the city have, in effect, led the king on a procession into, through, and out of London to his own palace. The king is invited to acknowledge London as his chamber, but not to view it as a royal residence with royal jurisdiction.

The approach of Lydgate and Wells to the poetic description of the 1432 entry shows that the two men were aware of how they could use the poem as a public relations exercise. Wells commissioned a written memory of the event in which the city’s role and prominence—and his own prominence as its mayor—were the subjects of emphasis. The city, the pageants it organized, and its mayor are the stars of this version. When the king and his two crowns are mentioned, they are used as reminders that the citizens of London expect their ruler to provide peace. Like the placement of Carpenter’s description in the Letter Book, and like that description’s contents, Lydgate’s poem deliberately presents a moment of negotiation between two powers largely as a civic moment.

Beyond promoting the city, Lydgate’s version also created a London-centred memory of the event much like that created by Carpenter in LBK. As Nolan argues, this is a mediated representation of a public event that works to point and shape the historical interpretation of Henry VI’s entry....When Lydgate was commissioned by Mayor Wells to write a poetic account of the entry...he was asked not only to record the occasion for posterity (Carpenter’s letter, or one like it, would have sufficed for that), but to transform it into poetry.\(^2\)

Poetry, Wells realized, could have a significant effect. “The 1432 verses,” Nolan concludes, are particularly instructive both because they allow us to see what Lydgate imagined a public spectacle should be, and because they show us that at least one figure—the mayor—understood and valued the kind of public discourse that Lydgate helped to create.\(^3\)

The manuscript history of Lydgate’s poem indicates that more people than John Wells “understood and valued” such a use of the royal entry description. Seven known

---


\(^3\) Ibid., 235.
manuscripts of the poem survive, indicating that Lydgate’s account of the London entry
circulated as an independent object, separate from descriptions of, for example, the Paris
entry or either one of the king’s coronations. These include London, British Library MS
Harley 565 and Rome, English College MS A. 347. The five remaining manuscripts—
Longleat MS 53, London Guildhall MS 3313, and British Library MSS Cotton Cleopatra
C.IV, Cotton Julius B.II, and Harley 3375—are all London chronicles.

The placement of the poem in London chronicles is as important to
understanding Lydgate’s version as is LBK to Carpenter’s version. Forty-four London
chronicle manuscripts survive. They are dated from 1430 to 1566, and were a uniquely
fifteenth-century phenomenon. Written by Londoners about London, these anonymous
works formed a London chronicling tradition that was “essentially civic in nature.”
This is evident in both their content and their production. The London chronicles focus
largely on matters related to the English capital; they are not universal chronicles or

94 A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts, Purchased by Authority of Parliament, for
the Use of the Publick...; and Preserved in the British Museum (London: Dryden Leach,
1808), 1:565; Julia Boffey and A. S. G. Edwards, A New Index of Middle English Verse
(London: British Library, 2005), 254; Alain Renoir and C. David Benson,
“Bibliography: XVI. John Lydgate,” in A Manual of the Writings in Middle English,
1050-1500, ed. J. Burke Severs and Albert E. Hartung (New Haven: Connecticut
Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1980), 2117; Ralph A. Klinefelter, “A Newly
Discovered Fifteenth-Century English Manuscript,” Modern Language Quarterly 14
(1953), 3-6.
95 For Longleat MS 53, see Bale, “Bale’s Chronicle,” in Six Town Chronicles of
England, ed. Ralph Flenley (Oxford, 1911); for Guildhall MS 3313, see A. H. Thomas
Gloucester, 1983); for Cotton Cleopatra C.IV and Cotton Julius B.II, see C. L.
Index of Middle English Verse, 254; Mary-Rose McLaren, The London Chronicles of the
Fifteenth Century: A Revolution in English Writing (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002),
52n7, 276; Renoir and Benson, “Bibliography: XVI. John Lydgate,” 2117.
96 McLaren, The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century, 3-11, 141.
97 Ibid., 3-4, 141.
even chronicles of England. Even their organization is civic: they are dated by mayoral years. The London chronicles developed out of civic documents, such as the annotated mayoral list in Letter Book F, and they were created by men much like John Carpenter and John Wells, "free citizens of London, particularly the merchant classes, who may or may not have been involved in the governing of the city, but who were not noble." According to Mary-Rose McLaren, the single most identifiable aspect of the London chronicles as a group...is their specifically civic nature, reflecting the fifteenth-century London citizens' perception of their control over the affairs of the city, their history and contemporary world.

Although the chronicles were not a part of London's municipal record-keeping as was LBK, they were civic, London productions. The chronicles, which "appeared and disappeared with remarkable suddenness," show the development of a literary culture in London, a culture that was used for "establishing a common sense of identity."

Another striking similarity between LBK and the London chronicles is their treatment of the Paris entry of Henry VI. According to McLaren, "[a]lthough we might have expected the Paris account to be widely circulated in London, it is [only] recorded in [two] London chronicles." Given the London focus of these chronicles, however, it seems more surprising that any of them included the Parisian entry at all. Inclusion of this description, even in only two of the chronicles, indicates that at least some Londoners were interested in the comparison between the king's two capitals—a comparison also evoked in Carpenter's LBK unit.

98 Ibid., 12.
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102 Ibid., 3, 49.
103 Ibid., 54, 54n9.
The London chroniclers who used Lydgate’s version of Henry VI’s entry treated it in much the same way as it had been commissioned: it was used by Londoners to preserve a pro-London version of the event. In this way, Lydgate’s version was a manifestation of London’s documentary culture just as much as was Carpenter’s LBK unit. In the London *Dance of Death* project, the collaboration between John Carpenter and John Lydgate produced a civic version of the Parisian original, used to assert London’s jurisdiction over the Pardon Churchyard. In Lydgate’s poem, a third collaborator was present: London mayor John Wells. The result was a widely-disseminated vernacular poem in which the city’s role is emphasized, and the king’s nearly forgotten. The calculated creation of these descriptions indicates that civic officials understood that, if preserved in documents, a royal entry could continue to have a lasting impression far beyond the event itself. The treatment of Lydgate’s poem by subsequent chroniclers demonstrates both that there was an interest in these descriptions, and that John Wells and John Carpenter were right.
CONCLUSION

TO ALLE THAT DUELLE IN THIS CITEE,
MY WILLE WERE GOODE FFORTO DO YOW SERVYSE

A striking feature of both the events of Henry VI’s royal entries and the documents describing those events is the similarity between the two. Civic officials used both the format of the royal entry itself and the royal entry description genre to promote their city’s interests. Equally striking is the exclusive use of the royal entry description genre in London. Parisians would have had little motivation to create an urban memory of the royal entry of a foreign ruler who was crowned king of France, an entry in which they expressed their displeasure with the king’s actions in no uncertain terms. Still, there is no comparable description of any Parisian royal entry before Charles VIII’s in 1484—despite the at least seven Parisian entries that occurred before this one.¹ London, the king’s capital but not the king’s residence, administered by civic officials and not by royal ones, harnessed the royal entry genre to promote its interests.² This tactic was not employed in Paris, which was governed by a royal prévôt and which housed the royal Parlement.³

To disregard those royal entry descriptions that appear to provide less-than-accurate accounts of the events themselves—descriptions such as the LBK renditions, Lambeth, and Lydgate’s poem—would be to also disregard an important aspect of how

¹ See the available descriptions in Bernard Guenée and Françoise Lehoux, Les entrées royales françaises de 1328 à 1515 (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1968).
royal entries functioned in their contemporary society. Nowhere does this seem more
evident than in the treatment of Lydgate’s poetic description of the London entry, which
has been both discounted by scholars seeking to describe the procession, and used as an
example of the poet’s ability to write for multiple patrons and jurisdictions. It is equally
crucial to consider its role as a commissioned work preserving a London-centred
memory of a London-organized event.

Also essential to our understanding of the contemporary function of royal entry
descriptions is the manuscripts in which they survive. The level of intention in the
creation of LBK demonstrates conscious use of the genre to promote London, while the
preservation of Lydgate’s poem and the Lambeth Palace version show that sometimes, a
royal entry description was completely disconnected from the event itself. The many
chronicles that preserve either Lydgate’s poem or a prose description of the London
entry remind us that, while entry descriptions may not accurately convey the experience
of witnessing the event, it is likely that more people experienced the entry through its
written descriptions than by being present themselves. Understanding the fifteenth-
century royal entry requires us to remember that royal entry descriptions were not only a
product of their society, but an object produced for use in that society. Lydgate reminds
us of this in his “envoye,” in which he concludes his attempt “fforto tellen alle the
circumstaunces/Off euery thing shewed in sentence” during the entry:

O noble Meir! be yt vnto your pleasaunce,
And to alle that duelle in this citee,
On my rudenesse and on myn ygnoraunce,
Off grace and mercy fforto haue pitee,
My symple making fforto take at gree;
Considre this, that in moste lowly wyse
My wille were goode fforto do yow servyse. (63-64, 531-37, emphasis added)
Carpenter does the same in LBK, where the decoration of the letter I in "Inter cetera" and the large M of "Memorandum" implies an expectation of contemporary or future readership. Part spectacle, part procession, part document, fifteenth-century Paris and London royal entries can illuminate the relationships both between king and capital city, and between events and the documents that describe them.

An approach from both a historical and a literary perspective, focusing on events and documents, highlights the importance of these combined elements to contemporaries. Examining LBK, Lambeth, and the Lydgate manuscripts provides access to London's utilization of the royal entry genre in a way that would not be possible through a study of these descriptions in isolation from their material structure. This comparative and multidisciplinary approach can illuminate our understanding not only of royal entries, but also of the relationship between medieval rulers and their capitals, and the contemporary purpose of civic records such as LBK.
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