# Advanced Heraldic Studies: An Introduction

## Part II. *The Terminology of the Field: Its Nature, History, and Inadequacies*

## Division B. The Third Period, c. 1330 – c. 1560

### I. The First Phase of Heraldic Didacticism: Texts and Contexts

D'ARCY JONATHAN DACRE BOULTON
Ph.D. (Penn.), D. Phil. (Oxon.), F.R.H.S.C., F.S.A., A.I.H.
Professor of Medieval Studies and History,
University of Notre Dame

## 3. The Third Period in the History of Heraldic Erudition

We turn now to the third of the Periods in the history of heraldic taxonomic terminology that I defined in Division II.A of my survey. Not surprisingly, these Periods corresponded very closely to phases in the history of heraldic erudition more generally. In the first two Periods — lasting respectively from c. 1170 to c. 1250, and from the latter date to c. 1330[1] — this form of erudition had concentrated first on *describing* and then on *cataloguing* the particular arms constituting the armal corpora[2] representing the nobilities of our two kingdoms, France and England, and their respective regions. Thus, the only element of the emerging armorial (or more particularly at this stage, *armal*) code in which the heralds and heraldists of these periods took an active interest was that of the description of particular arms.

The erudition of the First Period had therefore been limited to the slow growth of the technical descriptive language now known in English as 'blazon'. As we saw in the previous Division, the earliest forms of

[1] I set the date of the beginning of this Period at c. 1335 in the previous division, but have since decided that it should be set back to 1330.

[2] This term **armorial corpus**, adopted in the first instalment of this essay, is defined in the Appendix on Concepts and Terms as: *A distinct set of arms or other armories, either in general (the **full** armorial corpus) or delimited in some particular way (e.g., a regnal, provincial, categorical, or institutional corpus).* An armal corpus is one composed of arms alone: the normal type of corpus recorded in armorials outside Germany before the fifteenth century.

blazon are recorded exclusively in random passages of contemporary literary works (especially knightly [3] romances) composed from 1170 onwards, in which the shield or flag of a character are described. Because such works were rarely if ever composed by heralds, they represent a strictly non-specialist version of the blazon employed in that Period.

In fact, as we have seen, the language of blazon was *systematically* recorded in writing only in the Second Period, especially in the earliest documents of the type called '**blazoned**' and '**illustrated and blazoned armorials**'. These were both subtypes of a more general type of compilation introduced in the same Period, which constituted the earliest type of work in the tradition of heraldistic (and more particularly *armoristic*) erudition: the **armorial** or **roll of arms**, in which a corpus composed of the arms of some body of armigers known to the compiler was set out in the form of a catalogue including either images or descriptions (or both) of those arms. Armorials of the blazoned subtype were produced throughout the Second Period both in France and in England, but remained all but peculiar to those two kingdoms until the end of the Second Period. Indeed, only one armorial of any of these types has survived from any other kingdom from any date before 1330: the German *Wappenfolge of Erstfelden* of 1309.[4]

France and England thus led the way both in the creation of the language of technical description, and in its expression in the form of records, and they maintained a virtual monopoly in these practices to the end of the Second Period. Their leadership in this field, and indeed in the broader field of armoristic erudition that grew out of it, would be maintained throughout the following period, as we shall see. Nevertheless, before c. 1340 progress in armoristic erudition remained confined even in those two kingdoms to improving the lexicon and syntax of the language of particular description. There is no evidence that before that date either the *heralds* (who seem to have been the principal inventors of blazonic language), or the amateur *armorists* (who were certainly the authors of some of the earliest armorials, and might have been the authors of most of them) attempted to explain or discuss, in any manner or language, any other element of the simultaneously evolving armorial *code*, let alone the less formal aspects of what I call 'armorial emblematics': those related to the styles in which arms could be represented, and the manners

[3] As I have recently demonstrated to my own satisfaction, at least, that 'chivalry' is a false construct of the nineteenth century, I have decided avoid both that word and its derivatives, including the nineteenth-century 'chivalric', and use only words based on the English word 'knight', including 'knightly' and 'knightliness'. (See D'A. J. D. BOULTON, 'The Notion of "Chivalry" as the Social Code of the Later Medieval Nobilities: The Origins and Shortcomings of a Modern Historiographical Construct', forthcoming in *Chivalry, Honour, and Care*, ed. Warren T. REICH and Jonathan RILEY-SMITH, Oxford University Press.)

[4] See above, n. 27. The noun 'armorial' has recently been extended to designate any collection of images including arms, including those painted on the walls and ceilings of buildings, and those associated with images of their bearers in songbooks. These may be distinguished as **illustrative** and **decorative armorials**.

and contexts in which they might be displayed.

Because of this — and because the recorded blazons merely described *particular* emblems of the species then and now most distinctively designated by words cognate with or equivalent to 'arms' — our knowledge of the words used by contemporaries to designate or indicate a relationship to such related phenomena as *signs* in general; *signs* of the general functional type we call 'emblems'; *emblems* of the particular species we call 'arms' and 'crests'; the *contexts* in which such emblems were regularly displayed; and the *profession* particularly concerned with such matters, has all to be gleaned in a piecemeal fashion from a wide variety of texts written for purposes other than that of informing us about these phenomena.

In the years around and immediately after 1330, however, two new kinds of text of particular value for the reconstruction of the terms used for designating the different species of armorial sign were finally introduced, in both cases in England (at least in a form of use to us) considerably earlier than in France. The first of these was the **legal document** by which the actor — who might be a private individual, a group of related individuals, a subordinate prince, or a monarch — conveyed to the beneficiary the right to possess or make use of all or part of a *particular* coat of arms or crest, that either *belonged* to the actor (the normal situation in the early years) or was *created* by him for the purpose.[5] The general practice of issuing documents conveying such armigeral rights seems to have begun in Germany, where the earliest non-royal acts to survive date from the 1260s and '70s, and the earliest royal acts from 1305, 1329, 1339, and 1355.[6] In France the practice is attested from 1315, when the first known royal letters conveying the right to employ arms (in this case the arms of a the current superior of a community) were issued. Nevertheless, such acts remained rare in that kingdom throughout our period, and are not known to have involved the grant of wholly new arms before 1392, or of any other species of emblem at any date before 1560. In England, by contrast, the private practice of licencing or alienating arms and crests is attested from 1314, and the first known *royal* letters conferring an armorial emblem (in this case the first royal *crest*) were issued by Edward III in 1330. Various different types of instrument were introduced to effect the acts of these types, which for a century and a half continued to be permitted to armigers of all ranks, but around 1460 the earlier types were almost all superseded by letters patent issued by one of the royal kings of arms either to grant or to confirm a right to particular arms or armories.

Whatever their formal type, however, such instruments differed from armorials in actually *naming* the particular species of armory they conveyed, which from the very beginning included crests as well as arms, and from the middle decades of the fifteenth century included other

[5] For a more detailed discussion of the documents of this type, and a full bibliography of the published sources, see below, § 3.3.

[6] For the texts of these grants in chronological order, see Gustaf A. SEYLER, *Geschichte der Heraldik*, (Nuremberg, 1890; repr. Neustadt an der Aisch, 1970), pp. 811-844.

elements of the armorial achievement as well. These characteristics make such instruments particularly useful sources for the history of the taxonomic lexicon of armory.

The second of the new types of document of particular importance for the reconstruction of the lexicon of heraldic generalisation to appear in the period after 1330 was what I shall call the **treatise**[7] **on armory**,[8] or **armoristic treatise**, the earliest known of which — called *De heraudie* or the *Dean Tract* — was composed in England shortly after 1340, and the second, Bartolo da Sassoferrato's *De insigniis et armis*, was composed in Italy in 1355.[9] These and their successors in the genre in the century after 1390 were true expressions of armoristic erudition, and the former in particular clearly arose out of a combination of the established practice of compiling blazoned armorials with the even older practice of composing short didactic treatises on particular technical subjects. Down to the years around 1560 — despite Gutenberg's introduction of reproduction by printing in 1450 — such treatises were almost all published exclusively in the very limited editions permitted by hand-copying in some type of *manuscript*. They also remained relatively primitive in their organisation and narrow in their focus, so the years between c. 1340 and 1562 (when the first of the more sophisticated treatises characteristic of the next three centuries, Gerard Legh's *Accidens of Armory*, appeared in print[10]) may reasonably be seen as a distinct period in the history of armoristic erudition.

In any case, the coeval *emergence* and *persistence* of the two key types of text just described led me to define my **Third Period** in the history of heraldistic erudition as that in which the earlier types of source for our knowledge of heraldic taxonomic terminology were *augmented* in both kingdoms by such primitive treatises on armory published in manuscripts, and in England by documents conveying arms and other armories.

---

[7] On the nature and nomenclature of the contemporary *tractatus* or treatise and its place in the didactic tradition generally, see below, p. 28, n. 66.

[8] I employ the term 'armory' in the sense adopted in the first instalment of this essay and set out in the appendix on Concepts and Terms in § V.1.e-g, which may be expressed as: '*the body of knowledge concerned with (a) the* ***code*** *or body of rules and conventions governing the design, description, representation, modification, combination, acquisition, and transmission of arms and other armories within a particular country, domain, or cultural region; and (b) the* ***corpus*** *of armories of the country, domain, or other cultural unit in question*'. The treatises of our Period dealt at least cursorily with most of the elements of armory related to the arms, but tended to concentrate primarily on those of design and description, as we shall see.

[9] For a systematic discussion of such treatises, see below, § 3.2.

[10] Gerard LEGH, *Accidens of Armory* (1st edn., London, 1552). It is of interest here that he cited among his nine authorities (though not always accurately) six of the treatises produced in the Third Period: those (1) of Bartolo da Sassoferrato of 1355, (2) of Honoré Bovet of 1387 (based on Bartolo's), (3) of François des Fosses of c. 1390 (lost, but cited by Trevor), (4) of John Trevor (alias *Johannes de Bado Aureo*) of c. 1395 (ostensibly based on des Fosses), (5) of Nicholas Upton of 1446, (6) and of Jehan Le Feron of 1520. Significantly, none of these had been composed in English.

The Period thus defined also saw the appearance, at various later dates, of several other new types of text of some value for the purposes of my study, including both legal documents and treatises. Like the documents conveying arms and armories, the later types of legal document arose from comparable new practices and institutions introduced in the Period — of which, as we shall see, there were many. In England the earliest of these was the **record of litigation** in a new court with jurisdiction over a variety of matters of concern to knights and soldiers, including the right to possess and use particular arms and armories.[11] This court — in our Period often referred to as that of the Constable and the Marshal, but designated in its own records by the synonymous names *Curia Militaris* in Latin and *Cour de Chivalrie* in Anglo-Norman[12] — seems to have been created in 1347 or '48, when the first proceeding before it was held, and to have been active on a regular basis from the 1370s. Its official records for our whole Period have been lost, but transcripts of most of the documents produced by three cases of the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV have been preserved, and as all three involved disputes over the right to arms, their records include some terms of relevance here. In France no comparable central court was given jurisdiction over armigeral disputes, and cases of this sort were brought before a wide variety of lower courts, whose records, where they survive at all, are scattered in municipal and departmental archives, and have never been systematically collected or studied.

The two remaining types of document of particular relevance to my project of reconstructing the history of taxonomic terms that first appeared in the Third Period were the **record of an heraldic funeral**[13] and the **record of an heraldic visitation**,[14] both of which appeared considerably later than the types I have identified to this point. In England the earliest surviving example of the former dates from 1460, and of the second from the time of the first known visitation in 1530, but in France the earliest detailed records of funerals now surviving date only from the early sixteenth century, and I have found no record of an official visitation at any time before 1560.

The place of the funeral record, however, is partially taken by the **treatises** on the rituals to be observed in the conduct of such funerals, the earliest of which (though impossible to date precisely) were probably composed in the later fifteenth century, both in English and in French. These didactic works, like the records of particular funerals, designate by name the various species of armory that were actually borne or displayed in their primary form before, during, and after such ceremonies, and are therefore of considerable value to the student of the taxonomic lexicon of

---

[11] On this court, see G. D. SQUIBB, *The High Court of Chivalry: A Study of the Civil Law in England* (Oxford, 1959).

[12] Ibid., p. 2. It should be noted here that the Anglo-Norman and Middle English *chivalrïe*, like their French source-word *chevalerïe*, included in their semantic range the sense of 'military matters', and it is that sense that it bore in this context.

[13] I shall discuss heraldic funerals in the next Subdivision of this essay.

[14] I shall discuss the heraldic visitations of England in *ibid*.

armory. The records of visitations, by contrast, bear a closer resemblance to blazoned armorials, and actually add little of significance to our knowledge of armorial terms.

The treatises on how to conduct an heraldic funeral constituted part of a much larger category of didactic works on broadly heraldic subjects that emerged in the fifteenth century, especially after about 1430. The works of this encompassing category (which included a growing number of armoristic treatises) may usefully be distinguished by the broader term **heraldistic treatises**. Several types of heraldistic treatise included descriptions of activities involving the primary forms of the oldest armorial signs — the arms, crest, crest-base, helmet, and mantling — and are therefore of value to my current project. After the treatises on the conduct of funerals, the most important among these works were the **treatises on how to hold a hastilude** — either a tourney or a jousting competition — the first of which appeared in the late fourteenth century, but most of which appeared only in the middle decades of the fifteenth. These works are especially useful as supplements to the contemporary treatises on armory, which were intended by their authors primarily to explain the principles of the design and of the description of *arms*, and omitted all reference both to the *dependent armories* severally and to the *armorial achievement* in which they had come to be assembled.

Thus, the historian of heraldic taxonomic terms in the Third Period of heraldic erudition has at his disposal a significantly larger and more useful range of texts of a more or less technical nature, both legal and didactic, than were available for the two previous Periods. Nevertheless, these texts all suffer from a number of liabilities that reduce their value as sources of knowledge for the contemporary lexicon. One of these is that none of the texts of either type produced in Britain was written in English before 1446 (when letters patent of armigeration were finally issued in that language), so they tell us nothing about the lexicon in that language during the first half and more of our Period. Another is that, among the treatises composed in England, all but the first of those composed before 1446 (*De heraudie*) were written in Latin, so they tell us nothing of the development of the lexicon in the other vernacular language of that country, Anglo-Norman. Latin was also the language of the original treatises composed in France before 1400, and the normal language of the surviving letters conferring armorial emblems or charges until late in our Period, so neither type of text contributes to our knowledge of the lexicon in continental French before the fifteenth century. Furthermore, because neither the treatises nor (so far as I have found to date) the letters composed in France before 1560 make any mention of emblems other than the arms, the value of both types of work for the reconstruction of the taxonomic lexicon in French in our period is actually very limited.

For these reasons, much of the vocabulary used to designate the different species and classes of armorial signs in the Third Period (and especially in its first two Ages) must once again be gleaned from the usually casual (and all-too-often obscure) mentions of them in various types of **narrative work** composed within its boundaries (especially

**knightly romances**, **histories**, **biographies**, and **accounts of travel** for adventures, embassies, pilgrimages, and the like); in other types of **literary work** commenting on the state of society (especially the **allegorical dream-vision**), in a small but growing number of **bilingual glossaries**, and finally in **formal documents** both **public** (like the Rolls of Parliament in England) and **private** (especially **wills** and **inventories** of the possessions of noble knights and lords). Fortunately, a reasonable number of works of all of these types has survived, and a sufficient proportion of the works of each type has been examined by lexicographers to serve as an adequate supplementary basis to my preliminary survey.

I had originally intended to proceed directly from this brief survey of the nature of the evidence for the taxonomic lexicon of the Third Period to an examination of that lexicon itself. It quickly became clear to me, however, that the evolution in this Period of that lexicon, of the steadily growing number of species of emblem and insigne it came to designate, and of the newer types of text in which it has been principally preserved, could not be properly understood without some consideration of the broader cultural changes which gave rise to both the signs and the texts. For that reason — and because I knew of no comparable discussion in the literature of heraldic studies — I decided to insert, before my discussion of particular terms, a survey of the principal cultural developments of the Third Period of relevance to the history of heraldic and heraldistic erudition, as well as to the history of the languages in which that erudition was expressed.

Because the developments in question proved to be not only *profound* but both *numerous* and *complex*, this survey turned out to be longer than initially anticipated, so I have had to divide this Division of my essay into three Subdivisions. The first of these, published in the present issue, will be taken up first (in § 3.1) with the survey of developments in the fields of **language**, **literature**, and **didactic treatises** of all kinds in which words of heraldic interest commonly appeared in both France and England, and then (in § 3.2) with a more detailed survey of the **treatises on armory** produced anywhere in Latin Christendom in Third Period.

The reasons why I have not restricted myself to the latter should be clear from what I have already said about their limitations. Unfortunately for my project, most of the phenomena of the Third Period that would eventually be discussed in treatises on armory were completely ignored in the treatises of the Period itself, and would only be incorporated in the treatises composed for publication in print in and after 1562. Nevertheless, most of these phenomena not only *emerged* but achieved their *classic forms* and *uses* during the course of the Third Period, and much of the *lexicon* later used to designate and describe them in didactic works emerged at about the same time — albeit in non-didactic sources. A survey of the written sources of *all* relevant types, and the manner of their production and publications, will therefore be useful, and a systematic examination of the didactic literature of the Period will provide a much clearer picture of the nature and development of heraldistic erudition more generally.

The Second Subdivision, to be published in the next issue, will begin (3.3) with a survey of developments in both the **nature** and the **culture** of the **armigerates of the two kingdoms** (especially the noble armigerates), and also in the **profession of the heralds** of arms, which had either an *immediate* or an *eventual* effect on the armigeral practices of the two kingdoms and their respective armorial codes. It will conclude with an examination of the **documents by which arms and armories** were either **conferred** (3.4) or **recorded** (3.5). The Third Subdivision, to be published in the following issue, will consist (§ 3.6) of my examination of the **lexicon** employed in all of the different types of document surveyed in the first two to designate or describe the various forms of heraldica whose general history I shall have surveyed in the first two.

## 3.1. A Survey of Linguistic, Literary, and Didactic Developments

The Third Period as I have just defined it spanned more than two centuries, and corresponded very closely to the phases in the general cultural history of Latin Christendom best designated by the names 'Late Gothic' (c. 1330 – c. 1485) and 'Early Renaissance' (c. 1485 – c. 1550). So long a time-span inevitably witnessed many important developments in every aspect of the particular culture within which both armigery and heraldry had arisen and evolved before it began: that of the *royal and princely courts* of both France and England, which became ever more splendid and geographically fixed; of their *knightly nobilities*, which not only grew significantly in numbers, but were increasingly divided into formal grades and strata marked by visual insignia, increasingly involved in royal service, and increasingly subject to royal control; of the *heralds* who served both kings and knights as the ministers of their honour in an ever greater variety of rôles, but had ever less to do with *knightly games* — which were themselves profoundly transformed; and of the *learned clerics* and *lawyers* who took an active interest in their institutions, and composed most of the treatises dealing with them. Many of the cultural developments in question had a significant impact — either immediate or eventual — not merely on the *armorial emblematic system* that would eventually be described in the treatises embodying contemporary armoristic ideas, but also on the pseudo-historical accounts of the *origins of nobility*, *armigery*, and *heraldry*, on the imagined *symbolic significance* of armorial emblems included in such treatises, and on the *terms* in which these ideas were expressed.

Some of the same developments had a similar impact on the several rival **families of emblems** that emerged and crystallised in the Period: by far the most fruitful in Latin Christian history for the invention of new species and families of emblems and related emblematic codes. The most important (and most complex) of these was the **armorial family** itself, centred on the arms and eventually including the *crest*, *supporters*, and the other elements of the *armorial achievement* — a family that was almost entirely a creation of this Period, and acquired within its limits all but the first of its uniquely elaborate set of emblematic and insignial species (if not quite all of their particular forms). The growing armorial family, however, was soon joined in the Frist Age of our Period by the earliest species of the

new emblematic family I have called **para-armorial** (composed of *badges*, *mottoes*, *devices*, and *colours*). The latter was in its turn joined in the Second Age of the Period by the emblems of the **patronal-national** family (composed of *patronal-national crosses* and the *effigies of patron saints*); in the Third Age by those of the **allegorical family** (composed at first of different forms of *achromatic device* and later, in the fifth Age, by the more complex *emblema*); and in the Fourth Age by those of the **hybrid-heraldic family** (which initially took the form of *flag-designs* in which species of the first three families were combined without loosing their discrete identities). All of these families persisted in their respective spheres (which overlapped enough to create a real rivalry among them) well beyond the end of the Period. Thus, by the end of the Third Period around 1560, the arms, which had begun the Period as the *only* stable species of armorial (and indeed, *heraldic*) sign, had become but one of many signs of five different families that needed to be explained — and of course named — by the authors of armoristic and more broadly heraldistic treatises.

Both the desire *for* and the forms *taken by* the numerous new species of emblem (which were all closely related to those of the equally new, plastic form of armorial *crest* that crystallised around 1340) were strongly affected by the growing taste for individuation, arcane symbolism, visual playfulness, and variety that characterised the Period as a whole.[15] Similar tastes were also expressed in the more general revolution in *fashion* that began in the courts of Latin Christendom in the 1330s and persisted throughout and beyond the Third Period.[16] This continuing revolution involved (among many other things) the replacement of the traditional long, loose costumes of simple construction inherited from Late Antiquity, with new forms that were elaborately tailored, often padded, and initially, at least, both tighter and shorter than their predecessors. Of significance here is that it was on the civil versions of these costumes that the emblems of the new para-armorial family were first displayed as signs of service and adherence, and it was on the military version of the new form of *cote* — at first called the *cote armure* and later the *cote d'armes* — that the emblematic *armes* were first regularly displayed over knightly armour.

The Third Period also witnessed major changes in the vernacular languages of both of our kingdoms that were of comparable importance to the history of heraldic terminology, as well as an enormous increase in the production of treatises of all kinds in both Latin and the national vernaculars, and a comparable increase in the number of books containing

[15] The fundamental discussion of the cultural basis of the emergence of the para-armorial family of emblems is Michel PASTOUREAU, 'Aux origines de l'emblème: La crise d'héraldique européenne aux XVe et XVIe siècles', in *Emblèmes et devises au temps de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1981), repr. in *idem*, *L'Ermine et le sinople*, pp. 327-33.

[16] On this history of costume in this period, see esp. C. Willett CUNNINGTON and Phyllis CUNNINGTON, *Handbook of English Medieval Costume* (2nd edn., London, 1973); Stella Mary NEWTON, *Fashion in the Age of the Black Prince* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1980); and Anne H. VAN BUREN and Roger S. WIECK, *Illuminating Fashion: Dress in the Art of Medieval France and the Netherlands 1325-1515* (New York, 2011)

them, aimed not only at the traditionally literate upper and middle ranks of the clergy — especially those associated with universities — but at an ever larger population of literate laypersons. The latter were drawn primarily from the growing classes of minor nobles, members of the various branches of the legal profession (especially in London, Paris, and other French cities in which provincial *parlements* were established), and burgesses, or members of the merchant class of the principal towns of the two kingdoms. It is clear that the interests of the (primarily but not exclusively) male membership of these literate social categories overlapped to a considerable extent, and treatises and comparable works of interest to heralds were produced for all of them by members of the first three, as we shall see.

In France north of the Loire basin, where the dialects spoken were all versions of what we now call French, the Period coincided almost exactly with the phase in the structural development of the literary language now called 'Middle French', whose distinctive characteristics would persist to c. 1610.[17] The dialects spoken in the south belonged to the very different Occitan tongue, closer to Catalan than to French, but their importance for both literary and administrative purposes had declined considerably after the northern conquest of the south in the Albigensian crusade of the thirteenth century, and played so small a rôle in the developments with which we are here concerned that I shall ignore them. In England the Third Period coincided with the last subphase of Middle English (which lasted to c. 1470) and the first half of the phase now called 'Early Modern English' (which ended around 1660).[18] In both countries the Period saw the slow but steady growth of not only of a more extensive and sophisticated vocabulary (ever richer in words of Classical Latin and Greek origin, and in England in words borrowed from Middle French), but of a more uniform *standard* language for the use both of the royal court and government, and of the authors and publishers of serious works of literature: a category including treatises of all kinds.

In the Period in question, the phases through which such general cultural developments passed coincided closely enough with those in the field of armorial erudition and publication that both sets can be divided into five fairly distinct sub-periods or **Ages**, each lasting — like the lives of most contemporaries — between forty and sixty years. These may be defined chronologically as follows: **First Age**, c. 1330 – c. 1380; **Second Age**

[17] On the history of the French language in this period, see Peter RICKARD, *A History of the French Language* (2nd edn., London, 1989), esp. ch. 4 'Middle French Developments', pp. 61-80; R. Anthony LODGE, *French: From Dialect to Standard* (London and New York, 1993), esp. ch. 5 'Elaboration of Function', pp. 118-152; and Christiane MARCHELLO-NISIA, *Histoire de la langue française aux XIVe et XVe siècles* (Paris, 1979, 1992). On the history of Anglo-Norman, also called 'the French of England', see especially Jocelyn WOGAN-BROWNE, *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c.1100-c.1500.*

[18] On the history of the English language in this period, see John W. CLARK, *Early English: A Study of Old and Middle English* (New York, 1957) and Barbara M/ H. STRANG, *A History of English* (London, 1970).

c. 1380 – c. 1422; **Third Age** c. 1422 – c. 1483/5; **Fourth Age** c. 1485 – 1520/30; and **Fifth Age** 1520/30 – c. 1560. I shall henceforth organise both my discussion of the historical setting and relevant developments, and my later discussions of the history of the principal sources for taxonomic terminology, largely under the headings of these five Ages, but shall ignore or transgress their boundaries whenever it seems more useful to do so.

### 3.1.1. THE FIRST AGE, c. 1330 – c. 1380

In England, the First Age was dominated by a single king, **Edward III** 'of Windsor', who reigned for the fifty years between 1327 and 1377, outliving his eldest son Edward 'of Woodstock', the 'Black' Prince of Wales, and passing the throne to the latter's young son Richard II 'of Bordeaux', still a child at the time of his accession. In France Edward III's contemporaries were **Philippe VI**, first of the Valois branch of the Capetian dynasty, who in 1328 had been elected to succeed his late cousin of the senior line, Charles IV 'the Fair' (youngest of the three sons and successors of King Philippe IV), and reigned to 1350; Philippe's elder son **Jehan II** 'the Good', who died in captivity in England in 1364; and the latter's son **Charles V** 'the Wise' (the first royal 'Dauphin' of Viennois from 1349 to 1364) who died in 1380, the last year of the Age.

Although Edward III devoted much of his energy in the first years of his reign to an ultimately unsuccessful attempt to restore English control over Scotland, thereafter most of his attention would be devoted to asserting the autonomy of his own lands in France from their French overlord. Indeed, in both of our kingdoms the First Age was dominated in a variety of spheres by an intense rivalry between Edward III and the three Kings of France who were his contemporaries: a rivalry increasingly expressed in the form of open warfare, in which the English were both the aggressors and, down to 1360 at least, the usual victors. Both Philippe and Jehan suffered crushing defeats in their war against Edward: the former at Crécy in 1346, and the latter at Poitiers in 1356, which led to his capture and imprisonment. Before the latter battle, however, Edward and his French rivals had supported a revival of knightly values and activities in their respective kingdoms. Their open rivalry — especially after Philippe formally confiscated Aquitaine in 1337 and began preparations for what would be called the 'Hundred Years War', leading Edward in 1340 to make a formal claim to the throne of France as the true heir of his uncle Charles 'the Fair' — contributed to a whole series of innovations in areas that would come to be of special interest to heralds, but did not attract the attention of either the heralds or heraldists who composed treatises on armory in the Third Period. Among the innovations of special interest here were the foundations of the first monarchical orders of knighthood in their kingdoms: the **Company of St George** or of the **Garter** by Edward in 1348/9 (following a failed attempt to revive the fictional Arthurian **Company of the Round Table** in 1344), and the **Company of Our Lady of the Noble House** (commonly called from the form of its badge the Order of the **Star)** by Jehan in 1352. By the end of the Age, no fewer than eight additional orders would be founded on their model by Francophone

princes, including three kings (of Sicily and Cyprus) and five dukes.[19]

### 3.1.1.a. The corps and craft of the heralds of arms in the First Age

In neither of our two kingdoms are the heralds known to have played more than a supporting rôle in the process of conferring new arms before the end of the First Age. Nevertheless, in the First Age the heralds as a class (still divided between the royal service and those of particular princes and barons) rose from almost total obscurity, and the apparent contempt of their contemporaries from which they had previously suffered, to positions of responsibility, authority, and honour.[20] The increasing number both of the species of armorial sign, and of knightly games and courtly rituals involving them, combined with the increasing emphasis placed in the Third Period as a whole on noble status, rank, and ancestry, and on their verbal, visual, and ritual expression, gave a great boost to the profession of the heralds — who gradually acquired an expertise in all such matters. The permanent state of war that existed between our two kingdoms after 1337 also contributed to the steady rise of the heralds in this Age, as they were increasingly employed as neutral messengers both on the field of battle and among the courts of allied kings and princes, and converted into something resembling the modern diplomatic corps.

No doubt in recognition of their new skills, the heralds of both kingdoms began in the 1330s to be appointed to named offices maintained on a more or less permanent basis, and commenced their collective ascent to the conditions both of a diplomatic corps and of a (partially) learned profession. These developments did not occur overnight, however, and it was only around the end of the First Age in 1380 that the classic hierarchy of four distinct grades — *pursuivant of arms*, *herald of arms*, *provincial king of heralds*, and *principal king of heralds*, all with named offices — was established in England, where the *generic* title 'pursuivant' itself had scarcely been known before that date.[21] In most of the rest of Latin Christendom, where even a title cognate with 'herald' came into use only after 1350, an heraldic hierarchy on the French model would not emerge

---

[19] On these and the other such orders founded in our Period, see D'A. J. D. BOULTON, *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe 1325-1520* (2nd edn., Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2000)

[20] On the rise of the English heralds in this period, see Anthony Richard WAGNER, Richmond Herald, Heralds and Heraldry in the Middle Ages: An Inquiry into the Growth of the Armorial Function of the Heralds (2nd edn., Oxford, 1966); Sir Anthony WAGNER, [Garter King of Arms] *Heralds of England: A History of the Office and College of Arms* (London, 1967), pp. 23-4; and Maurice KEEN, *Chivalry*, ch. vii 'Heraldry and the Heralds' (New Haven, 1984), pp. 125-142.

[21] On these matters, see my forthcoming article 'Treatises on the Education of Heralds and the Rôle of Heraldic Itinerancy in the Dissemination of Courtly Culture in the Fifteenth Century', presented to the 13th Triennial Congress of the International Courtly Literature Society, Montréal, 29 July 2010.
MATHIEU, *Système héraldique*, pp. 62-68; and *The Herald in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Katie STEVENSON (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2009).

until much before the end of the Second Age.[22] The heralds of all ranks remained obscure in the First Age, however, and nothing is known about most of them beyond the existence of their named offices.

Despite their rise in other areas of their profession in the First Age of the Period, the traditional functions of the heralds as the proclaimers, organisers, and criers of the traditional tournament were seriously undermined by the decline and disappearance of the tournament and its replacement by jousting competitions in which the identity of the contestants was obvious to everyone present. The value of the heralds' expertise in recognising combatants from the arms on their shields, coats, and banners declined in the same Age as a result of the growing tendency to replace stable armorial emblems in such ludic settings with occasional or ephemeral para-armorial badges and devices — in which the heralds seem to have taken little interest before the Fourth Age of our Period.

It is at least possible that the heralds of both France and England were responsible for the majority of the **armorials** or rolls of arms produced in in their respective kingdoms in the First Age of the Third Period, at a rate distinctly lower than that of the Second Period.[23] Likewise, their German brethren may have been responsible for the creation of at least some of the armorials that had finally begun to be assembled in the Germanophone lands of the Empire in and after 1309 (of which only nine have survived from the period down to 1380).[24] In France at least one major armorial of the First Age — the *Armorial Navarre*, compiled between 1368 and 1375 — is generally attributed to a herald: specifically **Martin Carbonnel**, king of heralds of the French prince Charles 'the Bad', Count of Evreux and King of Navarre.[25] In addition, the two principal armorials of

---

[22] On the spread of the different heraldic grades to the rest of Europe, see the chapters in STEVENSON, *The Herald*, and CEBALLOS-ESCALERA, *Heraldos y Reyes*.

[23] In England, only fourteen armorials have survived from the fifty-year reign of Edward III, as compared to eleven from the twenty-year reign of his father Edward II and sixteen from the thirty-five-year reign of his father Edward I. (*Aspilogia* II, ed. Thomas Daniel TREMLETT and Hugh Stanford LONDON [London, 1967], pp. 260-261. In France, only one armorial (of 1322) has survived from the whole period 1312-30, and only eight from our First Age: three from the reign of Philippe VI (of 1330, 1332, and 1348), two from that of Jehan II (of p. 1356 and 1356/61), and three from that of Charles V (of 1364/8, c. 1370, and 1373). (J.-B. DE VAIVRE, *Orientations pour l'étude et l'utilisation des armoriaux du Moyen Age* (CNRS, Paris, 1974; *Cahiers d'héraldique* I.)

[24] On the German armorials, see Egon Freiherr VON BERCHEM, D. L. GALBREATH, and Otto HUPP, 'Die Wappenbücher des deutschen Mittelalters', *AHS* an. 38 (1924), 17-30 64-72; an. 39 (1925), pp. 97-107, 23-33, 80-93, 114-124, etc.; and IDEM, (revised by Kurt MAYER), *Die Wappenbücher des deutschen Mittelalters*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Heraldik, Schriftenreihe der Reichsstelle für Sippenforschung, Band III. Only seven such armorials are known from the First Age, and ten from the Second, but fully thirty-seven for the Third Age, and another fifteen from the first fifteen years of the Fourth. All of them are purely illustrative, and therefore of no value for the history of the language of blazon in Germany.

[25] See Michel POPOFF, *Marches d'Armes* II: *Normandie* (Paris, 1985), p. 103; and WAGNER, *Heralds and Heraldry*, p. 53.

these lands *begun* in this Age but completed in the next were certainly prepared by heralds: the *Bellenville Armorial*, compiled between 1360 and 1400 by the otherwise anonymous **Bellenville Herald**;[26] and the *Gelre Armorial*, compiled between about 1370 and 1395 by **Claes Heinen**, ***Gelre* or Guelders Herald** in the service of the duke of that land from about 1372 to 1374, who had previously served Jehan de Chastillon and the Prince-Bishop of Utrecht, and would go on to serve the Wittelsbach Counts of Hainault and Holland as Bavaria Herald, and King of Arms of the *Ruyers* or Ripuarians, from 1375 to 1414.[27]

Nonetheless, all but one of these compilations in all three countries *completed* before 1380 remained anonymous, and the only one whose author we know — *Sir Robert de Laton's Roll* of c. 1370 (now lost) — was compiled by a knight at the dictation of his elderly father, also a knight.[28] Thus it is entirely possible that most of the anonymous rolls were compiled by such knowledgeable amateurs rather than by heralds — of whom the majority may well have remained illiterate before the end of the fourteenth century. Indeed, the relatively low intellectual state of the heraldage of this Age in general is suggested by the fact that, of the two treatises on armory produced anywhere in Christendom during the Age, neither seems to have been composed by a herald, and only the first under heraldic instruction.

In any case, only a small minority of the armorials compiled in the First Age were expressed in the technical language of **blazon**. In England, this was true of only four of the sixteen armorials that have come down to us (all composed by c. 1350),[29] and they alone reveal the slow but continuous evolution of its usages in Anglo-Norman — ancestral to those in Middle English that would not appear (and may not even have been created) until the 1440s. In France, the set of blazoned armorials includes the *Armorial Navarre*, the slightly later *Armorial Urfé*, prepared c. 1380,[30] and the *Armorial de Gelre* — two of which, at least, were prepared by heralds.

It is also significant that, as late as the early years of the Second Age, the expertise of the heralds in matters relating to armigery and the 'Laws of Arms' was not yet regarded by contemporaries as being any greater than that of the principal class of primary armigers themselves — the men of lordly and knightly rank who from an early age actually bore their own arms on their coats and shields, and needed to be able to recognise those of their fellows in many situations. We know this because

---

[26] Colin CAMPBELL or Charles CRISP, *The Armorial de Bellenville* (Repr. from *The Coat of Arms* 7 (50), April 1962, with a facsimile; *L'Armorial Bellenville. Fac-simile du manuscript Français 5230 conservé du Département des manuscripts occidentaux de la Bibliothèque nationale de France*, ed. Michel PASTOUREAU and Michel POPOFF (Latuile, 2004)

[27] CLAES HEINEN, roi d'armes des Ruyers, *L'armorial universel du héraut Gelre (1370-1395)*, ed. Paul ADAM-EVEN, offprint of *Archives Héraldiques Suisses* (1971)

[28] See WAGNER, *Aspilogia* I, p. 65. The roll or armorial itself is now lost.

[29] The *Carlisle Roll*, *Second Dunstable Roll*, and *Ashmolean Roll* of (c.) 1334, and *Grimaldi's Roll* of c. 1350.

[30] See Emmanuel DE BOOS, *Marches d'Armes III: Berry (Touraine, Berry, Bourbonnais, Auvergne)* (Paris, 1989), p. 117.

it was the testimony of men of the latter type (like Sir Robert de Laton), and of royal officers of humbler status who were often in their society (including Geoffrey Chaucer, who like Laton was a witness in the case of Scrope *versus* Grosvenor of 1389), who provided most of the testimony in the three cases of armorial disputes whose records have come down to us.[31] It would appear that in this, as in many other areas of life, the members of the nobility preferred to rely on their own collective memory than on the expertise of their servants.[32]

### 3.1.1.b. Developments in language and literature in the First Age

I noted in my introductory section that the First Age of our Period also saw important developments in ordinary language and literature in both of our two kingdoms. In France, as I observed, the inception of the Period around 1330 coincided very closely with the transition from the earliest recorded stage of the language now called **Old French** to the intermediate stage called **Middle French**, which would persist to c. 1610. In addition to losing the case-system of its predecessor, Middle French was characterised by a much more standardised grammar and lexicon; an increasingly rich and sophisticated lexicon, incorporating (especially after 1360) a large and growing number of words from both Classical Latin and Greek;[33] and a new status as the language not only of the French *court* but of the French *state*, in whose documents it gradually replaced Latin down to the year 1539. In general it came to bear a much closer resemblance to Modern French than to Old French, with which its speakers soon had sufficient difficulty that they commissioned translations from it into their own idiom. The richness of its lexicon had a very positive effect on the ability of its speakers and writers to express complex ideas, but it also had the negative consequence of producing many more synonyms and partial synonyms, and a high level of semantic drift that tended not merely to *extend* but to *shift* the senses of many words in unpredictable directions. All of these developments had a deleterious effect on the lexicon of heraldic taxonomy, as we shall see.

Middle French was used in the composition of numerous literary

---

[31] On the Scrope-Grosvenor case, see Sir Nicolas HARRIS NICOLAS (ed.), *The Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy* (London, 1832).

[32] On the notion of collective or cultural memory in this period, see the work of Mary CARRUTHERS on its use in literary philosophical, historical and anthropological literature, esp. 'Mechanisms for the transmission of culture: the role of "place" in the arts of memory', in *Translatio, the Transmission of Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. Laura HOLLENGREEN. (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 1-26.

[33] The reigns of Jehan II and Charles V saw the introduction into Middle French of an extensive but still incomplete political lexicon derived from Latin translations of Aristotle's *Ta Politika* ('The Politics'), most of it introduced in the vernacular translation of that work by Nicolas ORESME. The words in question included *aristocratie* and *aristocratique* (1361), *monarque* (c. 1370) and *monarchique* (1372/4), and *oligarchie* and *oligarchique* (1370/2). *Monarchie* in its modern sense had already appeared in 1330, but *aristocrate* and *monarchiste* would not appear until 1550, and *olygarche* until 1562.

works in various genres, both traditional and novel, and as these continue to be our most important sources for the lexicon in question throughout the Third Period, it will be useful to say something about them here.

From the perspective of my project, the most important literary genre had always been that of the **knightly romance**, whose themes had by 1220 been divided among four principal quasi-historical 'matters': the 'Matter of Rome', recounting the deeds of Greek and Roman heroes from the Trojan War to the age the Caesars; the 'Matter of France' recounting those of the Franks of the early Carolingian period and of the First Crusade; the 'Matter of Britain', recounting those of Arthur, his knights, and their fictive ancestors to early Christian times; and finally, what might be called the 'Matter of Palestine', recounting those of the heroes of the Old Testament. In 1312, in his work the *Voeux du paon*, Jacques de Longuyon had selected from these four matters a triple triad of preeminent heroes — three pagan (the Trojan Hector, the Greek Alexander, and the Roman Caesar), three Jewish (Joshua, David, and Judas Maccabaeus), and three Christian (Arthur, Charlemagne, and the crusader Godefroy de Bouillon) — who embodied the highest qualities of knightly nobility. A veritable cult of these heroes — called in French the *Neuf Preux* or 'Nine Valliant Ones', and in English the 'Nine Worthies' — soon developed, and their attributed arms came to be widely represented, and included in a set in many armorials. They are of particular interest here because the invention of the professions of both knight and herald, and of the emblematic arms the former bore and the latter described, came to be attributed to the pagan Worthies in the treatises of our Second Age.

In the First Age itself, the traditional Trojan conqueror of Britain, Brutus, was replaced in the pre-history of the Matter of Britain by the Greek Worthy Alexander in the most important of the **prose romances** composed in French in that Age: *Perceforest*, composed c. 1337-1344. In it King Perceforest — a companion of Alexander assigned to govern and civilise the British — founded the knightly order of the *Franc Palais* or 'Noble Palace': a body that may well have served as a model for Edward III's project of 1344 to revive the Round Table, and for his rival Jehan II's order of the 'Noble House' of 1352. Comparable in importance to the *Perceforest* was the last verse romance composed in the whole Period: the great historian **Jehan Froissart**'s *Meliador*, redacted in c. 1365 and c. 1380.

Other works produced in this Age that are of interest to us are the **vernacular chronicles**: most significantly **Jehan le Bel**'s *Vrayes Chroniques* of 1272-1363, and its much longer and more famous sequel, **Froissart**'s *Chroniques de France, d'Angleterre et des païs voisins* of 1327-1400. Of similar interest is the **knightly biography** of the crusading King Pierre II of Cyprus, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*: the last work of the greatest poet and composer of the century, **Guillaume de Machaut**, written between 1369 and his death in 1377. The genre to which it belonged — earlier represented by only two works, one of 1220/5 and the other of 1280 — would enjoy a major revival in the next age, as we shall see. The works of all three of these genres continued to promote the heroic ideals of noble knighthood that were closely associated both with the heraldic profession and with the new knightly orders, and contain numerous descriptions of

their heroes in the panoply of their time. [34]

Another literary form that was particularly popular in this Age was the **dream-vision**, in which the writer recounted an elaborate dream in a narrative that was commonly of an allegorical character. Inspired both by Cicero's *Sommium Scipionis* or 'Dream of Scipio', and more directly by the hugely influential thirteenth-century *Roman de la rose* of Guillaume de Lorris and Jehan de Meun, the works of this genre in the Third Period often commented on the state of society organised by Estates. To the extent that they commented on the Second Estate, they constituted part of the literature on nobiliary culture.

An important work of precisely this sort — the Latin ***Somnium Viridarii*** or 'Dream of the Pleasure Garden' — was composed in 1376 by an anonymous French author, and translated into French in 1378 at the request of Charles V of France (a learned monarch who created the Royal Library on which the modern National Library of France was founded) by Evrart de Tremaugon, with the equivalent title ***Le Songe du Vergier***.[35] The *Somnium* or *Songe* was a polemical work that took the form of a dialogue (a common form of structure for didactic works in this period, derived from the Platonic tradition) between a *clerc* and a *chevalier*, of whom the former argued for the superiority of the lay and the latter for that of the ecclesiastical power. Of particular interest here is that Book I, chapters CXLIX-CLIV constitute a disputation about the nature of nobility and the right to ennoble, while the preceding chapter, CXLVIII, includes an epitome of the first continental treatise on armory, referred to above: **Bartolo da Sassoferrato**'s ***De insigniis et armis***, published in Bologna only twenty years earlier.[36] This is the earliest use of that seminal treatise I have found in a French work of any sort, and therefore the earliest discussion of armorial matters in the French language.

The tradition of writing short **treatises** on various subjects, both in Latin and in the vernacular, was also maintained in France throughout the Third Period, and gave rise to a considerable literature in its later Ages. Since works of this general type would become a major source for our knowledge of heraldic erudition and terminology in this Period, it will be useful to say something here both about their nature and place in the general didactic tradition, and about the type of physical context in which they were typically published: that of the **manuscript book**, produced by scribes working for stationers.

I shall begin with the context. Although there were exceptions, most of the books produced in manuscript before 1560, including those with which we shall be especially concerned, were composed of collections of distinct works on different subjects by different (usually anonymous) authors, selected by the purchaser from a list of models kept by the stationer for copying. While some of the works included in such

---

[34] The anonymous *Histoire de Guillaume le Mareschal*, and Jehan de Joinville's *Vie de Saint Loys*. See E. GAUCHER, *La Biographie Chevaleresque* (Paris, 1994).

[35] Marion SCHNERB-LIÈVRE. *Le Songe du Vergier, édité d'après le manuscript Royal 19 C iv de la British Library*. CNRS (2 vols., Paris, 1982), esp. I, pp. 294-314

[36] On this work, see below, § 3.2.

'miscellanies' or 'anthologies'[37] (including histories, romances, and lyric poems) were essentially *literary*, in many cases a high proportion of them were *didactic*, and took the form of a treatise or tract[38] (generally fairly short but sometimes much longer) intended to instruct the reader on a particular subject. Even primarily literary works in this period often had a strongly didactic character, and treatises (including a number on knightly virtues like the *Ordene de chevalerïe* of c. 1210 and the *Livre Charny* of c. 1352) were frequently expressed in verse rather than in the prose that would seem more natural to us, so the distinction between these genres is not as sharp as it might be. Nevertheless, treatises were normally expressed in an overtly didactic style, and like their modern successors, those on practical subjects usually dealt with their material in a straightforward explanatory mode, lacking any literary pretensions.

Treatises on subjects of particular interest to noblemen — including the ideal qualities and duties of a noble knight or lord, the art of war, and the rules governing judicial combats involving noblemen, though not heraldic arms — had already been composed in some numbers by the end of our Second Period, especially between 1170 and 1270.[39] The production of new works of these types had fallen off significantly after the latter date, however, and picked up again in France only briefly in the years around 1350. It was in these years that the first French translation of Ramon Llull's classic Catalan treatise ***Le Livre del orde de cavayleria*** of c. 1270[40] seems to have been produced, perhaps to serve as a partial basis for the last and most realistic treatise on the knightly vocation, the ***Livre de chevalerïe*** of c.

---

[37] In strict usage, the term 'miscellany' refers to a collection of works of disparate natures assembled with little or no rationale, while 'anthology' refers to a collection of a similar genre or by a single author or set of authors. Most manuscripts containing treatises fell somewhere between these ideal types.

[38] The Latin word for works of this sort was *tractatus*, which by 1432 had given rise to the English 'tract'. In the meantime, the related Old French verb *traitier* 'to treat' had by 1250 given rise to the Old French noun *tretis*/ *tretis*, which itself had by 1375 given rise to the Middle English *tretys* (from 1633 usually written 'treatise' in the modern manner). (*OED 2*, XVIII, pp. 342, 464) Both 'tract' and 'treatise' are still used to designate works of this sort individually, but the latter is the normal word for them as a class. In Middle French, *tretis* was gradually replaced by the related word *traicté* (att. 1370), a Latinised version of the Old French *traitié*, a substantivised use of the past participle of the verb, attested from c. 1170; it would be replaced in Modern French by the de-Latinised *traité*, attested from 1530.

[39] That period alone saw the production of at least twenty-nine treatises dedicated wholly or in large part to such matters, including several embedded in other works. I have compiled a bibliography of such works in all languages, and acquired copies of most of them, to serve as a basis for a series of studies on the didactic literature aimed at nobles. Of these studies the first is 'The Notion of "Chivalry"', cited above on p. 2, n. 3.

[40] The original Catalan version was edited as L*ibro de la Orden de caballeria del B. Raimundo Lulio*. José Ramón DE LUANCO, (Real Acad. de Buenas Letras de Barcelona, 1901); one of the Middle French translations was edited by V[icenzo] MINERVINI, Ramon Llull, *Livre de l'ordre de chevalerie* (Bari, 1972).

1352,[41] composed by Geoffroy de Charny for Jehan 'the Good' of France and his knights of the Star, and soon (or perhaps initially) given a poetic form for easier memorisation in the ***Livre Charny***.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the first two treatises on armory known to have been composed anywhere — the anonymous ***De heraudie*** or *Dean Tract* of 1341/5[42] and the ***De insigniis et armis*** of 1355/8 — appeared a few years before and after these works, and that no other comparable works would be composed before the end of the Age three decades later. It is also significant that the earlier of these works belonged to a long-established genre of practical treatises apparently aimed at apprentices in some craft. As such it was related both to Charny's contemporary treatises on knighthood, and to the much better-known and influential work called ***Il Libro dell'arte*** — probably composed around the end of our First Age by the Tuscan painter **Cennino d'Andrea Cennini**, and intended to serve as a general introduction to the contemporary art of painting as practised in northern Italy.[43] Among other matters discussed by Cennino in this treatise was the manufacture of crests for use by knights in tourneys, or by princes in solemn processions — thus making it in part the first treatise on any aspect of **emblazonry**, or the representation of armorial signs.[44] The art of the herald as the *describer* of arms and that of the painter as the *realiser* of their descriptions had always been closely entwined, but these treatises provide us with the earliest written evidence we possess for the thinking of contemporaries on such matters.

Literary and linguistic developments in **England** in the First Age of our Third Period were of a comparable nature but an even greater significance. In England the Age witnessed the final stage in the rise of English — increasingly fortified with words borrowed from both French and Latin — as the language of courtly literature, and the gradual reduction of Anglo-Norman to the role of a technical language for lawyers and heralds, learned for professional rather than social reasons.

After two centuries in the shadow of the insular dialect of the Old French of the conquerors, **Middle English** had finally begun to emerge as a respectable vehicle for the composition of both romances and chronicles in the reign of the knightly king Edward I (1272-1307). Down to about 1300 almost all of the **romances** composed in England had been expressed in the

---

[41] The prose version has been edited twice: 1. by Kervyn DE LETTENHOVE, in *Froissart, Chroniques*, I, iii (Brussels, 1873), pp. 462-533; and 2. by Richard W. KAEUPER and Elspeth KENNEDY, *The Book of Chivalry of Geoffroi de Charny. Text, Context, and Translation* (Philadelphia, 1996).

[42] On these works, see below, pp. 65-68.

[43] This work was edited, translated, and studied in *Cennino d'Andrea Cennini da Colle di Val d'Elsa. Il Libro dell'Arte*, ed. D. V. THOMPSON, Jr. (2 vols., New Haven, 1932-3, repr. New York, 1960). The text is also available on line at http://www.noteaccess.com/Texts/Cennini/. The dates of Cennino's life and work can only be established very approximately, but the techniques he describes had all been established by the middle of the fourteenth century, so the work was probably completed before 1400.

[44] This was noted in WOODCOCK and ROBINSON, *Oxford Guide to Heraldry*, p. 83.

Anglo-Norman long preferred for such purposes by the members of their noble audiences, but this preference was clearly abandoned around that year, as all thirty-two of the known romances in insular French were composed before that date.[45] The earliest romances composed in English had been *King Horn* and *Havelok the Dane*, both of which had been based on Anglo-Norman originals, and had probably been completed in their earliest recorded forms around 1250. Nevertheless, both of them seem to reflect burgess values, suggesting a sub-knightly audience for works in English quite different from that of the French romances of the same period.[46] These early English romances were followed roughly half a century later by two romances equally derived from Anglo-Norman originals — *Guy of Warwick* and *Bevis of Hampton* — but clearly aimed at a noble readership, and this would be true of most of their successors.[47]

These two works (which with their predecessors formed part of what has been called the 'Matter of England', as they deal with peculiarly English heroes) were followed almost immediately by four other romances: *Richard Coeur de Lion, King Alisaunder*, the *Seege of Troye, and Arthur and Merlin*. The first of these belonged to the same indigenous matter, but the next two introduced into English literature the Matter of Rome, and the fourth the 'Matter of Britain'. Thus, soon before the death of Edward I in 1307, Middle English had finally been adopted as the vehicle for the expression of a range of romance themes embracing virtually all of those long expressed in Old French, and promoting the same nobiliary values. The production of such works in England would continue through the first three of our five Ages, and they would continue to be printed and read in the Fourth. In consequence, they could in principle serve as a source of information on the lexicon of knightly equipment and associated emblems for as long as arms continued to be displayed in battle — and in fact a number of them are quite useful for this purpose, as we shall see.[48]

The most important and influential English writers of the First Age of the Third Period were **William Langland** (v. c. 1332 – c. 1386) — the conjectured author of the dream-vision *Piers Plowman*, a social commentary completed at some time between 1360 and 1387 — and the anonymous **Pearl Poet**: the conjectured author of the four great poems *Pearl* (another

---

[45] See Ruth J. DEAN and Maureen B. M. BOULTON, *Anglo-Norman Literature: A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts* (London, A. N. T. S., 1999), pp. 88-102, nos. 51-75.

[46] On these, see Albert BAUGH (ed.), *A Literary History of England*, I, Kemp MALONE & Albert BAUGH, *The Middle Ages* (2nd edn., London, 1967), pp. 173-99.

[47] *Ibid*., p. 178.

[48] Not surprisingly, the Matter of Britain, set in the time and land of King Arthur, gave rise to the largest number of romances in English, including a dozen works devoted to the deeds of Gawain (the most important being *Ywain and Gawain* of c. 1350 and the Pearl Poet's *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* of c. 1355), and two at least ostensibly devoted to the life of Arthur himself: the alliterative *Morte Arthure* of c. 1360 and the stanzaic *Morte Arthur* of c. 1400. Not until the emergence of the form of our language now called Early Modern English just before 1485, however — the beginning of our Fourth Age — would a full treatment of the Arthurian legend be produced in England: Sir Thomas Mallory's *Morte Darthur*, published in print by William Caxton in 1485.

dream-vision), *Patience*, *Cleanness*, and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, and possibly of a fifth, *Sir Erkenwald*. Significantly, both of these conjectured poets still wrote in regional dialects, quite different from that of London and the royal court that would begin to prevail as the basis for courtly and literary English in the Second Age. So did the anonymous author of the other major work of the Age, *Wynnere and Wastoure*: another dream-vision, composed in the 1350s, and centred on a debate in the presence of Edward III. As this suggests, even literary English remained extremely diverse in our First Age, and to a diminishing extent to the end of the Third, and perhaps for that reason, continued to compete, with only moderate success in most spheres, not only with Anglo-Norman, but also with Latin.

This was to be true in the sphere of heraldic erudition and administration, as we shall see, but it was also true in the sphere of **historiography**. The first history to be composed in English had been ***Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle***, covering the period from legendary conquest of Britain by the Trojan prince Brutus down to 1270, and probably completed in the 1290s.[49] Unfortunately from the perspective of this study, this work was to remain exceptional, and the great majority of the chronicles produced in England would continue to be composed in Latin well into the sixteenth century. Only one even *quasi*-historiographical work — a long poem called ***The Brus***, by the Scottish cleric **John Barbour** — was written in any dialect of English between 1300 and 1380, and even it was composed in the last decade of that period (which was also the last decade of our First Age). Furthermore, only three other historiographical works would be composed in Middle English before c. 1540, all of them after 1400: the *London Chronicles*; the *Ely Chronicles* from 1462; and John Hardyng's *Chronicle*, completed in 1464. To these may be added two chronicles eventually translated out of Anglo-Norman or Latin into Middle English in the later fourteenth or early fifteenth century: the **Anglo-Norman *Brut*** (a history of Britain to 1333) and **Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*** (a universal chronicle in the encyclopaedic tradition, ending in 1352).

Thus, the historiographical sources for the lexicon of heraldry in English in the Third Period are scarcely more abundant than they had been in the first two, and there are great gaps between 1333 and 1385 (the whole Frist Age) and c. 1410 and 1462 (most of the second and half of the Third Age). In addition, only a minority of the chronicles in English were composed in what is usually called the 'chivalric' or *knightly tradition* — concentrating on the glorious 'feats of arms' of knightly kings and lords — which alone tended to describe or even mention the shields, helms, and coats worn by knights. These works included Barbour's *Brus*, Higden's *Polychronicon*, Hardyng's *Chronicle*, and Froissart's *Chronicles*, which in their English forms all dated from after 1378, and mainly from after 1460. For these reasons, then, contemporary histories add rather less than might have been expected to our knowledge of the heraldic lexicon in English before 1460, but they, too, include some material of value for my purposes,

[49] See Antonia GRANSDEN, *Historical Writing in England 550-1307* (London, 1974), pp. 432-38; and EADEM, *Historical Writing 1307-1485* (for the First Age pp. 43-117).

and even the Latin words for heraldica often reveal the vernacular words they usually represent.

In fact, the one remaining chronicle in the knightly or romance tradition composed in England in our Period was composed in Latin: the ***Scalacronica*** of Sir **Thomas Gray of Heton**, the first nobleman since the Conquest to write a chronicle of any sort.[50] This is of some interest here, for Heton wrote it while a prisoner of the Scots between 1355 and 1363, and in addition to recounting the deeds of English kings and lords from the time of the early Britons to his own days as a combatant in the Hundred Years War, he expressed in philosophical passages the values of his Estate, in the context of a discussion of the relative merits of war and peace.

### 3.1.2. THE SECOND AGE, C. 1380 – C. 1422

The Second Age of the Third Period corresponded in **England** with the reigns of Edward III's ill-fated grandson Richard II (1377-99); of the latter's patrilineal cousin Henry IV Plantagenet of Lancaster (1399-1414), who deposed and murdered him, and usurped his throne; and of that king's heroic son Henry V (1414-22), who died after a short reign leaving his kingdoms to his infant son. The last of these kings sought to restore the honour (and assert the throneworthiness) of his lineage by vindicating his great-grandfather's claim to the throne of France, and between 1415 and his premature death in 1422 he succeeded both in conquering the northern half of that kingdom, and in securing the succession to its throne for his son Henry (VI) through his marriage to the daughter of the current French king, Charles VI.

In **France** the Age corresponded precisely with the disastrous reign of that king (1380-1422), marked by a long minority followed by intermittent royal madness, a civil war between parties loyal to his patrilineal kinsmen the successive Dukes of Orléans (Louis and Charles) and Burgundy (Philippe II 'the Bold', Jehan 'the Fearless', and Philippe III 'the Good'), the destruction of the French army at Agincourt in 1415, and the subsequent conquest of the northern part of the kingdom, including Paris.

#### 3.1.2.a. The corps and craft of the heralds in the Second Age

The Second Age witnessed a continuing rise in the status, organisation, and geographical distribution of the heraldic profession through most of Latin Christendom, and the final establishment in both France and England of the full hierarchy of heraldic ranks, from principal king of arms to pursuivant, all associated with named offices. I shall discuss these developments in more detail in the next Subdivision, but it will be useful to mention here the organisation of the royal heralds of both kingdoms into **colleges** (in 1407 and 1420 respectively), and the attachment of the **principal kingship of arms** in France rather loosely to the office of Montjoie King of Arms by 1380, and in England quite firmly to the office of Garter King of Arms, created by Henry V in association with the reform of

[50] *Ibid*., pp. 92-96

the Order of the Garter around 1417.

As we saw in the last section, the leading heralds of France and Germany completed a number of impressive armorials in the first decades of the Second Age. In England the rate of production of such catalogues of arms remained at about the same level as in the First Age (thirteen in forty-two years as compared to fourteen in fifty), but none of them can be attributed to a particular collector, and while two of them (those named for William Jenyns of c. 1380 and John Basynges of c. 1395) were early 'ordinaries', only two were blazoned, and the rest are of little interest.[51] The Age also saw, in its second decade, the composition of at least two distinct **treatises on armory**, one in Wales and the other in France: the ***Tractatus de armis*** of 'Johannes de Bado Aureo' of 1395, and the elements of the anonymous ***Livre des armes et des heraulx*** published c. 1402.

It is significant here that the French treatise was the first to have been composed by a member of the corps and *mestier* of the heralds, for the same decade saw the emergence of the idea that heralds — in order both to carry out their functions effectively and (even more importantly) to increase the esteem in which their occupation was held by contemporaries[52] — ought at least to be literate in their own vernacular, and ideally to be well educated by contemporary standards (which included literacy in Latin). This general idea was first clearly stated in a treatise on the preparation of pursuivants, composed at some time in the early fifteenth century,[53] but it is at least implicit in the pseudo-historical introduction to the *Livre des armes et des heraulx*, which included an account of the remote origins and dignity of their 'Office', and in a similar account in a treatise on the heraldic profession of 1406 that I shall discuss below.

The earliest surviving evidence either that heralds were regarded by contemporaries as the principal experts in armory, or that they often maintained written records of arms, also comes to us from the 1390s. In the record of the proceedings of the Court of Chivalry in the case of Lovel v. Morley in 1395, expert testimony on the question of the right to alienate arms was taken for the first time on record from two kings of arms (Valliant and Aquitaine).[54] In a passage of his Chronicle under the year 1397, Froissart recounted an encounter with John Othelake, March Herald,

---

[51] WAGNER, *Aspilogia* I, pp. 68-81

[52] It is significant in this regard that the word *heraudie*, when referring to a herald's coat, was used metaphorically for 'a shabby garment'. See Part II.A, § 2.2.5.b., p. 46.

[53] The treatise in question — called in the manuscripts *Comment on doit faire pursuivant et comment il se doit gouverner* — is concerned with the qualifications and training ideally required for admission to the Office of Arms as a pursuivant, and for promotion from pursuivant to master herald. It is a short piece of about 680 words that occupies less than three pages of the manuscript from which I have transcribed it (London, British Library, Additional ms. 30,495, fols. 13v-14v). I discussed it in a paper 'Treatises on the Education of Heralds and the Rôle of Heraldic Itinerancy in the Dissemination of Courtly Culture in the Fifteenth Century', to the 13th Triennial Congress of the International Courtly Literature Society, Univ. de Montréal, Univ. de Québec à Montréal, 29 July 2010.

[54] See WAGNER, *Heralds and Heraldry*, pp. 22-23.

in which he asked the latter if he knew the arms of one Henry Cristede, and the latter not only answered him with a blazon of the arms in question, but assured him that he knew it because he had had written it down so that he would not forget it.[55] Finally, in a passage of the satirical poem *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*, composed between 1393 and 1400, the anonymous author commented critically on the armorial windows of a Dominican house, and declared that '*There is non heraud hath half swich a rolle*'.[56]

No English herald is known to have written anything more challenging than a blazoned armorial before the end of the Second Age, but heralds in both Germany and France certainly did so in its first two decades. We have already encountered **Claes Heinen**, Gelre Herald, as the author of one of the greatest universal armorials of the whole Period, begun in the previous Age but only completed in the current one. Gelre was in fact an accomplished writer, who not only composed a whole series of *Lobdichte* or 'praise-poems' for an unnamed lady — describing in the most courtly manner his various adventures in the service of noble ladies — but a lament for the seven 'men of price' who fell at Staveren in 1346, and a series of brief poetic biographies of contemporary heroes, including Rutger Raets and Dietrich of Elnaer.[57]

The other German herald of this period to leave a literary legacy was **Peter 'Suchenwirt'**, who lived from c. 1320 to c. 1395, and from 1372 was *Suchenwirt* Pursuivant (*Knappe von der Wappen*) to Duke Albrecht III of Austria (v. 1348-1407) — called 'with the Tress' as the founder (by 1386) of the knightly society of that name.[58] Suchenwirt's *oeuvre* is of a quality and diversity comparable to that of Heinen, and included not only similar laments for fallen heroes, but an account in verse of Albrecht's crusade to Prussia of 1377 (in which he took part).[59] He is regarded as a master of the peculiarly German genre of *Heroldsdichtung* or 'heraldic poetry', characterised by versified blazons of the arms of the protagonists. Like the poetic works of Heinen, therefore, those of Suchenwirt are among the most important sources for our knowledge of blazonic language in the dialects of Germany, but make a much smaller contribution to our knowledge of taxonomic terminology.

The only French herald known to have made a contribution to the non-blazonic literature of the Second Age was **Nicolas Villart**, who appears to have served as both Calabria and Anjou King of Arms under Louis II Capet de Valois-Anjou, the grandson of King Jehan 'the Good'. Louis had been titular Duke of Calabria from 1383, and from the following year to his death in 1417 was the second Duke of Anjou and Count of Maine in succession to his father Louis I; titular King of Jerusalem and Sicily, and Count of Provence, Forcalquier, and Piedmont, in succession to his mother; and from 1400 titular King of Aragon, Valencia, and Majorca,

---

[55] *Ibid*., p. 51

[56] Ibid. The latest edition is Helen BARR, *The Piers Plowman Tradition* (Lond., 1993)

[57] KEEN, *Chivalry*, pp. 139-40, citing V. BOUTON (ed.), *Wapenboek ou Armorial de 1334 à 1372 … par Gelre Héraut d'Armes* (Paris, 1881), I, pp. 67ff, 90, 97, 7ff, 41, 49.

[58] BOULTON, *Knights of the Crown*, pp. 338-342

[59] KEEN, *Chivalry*, p. 140, cit. A. PRIMISSER (ed.), *P. Suchenwirt, Werke* (Vienna, 1827)

in right of his wife. Not much seems to be known about Villart — called by his contemporaries *le bon Calabre* — but in 1406, while King of Arms of Anjou and Touraine, he composed what was presented as a letter replying to seven questions on the origins and duties of the heraldic office. This amounted to a treatise on the heraldic profession or 'office of arms', and as such was called by Alan Manning the ***Anjou Tract***.[60] In this work (preserved in at least one manuscript) Villart described the rituals by which kings of arms, heralds, and pursuivants had been created since the reign of Charles V (d. 1380), set out the form of the oaths that they were required to take, their rights to fees, *largesse*, and immunity on the field of battle, and a version of the recently-invented story of the origins of the heralds in Classical Antiquity already included in the composite treatise published a few years earlier. The literary quality of this treatise was not especially high, but it was nevertheless an important testimony not only to heraldic literacy, but to the claims of the heraldic profession at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Various later treatises on similar themes composed on both sides of the Channel would probably own a great deal to it.

### 3.1.2.b. Developments in general literacy, learning, and book-production

The novel notion that heralds should have a good education also reflected another set of developments in contemporary culture of particular importance here. Two of these were an increase in literacy and theoretical learning among the members of the higher orders of lay society in general, and a consequent increase of interest in acquiring manuscript books from which to gain a knowledge of matters that were regarded as important to gentlefolk: matters that increasingly included the armorial code, and some part of the armorial corpus as well.

Another development of the Second Age was closely related to the last two: an enormous increase in the production both of *treatises* and of *books* including them, along with other types of work both traditionally and newly of interest to nobles and those aspiring to their ranks.[61] The production of books of all kinds had fallen off sharply in the decades immediately following the first outbreak of the Bubonic Plague in 1348, and the sudden deaths of a third of the population of Latin Europe. Demand began to pick up again in the last quarter or so of the fourteenth century, however — the first half of our Second Age — driven by the rising levels of literacy among the laity in general, and the desires of three quite different sets of readers for books of different types in different numbers and qualities.

People of modest means typically wanted only one or two cheap books composed of a handful of texts of a practical, edifying, entertaining, or devotional character — the most popular type being the Book of Hours, of which many thousands were produced for all levels of the book-market.

---

[60] Alan MANNING, *The Argentaye Tract* (Toronto, London, 1983), pp. 8-9; and KEEN, *Chivalry*, p. 137, citing Oxford, Bodl. Lib, Rawlinson ms. C 399, fols. 77r-78v.

[61] On the history of the production of books in this period, see Andrew PETTEGREE, *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven & London, 2010), esp. pp. 3-62.

The manuscript including the very first treatise on armory, *De heraudie*, falls into this category. Many of the laymen and women of the next level — made up mainly of literate knights, squires, heralds, lawyers, and merchants — seem to have wanted a somewhat larger collection of books of better quality, and including a wider variety of texts — though even on this level the composition of most of the contemporary libraries of which we have a record was remarkably small and limited in range. That of Sir Bartholomew Bacon, for example, who died in 1389, contained only a single book (called *Romaunce*); that of Sir John Fastolf — one of the richest knights in England in the fifteenth century — consisted of nineteen books, including six histories, a French translation of Vegetius's *De re militari*, one French poem, and two romances; and that of the lawyer Sir Thomas Urswyck, Chief Baron of the Court of the Exchequer, who died in 1479, had contained only six volumes, including a law book, two devotional works, and copies of the works of Chaucer, Mandeville, and Froissart. One of the largest collections of the period was that of the relatively humble town clerk of London, John Carpenter, who left over twenty-six books to his friends in his will of 1442.[62] Nevertheless, a few of the treatises on heraldic and nobiliary subjects were actually composed by men of this level, including the knight Geoffroy de Charny and Chandos Herald in the First Age, and the knight Diego de Valera and Gilles le Bouvier, Berry King of Arms, in the Third. By Le Bouvier's time it is likely that senior heralds like Berry possessed substantial libraries of their own, including many of the treatises on military, nobiliary, and armorial subjects composed in our Period, but the first evidence we have for this is the inventory of the library of Thomas Benolt, Clarenceux King of Arms of southern England and Wales, who died in 1534. It did indeed contain a large collection of such works, but I shall postpone reviewing its contents to my discussion of heraldic literacy in the Fourth Age, in which he lived and worked.[63]

From early in our Second Age, men and women with deeper pockets and a better education often aspired to participate in the new 'Humanist' learning initiated in Italy around the middle of the fourteenth century, and therefore wanted well-prepared copies of Latin classics in the original language. Persons of this group were typically drawn from the ranks of abbots, priors, and monks in rich houses, minor prelates like archdeacons and canons, university lecturers in fields including law, and both clerical and lay graduates of universities of noble and burgess origin, serving in the households or administrations of princes, barons, and rich knights. It was probably from the ranks of such men — whose number included poets like Chaucer and Alain Chartier, and the only serious English antiquaries before 1485, John Rous and William Worcester[64] — that most of the authors of treatises in our period were drawn.

---

[62] See Sylvia THRUPP, *The Merchant Class of Medieval London* (Ann Arbor, 1980), pp. 247-249

[63] On his collection, see KEEN, *Chivalry*, pp. 141-142

[64] On these men and antiquarianism in England, see below, pp. 52-53.

At the highest end of the book-market were the princes, great lords, and major prelates, who in this period began to regard the possession of an extensive library as a necessary sign of their status and cultivation, and therefore competed with one another in collecting books from the best *ateliers*, usually written in the best hands and inks on the best parchment, and beautifully illuminated. Their libraries often came to be made up of books on a wide range of subjects, among them Bibles, lives of saints, chronicles, romances, and even translations of Classical Latin works. Like those of the humblest book-owners, their books also included numerous treatises on a wide range of subjects — increasingly including subjects of a distinctly heraldic nature, as we shall see. Perhaps surprisingly, a number of such treatises were actually composed by men of this exalted social level, including the prelate Siôn Trevor, Bishop of St. Asaph's, the prince René, Duke of Anjou, and the great lord Jehan, Count of Sancerre.

Down to 1450, all books in Latin Christendom would be produced by manual copying in one or another of the workshops that were mainly clustered in larger towns and cities — especially those that were the seats of a university or of a major court. The largest and most important cluster of workshops was located in Paris, they royal capital of France, in the vicinity of its University (itself the most important in Europe), but others of considerable importance emerged in the Flemish towns of Bruges and Ghent (where the Dukes of Burgundy emerged as patrons of the highest order), and in the principal towns of northern Italy, especially Florence (where the Medici played a similar rôle). The most important workshops of all of these cities provided books to order for rich collectors all over Europe from the later fourteenth well into the sixteenth century: long after the invention of printing by Johannes Gutenberg, patrician of Mainz, in or about 1450.

### 3.1.2.c. Developments in the languages and literatures of France and England in the Second Age

I must finally take note here of the general developments in language and literature in France and England during the Second Age that were relevant to the central questions of this Division of my essay on terminology.

In **France** and adjacent Francophone regions, the Age saw the continued expansion of the lexicon described above, especially in the area of political theory, and the continuation of the rise to dominance of the Parisian or Francian dialect of Middle French in all vernacular contexts.[65] There were no major innovations in purely literary forms or topics of particular interest to us, but romances and histories continued to be composed in the knightly tradition, including most importantly the final version of the chronicles of Froissart noted above.

[65] On the state of French language and literature in this Age, see RICKARD, *History of the French Language*, ch. 4; *idem*, *Chrestomathie de la langue française au quinzième siècle* (Cambridge, 1976) and *La literature française aux XIVe et XVe siècles*, ed. Daniel POIRION (Heidelberg, 1988- )

The Age did see a significant increase in the production of **knightly biographies**, both individual and collective. In the former category — which celebrated the achievements of the principal heroes of both the French and English sides in the ongoing war — fell **Cuvelier**'s *Chanson de Bertrand du Guesclin* of c. 1381 and its prose rendition of 1387,[66] **Chandos Herald**'s *La Vie du Prince Noir* of c. 1385,[67] the anonymous *Histoire de Bertrand du Guesclin* of 1387, Marquis **Tommaso III of Saluzzo**'s *Le Chevalier errant* of 1395,[68] and the anonymous *Le Livre des fais du bon messire Jehan le Maingre dit Boucicaut, Mareschal de France et Gouverneur de Jennes* of 1409.[69] In the latter, collective category of knightly biographies, the most notable work was **Jakes de Hemricourt**'s *Le Miroir des Nobles de Hesbaye* of 1398.[70] Like the contemporary romances, such works made frequent references to the functional arms, armour, and armorial emblems of their protagonists, and can therefore serve as useful sources for the contemporary words for such things.

We are here particularly interested in the composition and publication of *treatises* of interest to noblemen and heralds. In **France**, the rate at which works on these themes were produced grew somewhat more rapidly in the Second Age, which saw both the composition and the translation of treatises not only on **armory,** but on **warfare** (still verbally identified with *chevalerïe*) and on **nobiliary virtues** (now largely detached from *chevalerïe*).

The original treatises on armory produced in France in this Age may have included a Latin work called *De picturis et armis* (*On Pictures and*

---

[66] The latter was edited in F. MICHEL, *Chronique de Du Guesclin* (Paris, 1830); there is a study in M. GENOBA, G. SEIFFERT-BUSCH (eds.), *La Littérature historiographique des origines à 1500*, *GRLMA*, IX.2, (1993), no. 13873. Du Guesclin was a Breton knight who in 1366 commanded a French force in support of he claims of Enrique of Trastámara to the Castilian throne against Pedro 'the Cruel' supported by the Black Prince, and served as Constable of France under Charles V from 1370 to his death in 1380, and by avoiding pitched battles, turned the tide of the war. He was buried with great ceremony in the Abbey of Saint-Denys among the kings of France, and his funeral is the first of its kind for which we have any record.

[67] Diana B. TYSON (ed.), *La Vie du Prince Noir by Chandos Herald* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 147; Tübingen, 1975)

[68] There was no edition of this work in 1984, but there is a study: N. JORGA. *Thomas III, marquis de Saluces: étude historique et littéraire* (St Denis, 1893)

[69] See Denis LALANDE (ed.), *Le Livre des fais du bon messire Jehan le Maingre, dit Bouciquaut, Mareschal de France et Gouverneur de Jennes* (Textes littéraires français 331; Geneva, 1985), 549 p. **Boucicault** (v. 1366-1421) was a Bourbonnais knight who was made Marshal of France by Charles VI in 1391 and commanded French forces in the disastrous battle of Nicopolis in 1396. After his ransom in 1399 he founded a chivalrous enterprise he called the *Emprise de l'Escu Vert a la Dame Blanche*, later that year was made the Constable of the Empire of Constantinople, and in 1401 was made the French governor of Genoa. He commanded the French vanguard at the Battle of Agincourt in 1415, and was again captured and died in captivity.

[70] See C. de BORMAN, A. BAYOT (eds.), *Oeuvres de Jacques de Hemricourt* (Brussels, 1910)

*Arms*), attributed to an otherwise unknown **Franciscus de Foveis**, and presumably composed around 1390, but if so that work has been lost. The first treatise composed in continental French, and the only one composed before the end of the Second Age, was the composite work called by Claire Boudreau *Livres des armes et des héraulx*. It seems to have originated as a set of very short treatises, probably composed in the 1390s by one or more anonymous heralds, which were collected and published shortly after 1400. I shall have more to say on these works in § 3.2 below.

The principal original treatises on warfare composed in this Age were (1) Prior **Honoré Bovet's** monumental (and highly influential) work of 1387 on the laws of war, *L'Arbre des Batailles* or 'Tree of Battles';[71] and (2) the comparable treatise of 1409/10 called *Le Livre des fais d'armes et de chevalerie* or 'Book of Feats of Arms and of Warfare, composed by **Christine de Pisan**, the first woman to make a living as a writer, and the author of a whole series of books, including a biography of her father's employer King Charles V. Significantly for us, both of these works included chapters on armory based on Bartolo's *De insigniis*, the former apparently based on the borrowed chapter in the *Songe du Vergier* of 1378, and the latter directly on the chapter in the former.[72] The only other important work on warfare to appear in French in this Age was what was probably the fifth translation of **Vegetius**' late Classical treatise the *Epitoma de re militari* of c. 1380, though it might have been made slightly later.

The works produced in the same general period on nobiliary qualities seem to have included the fourth and fifth French translations of Llull's treatise of c. 1374, *Le Libre del orde de cavayleria*. The original works on nobiliary virtues published in or shortly after the Second Age were Christine's highly original treatise *Epistre d'Othea a Hector* of 1400/01,[73] and the poet Alain Chartier's poems *Le Breviaire des Nobles* and *Le Debat du Herault, du Vassault, et du Villain*, both of which were probably composed sometime between 1417 and 1425, and preserved in numerous copies.[74] Thus, while the Age saw the publication of several didactic works in French of some interest to us, the number of such works remained low.

In **England**, the Second Age witnessed rather more important linguistic and literary developments. At the very beginning of the Age the dialect of London and the royal court finally emerged as the most

[71] On the *Arbre de Batailles* and its background, see ibid., pp. 278-287, and G. W. COOPLAND, *The Tree of Battles of Honoré Bonet* (Liverpool, 1949), pp. 11-69.

[72] See D'A. J. D. BOULTON, 'The Treatise on Armory in Christine de Pisan's *Livre des Fais d'Armes et de Chevalerie* and its place in the Tradition of Heraldic Didacticism', in *Contexts and Continuities: Proceedings of the IVth International Colloquium on Christine de Pisan (Glasgow, 21-27 July 2000), published in honour of Lilane Dulac*, ed. Angus J. KENNEDY, with Rosalind BROWN-GRANT, James C. LAIDLAW, and Catherine M. MÜLLER (Glasgow, 2002), Vol. I, pp. 87-98.

[73] There is no modern edition of this work, but it was translated into English twice in the fifteenth century, by Anthony BABYNGTON and Stephen SCROPE, and the latter was edited by C. F. BÜHLER in E.E.T.S. 264 (London, 1970)

[74] Editions of these works can be found in J. C. LAIDLAW (ed.), *The Poetical Works of Alain Chartier* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 393-409, and pp. 421-435

important of the many literary dialects of the kingdom, thanks in part to the influence of the vast and brilliant *oeuvre* of Geoffrey **Chaucer** — effectively the poet laureate both to Edward III in the last years of his reign (1374-77) and to Richard II to his death in 1399. Nevertheless, linguistic uniformity on the élite level would continue to develop slowly, by stages, throughout the Third Period.[75]

It is of particular interest here that Chaucer composed works in *courtly genres* and a *courtly language* much more heavily influenced by recent and contemporary French and Italian literature than by that of England, and that in consequence he introduced many new words of those origins into what would become standard English. Of Chaucer's numerous works, the two of most relevance to my theme were the romances *Palamon and Arcite* (1382, later included as the *Knight's Tale* in his great composite work *The Canterbury Tales*), and *Troilus and Criseyde* (1386/6). Matters of heraldic interest appear in a number of his other poems as well, however, and several heraldic terms are first attested in these works, as we shall see. Two satirical sequels to *Piers Plowman* were also composed in the Second Age, one of which (*Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*) we have already noted for its reference to the heralds and their rolls of arms.

By contrast, relatively little in the way of didactic or biographical literature relevant to knightly, nobiliary, or heraldic themes was produced in **England** or its domain in the Second Age. Perhaps the most important works to touch on the nobility and its duties were the two meditations on the Estates by the 'moral' poet John **Gower**: the Anglo-Norman *Mirour de l'Omme* or *Speculum Meditantis* of 1376/9, and the Latin *Vox Clamantis* of 1377/81,[76] which appeared at the very beginning of the Age. In the same category may be placed the sermon of Thomas **Wimbledon** *Redde rationem villcationis tue*, delivered c. 1388: the first Middle English work to deal at any length with such matters.[77] It is worth noting that the *Vie du Prince Noir* of Chandos Herald — though composed in the French dialect of Hainault — is preserved exclusively in manuscripts prepared in England, indicating that it was of greater interest in that still secondarily-Francophone kingdom than on the continent.

None of these works, however, included material in *English* that is of particular interest in the present context. Indeed, no work dedicated primarily to an heraldic subject would be produced in any form of English before the middle of the Third Age, and none that was primarily concerned with such matters would be composed in any language in England proper

---

[75] On the state of English language and literature in this Age, see STRANG, *History of English*, ch. III, and BAUGH, *Literary History of England*, I, chs. X, and XIV-XVIII.

[76] On the first see William Burton WILSON (rev. by Nancy WILSON VAN BAAK) *Mirour de l'Omme (Mirror of Mankind)*, (E. Lansing, Michigan, 1992); on the second Eric W. STOCKTON. *The Major Latin Works of John Gower. The Voice of One Crying and the Tripartite Chronicle: An Annotated Translation into English With and Introductory Essay on the Author's Non-English Works* (Seattle, 1962), esp. pp. 113-18, and 196-208

[77] Ione Kemp KNIGHT (ed.), *Wimbledon's Sermon Redde Rationem villcationis tue: A Middle English Sermon of the Fourteenth Century* (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1967), esp. pp. 63-4

before that time. In the lands of the Crown of England, however, a single treatise on armory in learned Latin, the *Tractatus de armis*, was composed in Wales and published in 1395 by one **Johannes de Bado Aureo**, (now generally identified as the Welsh Bishop **Siôn Trevor**). He soon translated it into his native Welsh as the *Llyfr Dysgread Arfau*, but not into either of the vernacular languages of England.[78] Unless it was closely based on the lost *De picturis et armis*, which Trevor cites as a source, his *Tractatus* was the first independent treatise to adopt the unfortunate Bartolan doctrine that both the tinctures and the figures included in emblematic arms carried an inherent symbolic value: a wholly groundless notion that would distract armorists for another three centuries.[79]

### 3.1.3. THE THIRD AGE C. 1422 – C. 1483/5

The Third Age of our Third Period began around 1422 and continued to about 1485. It coincided in **England** with the long minority (1422-37) and effective reign (1437-61, 1470-71) of Henry VI of Lancaster, only son of Henry V by Catherine of France, and with the reigns of his cousins of the rival York branch of the House of Plantagenet, Edward IV (1461-70, 1471-83), Edward V (1483), and Richard III (1483-5). It included both the last phase of the Hundred Years War (which from 1429 saw the steady erosion of the conquests of Henry V in the north, and ended with the all but total and effectively final expulsion of the English from France inland of Calais in 1453), and the whole period of civil strife between Lancastrians and Yorkists later called the 'Wars of the Roses' (which erupted sporadically between 1455 and 1485, and culminated in the death of the last Plantagenet king of either branch at Bosworth Field in 1485). In neither context did the English monarchy or nobility cover itself with glory, and the loss of their French possessions initiated a long period of increasing isolation from continental culture that would not end until the Restoration in 1660.

In **France**, by contrast, much of the Age was characterised by the slow revival and eventual triumph of the Capetian kings of the Valois line over their ancient rivals of the House of Plantagenet, and the restoration of the power, wealth, and prestige of the monarchy during the long reigns of **Charles VII** (1422-61) and his son **Louis XI** (1461-83). The triumph of the French monarchy and the senior line of the House of Valois was delayed for some time, however, by the opposition of successive heads of a cadet branch of the dynasty: **Philippe III 'the Good'** (1419-60) and **Charles I 'the Rash'** (1460-77), who were not only **Dukes of Burgundy** and Counts of Flanders and Artois in France, but of Dukes of Brabant, Limburg, and Luxemburg and Counts of Hainaut, Holland, Zeeland, and Friesland in the adjacent region of the Empire, and thus rulers of most of the Low

[78] On these treatises, see below, pp. 71-73.

[79] See D'A. J. D. BOULTON, 'Le symbolisme attribué aux couleurs héraldiques dans les traités de blason des XIVe, XVe et XVIe siècles', *Le Langage figuré: Actes du XIIe Colloque international, Université McGill, Montréal, 4-5-6 octobre 2004, pub. par Giuseppe di Stefano et Rose M. Bidler* (Montreal, 2007), pp. 63-88.

Countries. As this was then the most urbanised region of transalpine Europe, the two dukes in question were richer than any king, and they created a brilliant (if peripatetic) court that soon became, and long remained, the epicentre of its nobiliary and heraldic culture.

Among the more important objects of the Burgundian dukes in this Age was to restore the prestige of noble knighthood, which had been progressively tarnished in the two previous Ages following the utter destruction of vast hosts of noble knights by ignoble foot soldiers at Crécy in 1346, Poitiers in 1356, Sempach in 1386, and Agincourt in 1415, and by Muslim Turks at Nicopolis in 1396: the only real battle in the last Crusade. The nobiliary values traditionally associated with knighthood were promoted in a number of ways in the Burgundian court, including the staging of elaborate jousting competitions of various types. They were especially embodied, however, in the neo-Arthurian monarchical *Ordre de la Toison d'or* or **Order of the Golden Fleece**, founded by Philippe 'the Good' in 1430 after a half-century in which no comparable order had been established anywhere.[80] Its foundation and opulent endowment seems to have inspired a second wave of founding such orders in Latin Europe,[81] which culminated in the establishment of the *Ordre de Saint Michel archange* or **Order of St. Michael** by King Louis XI of France in 1469:[82] a replacement for the long-defunct 'Order of the Star', which was destined to survive to the Revolution of 1790. The Burgundian dukes also encouraged a brief revival of the tourney in their domain, were major patrons of jousts of all kinds, and commissioned or promoted the production of a great number of translations into Middle French of histories, romances, and other works composed earlier in Latin and Old French, and the composition of learned treatises on many subjects of particular interest to noblemen and heralds.

In France, their only serious rivals in these areas were their own patrilineal cousins — the **Dukes of Anjou**, Counts of Provence, and titular Kings of Jerusalem, Sicily, Aragon, Valencia, and Majorca (**Louis III**, 1417-34, and his brother **René** 'the Good', 1434-80, who founded the knightly **Order of the Crescent** in 1448[83]); the **Dukes of Bourbon** (**Jehan I**, 1410-33; **Charles I**, 1433-56; and **Jehan II**, 1456-88), and finally (to 1454) the Kings of England in their capacities as **Dukes of Normandy and Guyenne** and *de facto* Kings in various parts of France.

Through most of the Third Age these princes all outshone the Valois Kings of France in every aspect of courtly and nobiliary culture. Only after the deaths without male issue of Charles 'the Rash' of Burgundy in 1477, and of René 'the Good' of Anjou in 1480, and the annexation of their French domains to the royal demesne as 'lapsed appanges', was their cousin Louis XI in complete control of his kingdom, but that finally restored France to its traditional place as the richest and most powerful kingdom in Latin Christendom. Nevertheless, it would not be until after

[80] On this hiatus and the foundation of the Burgundian order see BOULTON, *Knights of the Crown*, chs. 12 (pp. 325-355) and 13 (pp. 356-362)
[81] See *ibid*., ch. 14 (pp. 397-426, ch. 15 (pp. 427-447), and app. V (pp. 575-643).
[82] *Ibid*., pp. 427-447
[83] *Ibid*., pp. 611-622

the accession of Louis' son Charles VIII in 1483 that it would begin once again to be a major locus of courtly culture.

### 3.1.3.a. The heralds of France and England, their functions, and their varied contributions to the literature on heraldica in the Third Age

Despite the steady decline in the use of arms in the primary mode, the even more rapid spread of their use in the secondary mode gave the heralds plenty of business, and the **Office of Arms** (as the heraldic profession had come to be called in both France and England) continued to prosper throughout the Third Age, and in much of Latin Christendom achieved not only its classic form, but the apogee of its prestige and influence. Within a few years of its inception heralds had come to be established in every royal court from Scandinavia to Portugal, and throughout the Age the heraldage constituted an international corps comparable only to the secular clergy. The practice of attaching the office of the principal king of arms of a kingdom or domain to the ruler's monarchical order of knighthood, initiated by Henry V of England in 1417, as we have seen, was adopted in 1430 by Duke Philippe of Burgundy in the statutes of his new order of the Golden Fleece, and would be adopted in 1448 by Duke René of Anjou in those of his new order of the Crescent, in 1465 by King Ferrante of peninsular Sicily in his new order of the Ermine, and in 1469 by King Louis XI of France in those of his new order of St. Michael in 1469 — in each case effectively formalising the traditional relationship between heraldry and knightliness. Before 1469, however, the status of *premier roi d'armes* in France remained only loosely associated with the office of Montjoie *roi d'armes*, and indeed between the death of Charles VI in 1422 and c. 1456 the premiership in the part of the kingdom initially governed by Charles VII from Bourges in Berry was actually held by Berry Herald or King of Arms, Gilles le Bouvier (v. 1386 – c. 1455), whom Charles had made a herald in 1420 and had probably given the march of Berry on his accession in 1422,[84] and whom Wagner described as 'a great man among heralds'.[85]

Unlike their English brethren, the French heralds did not acquire any new functions of consequence in this Age except in the context of funerals, and continued to serve in a strictly advisory capacity in the processes of both *granting* and *judging* the validity of disputed arms.[86] Nevertheless, they did continue to play a dominant rôle in the production of armorials in France, and also in the composition of treatises on armory, as we shall see. Not surprisingly, the most important armorial produced by a herald in the service of a King of France in the Third Age was the 'universal' *Armorial* compiled by the principal king of arms **Gilles le Bouvier**, which he probably compiled more or less continuously between 1420 and his death c. 1455, both from his own observations and from earlier armorials.[87] Significantly in the present context, Le Bouvier also

[84] Emmanuel DE BOOS (ed.), *Armorial de Gilles Le Bouvier, Héraut Berry* (Paris, 1995)
[85] WAGNER, *Heralds and Heraldry*, p. 54
[86] MATHIEU, *Système héraldique français*, pp. 62-63
[87] See DE BOOS (ed.), *Armorial de Gilles Le Bouvier*.

composed a history of his master's reign, the *Chroniques du roi Charles VII*; a chronicle of the reconquest of Normandy; a political biography of Richard II of England; and a geographical survey called *Le livre de la description de pays* that purported to be (and may in part have been) based on the journeys he had undertaken as an envoy of his master.[88] The last of these resembled two earlier works composed respectively by a Castilian and a Portuguese herald:[89] all natural reflections of the heralds' extensive experiences travelling from court to court on official business.

Probably not coincidentally, an armorial comparable to Le Bouvier's, now called the *Grand Armorial d'Europe et de la Toison d'or*, was compiled in the same period by the principal herald of the Burgundian domain, **Jehan le Febvre de Saint-Remy**, Charolais Herald and Marshal of Arms of Philippe 'the Good' in the 1420s, and first Golden Fleece King of Arms from just after the foundation of the Order in 1430 to his retirement in 1468 (when he was knighted by Charles 'the Rash'). Like Le Bouvier, Le Febvre de Saint-Remy was also the author of several other works, which included memoires of the principal chapters of the Order held in his time; two volumes of memoires on the events he experienced between 1407 and 1460; a treatise on the ordinances of the Dukes of Burgundy on armorial matters;[90] a treatise on armory called *Avis de Toison d'or sur le fait d'armoirie*;[91] and an earlier armorial called the *Armorial Charolais*, compiled around 1425.[92]

As the *oeuvres* of these two men suggest, the senior heralds of the Third Age were much more likely to be literate than their predecessors, and it is highly probable that the heralds of France were the authors of a large proportion of the numerous other types of work on heraldic subjects (mostly anonymous) that appeared in this period — especially those discussing the rights and duties of their profession. It is also likely that they created the designs and the blazons for most if not all of the arms both assumed and conferred by royal and princely letters patent in this and the following Ages, but those rôles are only occasionally mentioned in contemporary documents.

In **England**, as we shall see, the royal kings of arms — under the presidency of their new chief, Garter Principal King of Arms of the English — acquired by 1440 the right to confer arms on worthy recipients, from

---

[88] See *ibid*., pp. 6-7. For the last work, see E. T. HAMY (ed.), *Le livre de la description du Monde de Gilles le Bouvier, dit Berry, Premier Roy d'Armes de Charles VII, roi de France* (Paris, 1908)

[89] On these works, see M. J. LACARRA et al., *Libro del Conosçiemento de todos rregnos et tierras et señorios que son por el mundo, et de las señales et armas que han. Edición facsimilar del manuscrito Z (Múnich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hisp. 150)* (Saragossa, 1999); and Werner PARAVICINI, 'Signes et couleurs au Concile de Constance: le témoinage d'un héraut d'armes' (sent to me as an electronic offprint).

[90] On his life and works, see Fortuné KOLLER, *Au service de la Toison d'or (Les officiers)* (Dijon, 1971), pp. 137-139.

[91] On this treatise, see below, pp. 60 and 89.

[92] On the *Charolais Armorial*, see POPOFF, *Marches d'Armes* II, p. 141

1483 under the supervision of the Earl Marshal, but I shall postpone my discussion of these and related developments to the next Subdivision. Here we are concerned only with the contributions of the heralds to heraldistic erudition in this Age.

These contributions were probably rather greater and more diverse than in the previous two Ages, but the only herald whose name can be attached with certainty to any particular work was **William Bruges**, who from 1417 to 1450 held the office of Garter. The English heralds no doubt continued throughout the Age to compile armorials of the traditional types. No fewer than forty-six of these have survived from the Third Age — almost twice the twenty-seven of the two previous Ages combined — but once again very few were certainly compiled by heralds.[93] The most interesting armorials from the perspective of this study were: (1) the roll of the knights of the Garter prepared c. 1430 by Garter Bruges**,** arranged by stall, and including painted portraits of the First Founders in long armiferous tabards; (2) *Bradfer-Lawrence's Roll*, completed c. 1450, which was the first English armorial to include **crests** (happily blazoned as well as painted); (3) *Peter Le Neve's Book* of c. 1480-1500, and (4) *Ballard's Book* of c. 1465-90, which (with the *Rous Roll* of 1477-91, which I shall discuss below) are the only other armorials to include crests; and finally the only two works to contain collections of **badges**: (5) *Sir John Fenn's Book of Badges* of c. 1466/70, including fifty-seven badges drawn and tinted; and (6) *Barnard's Book of Badges*, a muster-roll of Edward IV's expedition to France in 1475, in which the badges are both tricked and blazoned.[94]

In addition the English heralds, like their French brethren, probably composed some or all of the didactic treatises on matters related to their profession that appear in contemporary manuscripts, but unlike the French heralds, as we shall see, they do not appear to have composed any of the treatises on armory that were produced in England in this Age. Thus, their only certain contributions to the development of heraldic and heraldistic terminology in English were made in the context of the letters by which they confirmed and conferred the right to particular arms and other armories in the years after 1440, which I shall examine in the next Subdivision of this essay.

### 3.1.3.b. The French tongue and relevant literature in the Third Age

The history of both linguistic and literary developments in our two kingdoms was sufficiently distinct, and the contributions of France and the Francophone regions of the Burgundian domain to the literature on matters of interest to heralds (and therefore to us) was so much greater than that of England, that it will be more useful to examine the former at length before turning to the latter (in §3.1.3.d) below.

In both **France** and **Burgundy** the Middle French of the royal and princely courts, employed both in formal documents and in works with any literary pretensions, continued to evolve slowly throughout the Age,

[93] See TREMLETT & LONDON, *Rolls of Arms of Henry III*, pp. 261-262.
[94] On these armorials, see WAGNER, *Catalogue*, pp. 83-86, 88-89, 106-107, 109-120.

marked as in the pervious Age by the growing standardisation of the literary dialect on the Parisian model, and further by its increasing influence on non-literary works produced in regions where the spoken vernacular was very different.[95]

In the literary sphere itself, most of the older genres also persisted in France in the Third Age, but inevitably some became *more* and others *less* popular than they had been in the previous Ages. A continuing taste for traditional works like epics, romances, and knightly histories and biographies can be seen in the number both of *copies* (often luxurious) made of such works composed in Early Middle French, and of *translations* of such works from Old French, Latin, Italian, and Spanish to contemporary Middle French, that were commissioned by kings and princes — especially by the Dukes of Burgundy, who also commissioned new works in the same genres.[96] Duke Philippe 'the Good' acquired by one means or another nearly 900 manuscripts, of which he personally commissioned (mainly in the years after 1445) forty-one volumes or sets, many of them of the luxurious type previously reserved for liturgical works.[97] The latter included the oldest manuscript of the vast fourteenth-century romance *Perceforest* (Paris, Arsenal ms. 3483-94), but the majority were histories that glorified the duke's ancestors and territories through association with early heroes — especially the *Preux* Alexander, Charlemagne, and Godefroy de Bouillon, portrayed as leaders of crusades of the sort he planned to undertake himself.[98] In addition, French writers composed or translated into Middle French an impressive number of treatises on a wide variety of subjects, including many that were of particular interest to heralds and heraldists. As they were mainly published in the context of heraldo-nobiliary anthologies, I shall examine these in § 3.1.3.c, which is devoted to the contents of such manuscripts.

French authors of the Third Age also produced a significant number of new historiographical, biographical, and purely literary works of all of the traditional types, in which descriptions of the armorial and para-armorial emblems employed in hastiludes were not infrequent. Because most of the authors of such works composed one or more works in several of these genres, as well as others of interest to us, I shall take note of these works first in the combined order of genre and author, introducing

---

[95] On the language and literature of France in this Age, see RICKARD, *History of the French Language*, ch. 4; IDEM, *Chrestomathie de la langue française au quinzième siècle* (Cambridge, 1976); & *La literature française aux XIVe et XVe siècles*, ed. Daniel POIRION (Heidelberg, 1988-)

[96] On these, see esp. Hanno WIJSMAN, *Luxury Bound. Illustrated Manuscript Production and Noble and Princely Book Ownership in the Burgundian Netherlands (1400-1550)*, Burgundica 16 (Turnhout, 2010).

[97] Georges DOGAER, Marguerite DEBAE, *La Librairie de Philippe le Bon* (Brussels, 1967); Wim BLOCKMANS, "Manuscript Acquisition by the Burgundian Court and the Market for Books in the Fifteenth-Century Netherlands', in *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, ed. Michael NORTH, David ORMROD (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 15 ff.

[98] See Elizabeth J. MOODEY, *Illuminated Crusader Histories for Philip the Good of Burgundy* (Turnhout, 2012), and Chrystèle BLONDEAU, *Un conquérant pour quatre ducs: Alexandre le Grand à la cour de Bourgogne* (Paris, 2009).

each author in the context of the discussion of the genre of his best-known or most important work. In shall also comment when it seems appropriate on the non-literary activities of the authors in question, in order to give the reader a more rounded picture of the literary, cultural, and social environment in which the treatises on armory and other heraldic subjects were produced in this uniquely fertile Age.

I shall begin with the historiographical works, and proceed to those of other genres composed by their authors, and then to other authors of similar works. The histories of particular interest composed in the Third Age were the *Chroniques* (1400-1444) of the Boulenois squire **Enguerrand de Monstrelet** (v. c. 1400-1453), which were begun as a continuation of those of Froissart; the *Chronique* (1420-1474) of **Georges Chastellain**, who from 1434 was a member of the Household of the Dukes of Burgundy, and from 1473 to his death in 1475 the official historiographer of the ducal House;[99] and finally the *Memoires* of the years 1435-1467 (completed c. 1470) of the Burgundian courtier and commander **Olivier de la Marche** (v. 1404/5-1475), Master of the Household of Duke Charles 'the Rash'.[100]

The latter two writers also composed important works in other genres of interest here. La Marche's *oeuvre* included at least four treatises: (1) on the household of Charles 'the Rash', completed in 1474; (2) on armory in the same year (discussed below); (3) on the rupture between Burgundy and France in 1491; and (4) on trial by combat (the *Livre de l'advis du gaige de bataille*) in 1494. In addition La Marche composed a number of poetic works, among which were knightly biographies of Dukes Philippe 'the Bold' (the *Vie de Philippe le Hardy*) and Charles 'the Rash' (the *Chevalier déliberé* of c. 1483).

**Chastellain** for his part wrote a similar biographical work (*Declaration des hauts faits et glorieuses aventures du duc de Bourgogne*), and several anonymous authors of the period composed works of the same genre. These included two biographies of the greatest Burgundian hero of the Age — the *Chronique de Jacques de Lalaing* (composed 1453/70?);[101] and *Le livre des faits de Jacques de Lalaing* (possibly written by the Burgundian herald, **Jehan le Febvre de Saint-Remy**, between 1470 and 1472)[102] — and biographies of two other heroic knights, *Le Livre des faits de Gilles de Chin*, and *Gillon de Trazenies*.[103]

In addition, the literary works of particular interest here include those of three noble authors, whose oeuvres comprised an even greater

---

[99] On the works of these historians, see Auguste MOLINIER, *Les Sources de l'histoire de France des origins aux guerres d'Italie: Les Valois, 1328-1461*, vol. IV (Paris, 1904), no. 3946, pp. 192-194 (Monstrelet), no. 3957, pp. 197-199 (Chastelain)

[100] On the life and works of Olivier de la Marche, see MOLINIER, *Les Sources*, vol. IV, no. 3961, pp. 200-203; on the *Mémoires* see Catherine EMERSON, *Olivier de La Marche and the Rhetoric of 15th-Century Historiography* (Woodbridge & Rochester 204)

[101] *Chronique de Jacques de Lalaing*, in. J. A. BUCHON, *Collections des Chroniques nationales françaises du treizième au seizième siècle* (Paris, 1825)

[102] Georges CHASTELLAIN, *Le livre des faits de Jacques de Lalaing*, in *Oevres*, ed. Kervyn DE LETTENHOVE (Brussels, 1866), VIII

[103] William KIBLER, 'Jacques de Lalaing', *Encyclopaedia of Medieval France*, p. 516

variety of genres. The first of these authors was the Gascon squire **Anthoine de la Sale** (v. 1386 - c. 1460), the first Occitan-speaker to write in French. His composite work *La Salade* of 1442-44 (composed for the instruction of Jehan d'Anjou, Duke of Calabria), included a number of heraldic treatises; his quasi-biographical romance *Jehan de Saintré* of 1456, dedicated to the same prince, included many descriptions of hastiludes, and a blazoned armorial of the princes and barons who took part in an expedition to Prussia described in it (extracted from the *Urfé Armorial* of c. 1380 noted above); and his treatise *Des anciens tournois et faits d'armes* of 1459 (composed for Jacques de Luxembourg, Viscount of Lannoy, younger brother of his current master Louis, Count of Saint-Pol — both knights of the Golden Fleece) was an important example of that didactic genre.[104]

Of comparable interest is *Le Jouvencel*, a practical treatise on the noble life in the form of a romance, composed between 1461 and 1468 by the Angevin knight and royal captain under both Charles VII and Louis XI, **Jehan V de Bueil** (v. 1404/6-1477), Count of Sancerre, who became a knight-companion of the Order of St. Michael at its foundation in 1469. As we shall see, this work was associated in most manuscripts with a treatise on armory in the form of figures alone, which is not otherwise preserved.[105]

Contemporary with these noble authors was another of still higher rank and much greater resources: **René 'the Good' Capet de Valois-Anjou** (v. 1409-1480), from 1430 Duke of Bar, from 1431 Duke of Lorraine, from 1434 Duke of Anjou and titular King of Sicily, Jerusalem, and Aragon, and from 1435 pretender to the thrones of the Crown of Hungary. From 1434 to 1437 he had been held prisoner by his cousin Philippe 'the Good' of Burgundy, who had a rival claim to the Duchy of Lorraine, and had thus become thoroughly familiar with the glories of the Burgundian court. After his release, René had done his best to outstrip his former captor in curial and knightly splendour, and during the many truces in the war with the English had organised (with his brother-in-law Charles VII, who had spent the years 1413-1417 in the court of Anjou as the fiancé of René's sister Marie), the grand tourneys for which he fixed the theoretical rules in his *Traictié de la forme et devis d'un tournoy*, composed between 1445 and 1450.[106] The latter work is an important source both for *representations* and for *descriptions* of the armorial elements of ludic armament. While writing it, René staged particularly splendid knightly festivals at Nancy in 1445, Saumur and Dijon in 1446, and Tarascon in 1449.[107] In the meantime, in 1448, he also founded his own order of knighthood, that of the Crescent, [108] on the general model of the Order of the Golden Fleece, but placed under

---

[104] On his life and works, see S.L., 'Antoine de La Sale', in *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le Moyen Age*, ed. Robert BOSSUAT, Louis PICHARD, & Guy Raynaud DE LAGE, rev. Geneviève HASENOHR & Michel ZINK (Paris, 1992), pp. 78-80.

[105] On his life and works, see S.L. 'Jean de Bueil', in *ibid*., pp. 755-757.

[106] Ed. in B. PROST, *Traicté de la forme et devis comme on faict les tournois, par Olivier de La Marche, Hardouin de la Jaille, Anthoine de La Sale* (Paris, 1878), pp. 193-221

[107] On these see Christian DE MÉRINDOL, *Les Fêtes de chevalerie à la court du roi René: Emblématique, art et histoire* (Paris, 1993)

[108] On the Order of the Crescent, see BOULTON, *Knights of the Crown*, pp. 611-622.

the patronage of the Antique warrior-saint, Maurice of the Theban Legion.

Over the next decade he composed his two most important literary works: the surprisingly ascetic *Mortifiement de vaine plaisance* ('*Mortification of Vain Pleasure*') in 1455, and the allegorical romance in the form of a dream-vision called the *Livre du cuer d'amours épris* ('*Book of the Heart Smitten by Love*') in 1457.[109] Like René's treatise on tourneys, both of these works were provided with elaborate programmes of illustrations of considerable interest to heraldists. He also commissioned many other works of art, including monuments literally covered with his armorial and para-armorial emblems.[110] The court of Anjou under René was thus a serious rival to that of Burgundy as a centre of patronage for both activities and works of interest to heralds — and significantly here, one that preserved the use of true arms and crests both in theory and in practice.

Other types of non-didactic work composed in the Third Age that can be mined for contemporary terms include accounts of travels including architectural descriptions (like the *Voyages et ambassades* of the Burgundian knight **Ghillebert de Lannoy**[111]), and the usual array of financial accounts, inventories of possessions, and wills. The language used in the great majority of these works is not the technical lexicon either of the *mestier* or craft of the heralds, or of the proto-discipline of the handful of learned heraldists, but rather that of men who were more or less well-read in the romantic and historical works of their time, and whose familiarity with the phenomena they described or named was derived from everyday experience. It is therefore reasonable to presume that the words they used to designate heraldic phenomena were, once again, those in current use in courtly and knightly circles.

### 3.1.3.c. The works collected in heraldic anthologies of the Third Age

As my account of the works of the leading historians and writers should suggest, the Third Age witnessed a tremendous growth in the production of **treatises** on nobiliary, knightly, and other heraldic themes, including armory. These works — the great majority expressed in Middle French — are naturally among the more important sources for our knowledge of the evolving heraldic lexicon in that language.

In fact, more treatises and related works on broadly heraldic themes were produced in our Third Age than in any comparable period before the late seventeenth century. Because of this proliferation, the best that I can do here is to suggest the range of their subjects, and the number of works on each of those subjects, is to present (in Table 3.1 below) and analyse the list I made of such works contained in the manuscripts of the *fonds français* of the Bibliothèque national de France: a list based on the descriptions of the contents of the thirty-eight manuscripts preserved in that collection

---

[109] On his life and works, see S.L., 'René d'Anjou', in *Dictionnaire* des lettres françaises, pp. 1258-1260.

[110] On these see Christian DE MÉRINDOL, *Le roi René et la seconde maison d'Anjou: Emblématique, Art, Histoire* (Paris, 1987)

[111] Ghillebert DE LANNOY, *Voyages et ambassades*, pub. in Ch. POTVIN (ed.), *Oeuvres de Ghillebert de Lannoy, Voyageur, Diplomate et Moraliste* (Louvain, 1878)

that include treatises on armory, given in the third volume of the doctoral thesis of Claire Boudreau.[112] Though constituting only about a third of the complete set of manuscripts Boudreau found to include such treatises, the thirty-eight *manuscripts* in question contain no fewer than one hundred and fifty-three *texts*: roughly two thirds of those contained in the whole set of such manuscripts she listed. They are thus broadly representative of the contents of such anthologies, and may stand as a proxy for the set — which itself omits the no doubt numerous anthologies of the heraldic-nobiliary category that did *not* include a treatise on armory.

In my table I sorted the whole set of texts into eleven general classes (marked with capital letters), and some of the larger of these into subclasses (marked with Roman numerals) and occasionally infraclasses (marked with Arabic numerals). Not surprisingly, the first and by far the largest of my general classes (A) is composed of **true treatises**. No fewer than sixty of the texts included in the manuscripts in question — almost forty percent — take the form of treatises or (in a few cases) extracts from longer treatises. The texts of this class fall into sixteen distinct subclasses, of which the largest (including thirty-two texts, or more than half) is made up of the treatises on armory studied by Boudreau.

In fact, the manuscripts in the *fonds français* series include the complete text of all but one of the French *traités de blason* or **treatises on armory** composed in French and published in manuscript before 1520. The fact that the set of manuscripts was selected on the basis of the inclusion of at least one such text does make this a less than ideal statistical sample, but it is significant that most of the treatises in question occur in more than one manuscript of the set, that several of the manuscripts include no other form of text, and that a number of them contain two or more such treatises.

Given their importance, it will be useful to make a few observations here about the treatises on armory composed in French in the Third Age itself as products of courtly culture.[113] As we have seen, only a single, composite work of this sort had appeared in the previous Age, so it cannot be too surprising that only four general treatises are known to have been produced in its first three decades, or that all four were probably composed after 1430. More surprising is the fact that the first two of the four, now called the ***First*** and ***Second Banyster Treatises***, appear to have been written by a Norman in the service of Henry VI of England, and that the third — which Boudreau has called the ***Traité en forme de questionnaire*** ('*Treatise in the form of a questionnaire*') — was composed soon before his death in 1437 by the herald **Jehan Courtois**, at the time Sicily Herald in the service of Alfons 'the Magnanimous', King of Aragon and also of peninsular Sicily — in title before 1444, and in practice thereafter. Courtois was also the author

[112] Claire BOUDREAU, *Les traités de blason en français (XVe-XVIe siècles)*, Thèse présentée pour l'obtention du diplôme de doctorat (nouveau régime) en histoire sous la direction de M. Michel Pastoureau, École pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Historiques et Philologiques (3 vols., Paris, 13 April 1996)

[113] All of these are discussed in detail *ibid*., and in a more cursory fashion in her published *Héritage symbolique des hérauts d'armes*, I, pp. 72-79, and I shall reserve both detailed comments and annotation on the individual texts to § 3.2.

of an armorial, called after him the *Armorial Sicile*, based largely on the *Urfé Armorial*, and completed around 1425,[114] and of a vast compilation on heraldic matters I shall examine below. Only the fourth general treatise, the ***Blason d'armes en douze chapîtres*** ('*Blazon of arms in twelve chapters*'), apparently published before 1444, might have been composed by someone in the service of a French prince, but although later claimed by Clément Prinsault — a member of the household of Jehan d'Armagnac, Bishop of Castres, the brother of Jacques, Count of Armagnac, and himself the author of an armorial named after him[115] — its true author is unknown.

A single short treatise on the much narrower subject of the two armorial furs, ermine and vair, may also have been composed before 1451. What may be usefully be called the ***Traité sur les fourures*** appears only in a manuscript compiled after 1454 (fr. 1983), in which it is attributed to a certain *Callabre*[116] — almost certainly the Angevin herald **Nicolas Villart**, whom we have already encountered as Calabria King of Arms under Duke Louis II of Anjou, and the author of a treatise on the office of arms completed in 1408. If Villart was indeed the author, it is likely that the treatise was composed before 1430, but its true origin remains obscure.

The second half of the Age saw the appearance of six more or less general treatises with texts, as well as the one in figures associated with *Le Jouvencel* noted above, and a **bestiary** based on that in Bartolo. Most of these works are very short, derivative, and of uncertain date. Three of the six more general treatises, including the ***Crequier de noblesse*** ('*Plum-tree*[117] *of Nobility*') were composed by an otherwise unknown **Hungary (*Hongrie*) King of Arms**, presumably in the service of Duke Louis' younger son René 'the Good' of Anjou in his capacity as pretender to the throne of Hungary between 1435 and his death in 1480. In one manuscript (fr. 5242) it is followed by an armorial attributed to and named for a herald with the same title, dated to 1460-1466.[118] The fourth treatise, the ***Avis de Toison d'or sur le fait d'armoirie***, ('*Advice of Golden Fleece on the Matter of Armory*') was composed in 1464 by the chief herald of the order of that name, and of the Burgundian domain more generally: **Jehan Le Febvre de Saint-Remy**, who as we have seen was the author of a number of related works. The one remaining treatise, which Boudreau called the ***Concertation héraldique*** ('*Heraldic Dialogue*'), was composed by another familiar author, the Burgundian courtier **Olivier de la Marche**, in consultation with several kings of arms, during the siege of Neuss in Germany in 1474.

Thus, most or all of the original treatises on armory composed in French between c. 1451 and 1480 were produced in the rival courts of Anjou and Burgundy, and all but the first were certainly composed either

---

[114] On the *Sicily Armorial*, see DE BOOS, *Marches d'Armes* III, p. 122.
[115] On the *Prinsault Armorial*, see POPOFF, *Marches d'Armes* II, p.
[116] On the *Traité de fourures* and its author, see Boudreau, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 78.
[117] The word *crequier* in Old and Middle French designated a wild plum-tree, which in armorial contexts took the stylised form of an uprooted tree whose branches, bearing both spines and fruit, were arranged like those of a chandelier of seven branches. (See Michel PASTOUREAU, *Traité d'héraldique* (1970), p. 322.
[118] On the *Hungary Armorial*, see DE BOOS, *Marches d'Armes* III, p. 148.

**Table 3.1. Texts in the Heraldic Anthologies of the *fonds français* of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.** The mss. are in numerical order under each heading, and the place of the text in the ms. is indicated in (). The treatises on armory are numbered in historical order of composition.

| TYPE /Subject | Text | Manuscripts (all Paris, B.n.F.) |
|---|---|---|
| **A. TREATISES** | | |
| **I. On Armory** | *Compil. hérald. de Jehan Courtois* | fr. **387** (S) |
| | ***2. Traité en forme de questionnaire de Jehan Courtois, Heraut Sicile*** | fr. **587** (2a); **1968** ( ); **1983** ( ) **2264** (11); **5231** (S); **5241** (9); **5930** (9) , **18,651** (2), **23,998** (2) [9 of 30 mss.] |
| | ***3. Traité en douze chapistres de 'Clément Prinsault'*** | fr. **1280** (2); **2475** (S); **5229** (9b); **5936** (S), **5939** (3), **6129** (S), **14,357** (3), **18,651** (1), **25,183** (1), **25,184** (1), **32,748** (S) [12 of 47 mss.] |
| | *12a. Tr. d. armes clericales,* extr. fr. Roland Bournel, *Recoeul de blason* | fr. **1969** ( 2?) [1 of 5 mss.] |
| | *12b. Tr. des armes féminines (extr. Roland Bournel, Recoeul de blason)* | fr. **1969** (4) [1 of 4 mss.] |
| | *12c. Tr. des armes de bastards* | fr. **1969** (5) |
| | *13. Tr. of Jean Le Féron* | fr. **2776** (S), **20,231** ( ) |
| | *Lost Tr. of 1389* | fr. **5229** (34 - erased) |
| | ***4. 1st Tr. of Calabria/ Hungary*** | fr. **5241** (3 – extr. on furs); **5242** (2a) |
| | ***5. 2nd Tr. of Calabria/ Hungary*** | fr. **5242** (2c) |
| | ***6. 3rd Tr. of Calabria/ Hungary (Crequier de noblesse)*** | fr. **1983** (), **2249** (), **5241** (12); **5242** (7) [4 of 9 mss.] |
| | *Extract of Crequier on colours* | fr. **2249** (11); **5241** (9) |
| | *Tr. metals & colours acc. emp.* | fr. **5930** (7) |
| | ***17. Diss. herald. [=Orléans tract]*** | fr. **5931** (1, 3) [Sole ms.] |
| | ***7. Jouvencel Tr.*** | fr. **5937** (6), **24,381** (2a, j) [2 of 3 mss.] |
| | *Tr. on heraldic animals* | fr. **5939** (6), **14,357** (5) |
| | ***14. Tr. of Jacques Le Boucq*** | fr. **9491** (1), **10,469** (3), **11,463** (1) [3 of 7 mss.] |
| | ***8. Avis de Toison d'or*** | fr. **1968** (24), **9491** (3), **23,998** (13) [2 of 6 mss.] |
| | ***10. Argentaye Tract*** | fr. **11,464** (1) [Sole ms.] |
| | ***1. Livre des armes et des heraulx*** | fr. **19,811** (3) [1 of 3 mss..] |
| | *Tr. on blazon* | fr. **24,381** (2l) |
| | *Tr. on placement of banners* | fr. **1968** (26) |
| | *Tr. on colours of Bartolo (Fr.)* | fr. **1968** (19), **19,811** (6), **23,998** (12)? |
| **II. Heralds, their origins and duties** | *Tr. of J. Erard* | fr. **5228** (1: extract) |
| | *T. on heralds* | fr. **5241** (8), **19,105** (6) |
| | *Tr. on heralds: Dits des philosophes* | fr. **1968** (14), **19,811** (2), **23,998** (7) |
| | *Origin: Epistre de Jules Cesar* | fr. **19,811** (2) |
| | *Quant on fait ung poursuivant* | fr. **19,811** (5) |
| | *Petition of the heralds of France for the reform of the office of arms* | fr. **1968** (11), **5241** (14) , **19,105** (12), **19,811** (7), **23,998** (14), **25,186** (5) |
| | *Oaths of French heralds* | fr. **1968** (13), **19,811** (8), **23,998** (6) |
| | *Tr. resp. to 7 questions* (Calabria) | fr. **5241** (15), **19,105** (13) |
| | *Cr. & app. of Montjoye K. Arms* | fr. **25,186** (13), **1968** (3) |
| | *Privileges of French heralds* | fr. **19,811** (9) |
| | *Tous heraulx et poursievans* | fr. **1968** (12), **1983** (3) **5229** (24), **19,811** (10), **25,186** (10) |
| | *Tr. on the funeral of a lady* | fr. **5229** (31b) |
| | *Les ceremonies du dire* | fr. **1983** (4) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **III. Military Offices** | *Tr. on the constable, marshal, admiral, captain, herald* | fr. **1968** (15), **5229** (29) |
| | *Tr. on the duties of a marshal* | fr. **1969** 6) |
| | *Tr. on the const., mar. France* | fr. **5241** (7), **19,105** (5) |
| **IV. Nobility** | *Nobles ordonnances* | fr. **23,998** (11) |
| | *Controversie de noblesse* (by Surse de Pistoie) | fr. **1968** (1) |
| ***1. Estates, status*** | *Breviaire de nobles* (by Alain Chartier) | fr. **5229** (24) |
| | *Tr. de noblesse* (by Jacques de Valere = Diego de Valera) | fr. **5229** (1, diff. redaction at 9a) |
| | Nobility of Hainault | fr. **5229** (13a) |
| ***2. Armigeral rights*** | *Des droits d'armes* | fr. **1280** (1) |
| | Extract fr. *Arbre de Batailles* | fr. **5229** (30) |
| ***3. Creation of dignities + precedence*** | Treatise on the creation of dignities (*Comment faire empereur*), foll. by Treatise on precedence of dignitaries | fr. **1968** (9a), **1983** (2), **2249** (1, 4), **5229** (27), **5241** (1a,b), **5930** (1a), **9491** (2b), **11,464** (2a), **23,998** (4), **25,186** (3a) |
| **V. War** | Treatise on tactics | fr. **1968** (9b), **1983** (2), **5241** (1c), **5930** (1b), **9491** (2c), **11,464** (2b), **25,186** (3a) |
| | *Arbre de Batailles* | fr. **2249** (24) |
| | *Débat Alex., Hannibal, Scipio* | fr. **1968** (2) |
| **VI. Gage of (i.e. trial by) battle** | *French rules* | fr. **1968** (8), **5241** (13) **9491** (2a), **11,464** (3), **25,186** (8) |
| | *English rules* (*D. of Gloucester*) | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **1968** (10), **23,998** (5) |
| **VII. Tournaments** | *Le roy Artus et le duc de Lancastre* | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **1968** (16) |
| | *C'est la maniere* | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **2249** (2) |
| | *Commant on crie les tournois* | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **25,186** (6) |
| **VIII. Errantry** | *Chevaliers errants* ('Merlin' de Cordeboeuf) | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **5241** (22) |
| **IX. Origin of jurisdiction** | | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **5930** (1c) |
| **X. Virtues** | Character of good Emperor | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **5229** (31a) |
| | Treatise on the 7 virtues of nobles, by rank from emperor to squire | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **25,186** (4) |
| **XI. Miscellaneous treatises** | Tr. on guard. of bodies of 3 kings, heads of 11,000 virgins | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **1968** (17) |
| | Treatise on marriage, priesthood, knighthood | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **1968** (18) |
| | *Epistre mout belle* | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **23,998** (9) |
| | *Le Jouvencel* | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **24,381** (1) |
| | *Homme est de brieve vie* | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **1968** (5), **23,998** (10) |

| **B. LISTS** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **I. Armorials** | Armorial of Jean Le Féron | fr. **586** (S) |
| | Armorial of Jehan Courtois | fr. **587** (2b); **2264** (11b); **5241** (10); **5930** (9b) |
| | *S'ensuivent les .. .Behaingnons* | fr. **2249** (7a) |
| | Armorial arranged by rank | fr. **2249** (7b) |
| | Aragonese armorial | fr. **2249** (9) |
| | Universal armorial A | fr. **5228** (3) |
| | Universal armorial B | fr. **5229** (11, incl. 12 Peers) |
| | Universal armorial C | fr., **18,651** (3) |
| | Armorial of Hainault | fr. **5229** (13b) |
| | Armorial of the Round Table | fr. **5229** (33), **14,357** (4e) |
| | *Ce sont les noms et les armes* | fr. **5241** (23) |
| | The 12 Peers of France | fr. **14,357** (a), **19,105** (2) |
| | French princes, peers, dukes, counts | fr. **5241** (1, 23a), **5242** (2), **11,464** (5?), **19,105** (3) |
| | French armorial by march | **fr. 5242** (5) |
| | Arm. of dukes & lords of Fr. | fr. **5930** (10), **5939** (5) |
| | Christian kings | fr. **5930** (10), **5939** (5), **14,357** (c, d), **24,381** (2c) |
| | The 9 Heroes (*Preux*) | fr. **5930** (10), **5939** (5), **24,381** (2d) |
| | The 9 Heroines (*Preuses*) | fr. **5930** (10), **5939** (5), **24,381** (2e) |
| | Armorial of Bourbon | fr. **5931** (4) |
| | Jesus, Church, Christian kingdoms | fr. **5937** (1) |
| | Arms of Redemption | fr. **5939** (1), **14,357** (1) |
| | Rome, Carthage, 4 Princes | fr. **5937** (3) |
| | *Court amoureuse* | fr. **10,469** (2) |
| | Arm. of Ferdinand, K. Hungary, Bohemia | fr. **11,463** (3) |
| | Armorial following the Prinsault Treatise on Armory | fr. **25,183** (2) |
| | Blazoned universal armorial, beginning w. the pope, 2 emperors | fr., **19,105** (7) |
| **II. Ordinaries** | Classified by region & march | fr. **5931** (4) |
| **III. Numbered phenomena** | 6 ages of world, 7 ages of man, 10 joys of paradise, 7 sacraments, 7 gifts of the Holy Spirit, 5 senses, 2 principal cods. | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **1968** (20) |
| **IV. Fiefs** | Fiefs of D. Brabant fr. C. St Pol | fr. **5228** (4) |
| **V. Lands held** | Walled towns of Burgundy | fr. **1968** (23) |
| | The cities and lords of Italy | fr. **5229** (4) |
| **VI. Kingdoms, nations, princes, cities** | Kingdoms inherited by Karl V | fr. **5229** (3, 12) |
| | The four Christian nations | fr. **5241** (4) |
| | The four Christian Princes | fr. **24,381** (2f) |
| | Peers, dukes, counts, and cities of France | fr. **1968** (22), **5241** (2), **5930** (3), **23,998** (15), **25,184** (4) |
| | Dukes and counts of France | fr. **2249** (3b, 10), **24,381** (2h) |
| | The twelve peers of France | fr. **2249** (8), **24,381** (2g) |
| | Cities of France | fr. **2249** (3a) |
| **VII. Kings** | Kings of France to Charles VII | fr. **2249** (3c), **5241** (5), **5930** (5a) |
| **VIII. Emperors of the Romans** | | fr. **2249** (3d), **5930** (5b) |
| **IX. Knights of the Round Table** | | fr. **5937** (4), **5939** (4) |
| **X. The Nine Worthies** | Male (*Neuf Preux*) | fr. **5241** (6), **5930** (4), **5937** (2), **11,464** (4) |
| | Female (*Neuf Preuses*) | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **11,464** (5) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **XI. Officers of Arms** | Of England | fr. **5242** (6a) |
| **XII. Marches of Arms** | Of France | fr. **5930** (8) |
| **XIII. Knights of Orders** | Order of St Michael | fr. **5242** (6b) |
| **XIV. Friends of prince** | Of the Duke of Savoy | fr. **25,186** (11a) |
| **XV. Subjects of prince** | Of the Duke of Savoy | fr. **25,186** (11b) |
| **XVI. Mayors** | Of Rouen | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **5930** (11) |
| **C. FORMULARIES** | | |
| **I. Letters close** | *French style* | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **5241** (19) |
| **II. Letters and rescripts** | *French style* | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **11,464** (6) |
| **D. ORDINANCES** | | |
| *1. On support req. for promotion to King of Arms* | | fr. **5241** (17) , **19,105** (10) |
| *2. Ordinance of the Count of St-Pol, 29 Nov. 1482* | | fr. **19,811** (11) |
| *3. Ordonnances, statuts, previleges, droictz, franchises des roys, mareschaus, heraulx, poursuyvanz d'armes de Thomas Ysaaq, Toison d'or* | | fr. **25,186** (2a) |
| *4. Ordonnances etc. lors des fetes, ambassades, guerres, joustes, mariages, baptemes, obseques* | | fr. **25,186** (2b) |
| **E. LETTERS PATENT GRANTING ARMS, NOBILITY, DIGNITIES** | | |
| **I. Grants of arms** | Max. to J. Molinet, 1 iv 1503 | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **2249** (18) |
| **II. Grants of knighthood** | *Lettre de chevalerie de L. de Beaunois, roy d'armes*, 1519 | Paris, B.n.F., fr. **5242** (6c) |
| **F. PROCLAMATIONS AND DECLARATIONS OF CHIVALROUS INTENT** | | |
| **I. Tourneys** | *Tournois de Robais-Quersebeche* | fr. **2249** (8) |
| **II. *Pas d'armes*** | *Pas de la Belle Pelerine*, 1448 | fr. **25,186** (12) |
| **III. Enterprises of arms** | *Emp. de Franssois de Ravoree* | fr. **25,186** (9a) |
| | *Emprises de Philippe de Ternant* | fr. **25,186** (9c) |
| | *Emp. de Jacques de Mont Bel, etc.* | fr. **25,186** (9d) |
| **IV. Gages of (i.e. trial by) battle** | *Oste de Grantson, Raoul de Grive 20 Sept 1411* | fr. **1968** (7), **23,998** (3) |
| **V. Pardons of arms** | *Pardons d'armes* | fr. **5228** (5), **5241** (18), **5242** (2), **19,105** (11), **25,186** (9b) |
| **G. DESCRIPTIONS OF PARTICULAR CEREMONIES OR EVENTS** | | |
| **I. Funerals** | Bertrand du Guesclin 1380 | fr. **2249** (5), **5241** (16), **19,105** (9) |
| | Ferran 'the Catholic' 1516 | fr. **5229** (2) |
| | Sire de Fiennes 12 July 1517 | fr. **5229** (5) |
| | Jehan de Luxembourg-Ville, 1508 | fr. **5229** (22) |
| **II. Solemn Entries** | Emperor Karl V, Aachen, 1519 | fr. **5229** (8) |
| **III. Baptisms** | 1st son of Mme de Nasson | fr. **5229** (16) |
| **IV. Promotions** | C. of Hochstratte, Emp., 1525? | fr. **5229** (32) |
| **V. Feasts** | Feste de l'Espinette, Lille | fr. **10,469** (4) |
| **VI. Jousts** | 8 knights in Dijon and prises | fr. **1968** (25a) |
| | Troyes, before Pentecost | fr. **1968** (25b) |
| | Tournai, 1330 | fr. **10,469** (5) |
| | Tournoy a l'usage de France | fr. **25,186** (7) |
| **H. GENERAL CHRONICLES AND HISTORIES** | | |
| *Chronique de François I* | | fr. **25,183** (1) |
| Hist. of Ks. of France fr. Troy to Charles VIII | | fr. **25,184** (3) |
| *Chroniques abregiés* 1403-1442 | | fr. **1968** (21), **23,998** (16) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **I. GENEALOGICAL TABLES OF ASCENT AND DESCENT** | | |
| | P. de Luxemburg, C. of St Pol | fr. **5229** (6) |
| | Jacques de Lalaing | fr. **5229** (14) |
| | Jehan de Melun | fr. **5229** (15) |
| | Marguerite des Baux, Countess of St Pol | fr. **5229** (7) |
| | Jehanne de Bar, Mme de Ghistelles | fr. **5228** (2) |
| | House of the Dukes of Cleves | fr. **5229** (17) |
| | Luxemburg and England | fr. **5229** (21) |
| | House of Thuermes | fr. **9491** (4) |
| | Kings, Dukes, and Princes of Brittany | fr. **11,464** (9) |
| **J. EPITAPHS** | | |
| | J. de Luxembourg by Nycayse Ladam | fr. **5229** (23) |
| | J. de Luxembourg by Ant. de Crequy | fr. **5229** (24) |
| | J. de Luxembourg, in Latin | fr. **5229** (25) |
| | J. de Luxembourg by J. Lacteum | fr. **5229** (26) |
| **K. MISCELLANEOUS BLAZONS AND DRAWINGS** | | |
| | Blazon (by stones, etc.) of arms of D. of Burgundy | fr. **2249** (12) |
| | Jacques de Lalaing | fr. **2249** (19a) |
| | Jacques de Luxembourg | fr. **2249** (19b) |
| | Blazon (by tinctures & stones) R. d'Anjou, K. Sicily | fr. **5241** (20) |
| | Anonymous and imaginary arms | fr. **5242** (6) |
| | 2 canons of Mainz | fr. **10,469** (6) |
| | Emperor Karl V | fr. **11,463** (2) |
| | Duke of Nemours | fr. **14,357** (4b) |
| | King of France | fr. **25,184** (1b) |
| | Arms of Redemption (i.e., of Christ) | fr. **25,184** (1b) |
| | Blazon (by tinctures, stones, etc.) of Arms of Savoy | fr. **25,186** (1) |
| **L. MISCELLANEOUS POEMS ON NOBILITY AND NOBLE LINEAGES** | | |
| | *Le sentier du paradis* | fr. **2249** (6b) |
| | *La voye de paradis* | fr. **2249** (6c) |
| | *La lai de paix* (by Alain Chartier) | fr. **2249** (6d), **11,464** (7) |
| | Miscellaneous songs of Alain Chartier | fr. **2264** (1-10), **11,464** (7?) |
| | *Devotio Commemorativa de cruce* | fr. **5939** (2) |
| | Ballade on origin of the name *Melun* | fr. **2249** (20) |
| | *Qui veult sable dessus argent pourtrait* | fr. **25,184** (1) |

by, or in consultation with, the leading heralds of those courts.

The second most common type of treatise found in the heraldic anthologies of this series deals with the related matters of the **origins**, **rights**, and **duties of the heralds**: the subjects of twelve treatises found in a total of ten manuscripts — six of them in two or more of the ten, and one of them in six of the ten. One manuscript (fr. 1968) includes six of these, grouped together as the eleventh through sixteenth works, running from folio 103r to 136r: (11) (a treatise in content if not in form) the supplication of the heralds of France to the king for the redress of various grievances, beginning '*Supplie humblement vos humbles et petis serviteurs les roys darmes*'; (12) a treatise on the duties of heralds in funerals beginning '*Comment che doivent faire obseques*'; (13) a text setting forth the oaths a new herald was to swear entitled '*Chy apres s'ensievent les articles de l'obeissance que ung nouvel herault doibt promettre et jurer*'; (14) a treatise on the origin, ordinances, and

rights of the Office of Arms, misleadingly titled '*Chy sont les dis des philozophes*'; (15) a treatise on the supposed creation by Julius Caesar and Pompey of the five royal offices of constable, admiral, marshal, captain, king of arms, and herald, titled '*Enseignemens notables aux poursievans*'; and (16) a treatise on the imagined foundation of various forms of hastilude by King Arthur and the Duke of Lancaster, and on the rôle of the kings of arms and heralds in crying and judging them, beginning '*Le roy Artu d'Engleterre*'. The treatises on the origins are of interest primarily because they were wholly fictitious, attempting to claim authority for the heralds by attributing to them a fashionable origin in early Antiquity, and by making the founders of their office (as well as of nobility and armigery) King Priam of Troy, Alexander the Great, and (or) Julius Caesar and Pompey the Great of Rome. The other treatises of this set may well exaggerate some of the rights and duties of heralds, but appear on the whole to be accurate accounts of the current state of affairs, and could actually have been used by heralds confronted with the need to preside at a funeral or joust (and to know what was owed to them for such services).

The general instructions included in treatises of this sort were supplemented by those contained in **formularies** of the type listed in Class C (which included instructions on how to address persons of every rank both in writing and in person), and **ordinances** of the sort listed in Class D (which explained how a pursuivant was to be educated, what a herald needed in order to be promoted, what rights had been given to the officers of arms of all classes, and what their duties were in all of the contexts in which they might have to perform their professional functions: baptisms, weddings, funerals, feasts, embassies, jousts, and wars).

All of these texts would presumably have been of interest primarily to the heralds themselves, as would the three texts on the **military offices** of constable, marshal, admiral, captain, king of arms, and herald that constitute Subclass A.III of my typology. The heralds were formally subject to the authority of both the Constable and Marshals of France, and had to cooperate with the other officers in carrying out their duties in the field. Significantly, these texts are included in six of the same ten manuscripts, so most or all of the ten could have been prepared for heralds. On the other hand, it would have been useful for any courtier to have some sense of the functions of all of these officers, who continued to play an important part in the world of noblemen well into the sixteenth century.

The remaining twenty-six treatises fall into ten relatively small classes, A.IV-X, including a class of five that can only be described as miscellaneous. The first nine of the twenty-one remaining treatises all deal with the broad themes of **social status and stratification**, especially from the perspective of noble men. The fifteenth century saw the production of a number of important treatises on the subjects of the organisation of society into estates, and of the place of the noble estate in that scheme. Since the heralds saw themselves as working for the greater glory of the nobles as an estate, they would naturally wish to be familiar with at least one such work. Five are represented in the present set of manuscripts, listed under A.IV.

Like their noble masters, the heralds of the Third Age took an increasingly active interest in such related matters as **nobiliary rank**, and the creation of new dukes and duchies, counts and counties, barons and baronies, bannerets, and knights. This interest is represented by the frequent inclusion in miscellanies of a fascinating treatise called by Boudreau the *Traité de la création des principales dignités* headed by some variant of the title *Comment faire empereur* ('How to make an emperor'), which was probably written for Duke Philippe 'the Good' of Burgundy when he was contemplating the erection of his lands into a new kingdom, either of Lotharingia or of Frisia. This text (of which I have been for some years preparing a critical edition) is found in ten of the manuscripts in this series (see A.III.3), and no fewer than seventeen others, while most of the treatises of its class are found in but a single manuscript.

The concern with nobiliary rank was intimately connected in the minds of the heralds with the functions of noble lords and captains on **the field of battle**. This can be seen from the fact that the treatise *Comment faire empereur*, after setting forth theoretical rules and procedures for the creation of new kingdoms, duchies, counties, and so forth, and the promotion of noble men to the dignities of banneret and knight, goes on in a second part to describe the manner in which men of each rank discussed should appear on the field of battle, including not only the way in which they should present themselves, but the number and types of soldiers they should bring, and how they should be disposed. Furthermore, in seven of the ten manuscripts in question, the treatise in question is followed by a short treatise based loosely on Vegetius' *De re militari*: a Late Antique military treatise already noted as one of those frequently translated in full in our Second and Third Periods. The **rights** and **duties of nobles in warfare** are also discussed in an epitome of the classic fourteenth-century treatise by Honoré Bovet, *L'Arbre des batailles*, and in a treatise in debate form featuring Alexander, Hannibal, and Scipio: a work originally composed by the Italian Humanist Giovanni Aurispa, but translated into French as *Le Debat de honneur* by the Burgundian **Jehan Mielot** in 1449.[119]

Because of their origins and continuing functions as tournament criers, and the centrality of the **tourney** and **joust** as rituals for the display of knightly (and therefore nobiliary) virtue, the heralds took a keen interest in treatises on these noble sports, and also on such kindred activities as trial by combat and errantry. Rather surprisingly, this whole sphere of activities is represented in our corpus of manuscripts by only seven texts, and only those concerned with trial by (or 'gage of') battle are included in more than one manuscript: the French rules governing such rituals in seven, and the English rules in two. It is hard to know what to make of this, but it may be that the manuscripts in question were prepared for gentlemen who might have had to take part in such a combat, rather than

[119] Published, along with two related texts, by Arie Johan VANDERJAGT, *Qui sa virtu anoblist; the concepts of noblesse and chose publicque in Burgundian political thought : (including fifteenth century French translations of Giovanni Aurispa, Buonaccorso da Montemagno, and Diego de Valera* (Groningen, 1981), pp. 163-173

for heralds. Aside from the treatises by René of Anjou and Anthoine de la Sale mentioned above, the only one included in these manuscripts was the anonymous ***Traité de tournois*** probably produced around 1445/50 in the entourage of Jacques d'Armagnac. That text itself is closely associated with a related work on errantry, ***Serments, lois et ordonnances de la Table Ronde***, which was indirectly derived (through the Arthurian chapter of **Laurent de Premierfait**'s *Des cas des nobles hommes et femmes* of 1400 and 1409), from **Giovanni Boccaccio**'s *De casibus virorum illustrium* of 1355. In anthologies, it is usually preceded or followed by the *Armorial des Chevaliers de la Table Ronde*, and the *Traité de tournois*.[120] The only treatise on contemporary errantry was the *Ordonnance et maniere des chevaliers errants* of **Hugues 'Merlin' de Cordeboeuf**, composed in 1446,[121] which was itself included in one manuscript in my set: fr. 5241.

The series of non-miscellaneous treatises ends with three concerned with **jurisdiction**, **rulership**, and the **virtues** of rulers and noblemen, all of which are obviously related to the concerns of heralds, but were of even greater interest to noble lords and knights. The miscellaneous set is much more varied, and the subjects of its five works all seem quite tangential to the main themes of the corpus.

The next major class of texts (B) is that which I have called **Lists**, since they consist primarily of sequences either of names or of images or technical descriptions. I have identified no fewer than sixteen subclasses of list, one of which has five infraclasses. Most of these lists are closely related in subject matter to the treatises already examined, and could be seen as constituting something like appendices to the latter. Certainly they supplement the information included in the treatises, for while the latter tend to be very generalised, the lists are all very specific — often purporting to present all of the *known* or *important* examples of a particular phenomenon. The vast majority (all but four, listing **heraldic offices** and **jurisdictions**, **episcopal jurisdictions**, and **mayors** or **major towns**) are concerned exclusively with the **nobility**, and the majority of these list either the nobles of some particular court, order, place, region, kingdom, or set of kingdoms, or the **dignities** *held* or the **jurisdictions** *ruled* by such nobles — in each case usually sorted by rank in descending order. In all of these respects they resemble traditional armorials.

The **non-armorial lists** are slightly less numerous, and distributed very largely through the same set of manuscripts: eleven of the eighteen manuscripts including an armorial also include at least one non-armorial list, and often several, while only four manuscripts lacking an armorial include such a list. It would thus appear at first glance that only about half of the people who ordered miscellanies were interested in such lists, while those who wanted any list typically wanted several. This of course would presume that the purchaser of miscellaneous manuscripts on heraldic

[120] See Richard TRACHSLER, 'Les Lois de la Table Ronde', *Studi Francesi* 120 (Anno XL – fasc. III – set.-dic. 1996), pp. 367-585

[121] See THOMAS, Antoine. 'Jammete de Nesson et Merlin de Cordeboeuf', 'Notes complémentaires sur Merlin de Cordeboeuf', *Romania* 35 (1906), pp. 82-94, 604-605.

subjects purchased only one such manuscript, or chose to have all of the material he ordered assembled in a single volume. This is both uncertain and unlikely, not only because the corpus was defined on the basis of the inclusion of at least one *treatise* but not one *list*, but because many of the armorials included in the miscellanies of which the corpus is largely composed were also published in manuscripts containing nothing but one or more armorials. Thus, miscellanies including armorials may be seen as a sort of hybrid between those composed exclusively of treatises and comparable works, and those composed exclusively of lists, which are not included in my corpus.

Considerations of space do not permit more than the barest mention of the remaining classes of text included in the anthologies of my corpus, but they include two **formularies**, or works setting forth the formulae to be used in writing letters and related legal documents; four **ordinances** or sets of rules related to heralds in various contexts; two **letters patent** conferring respectively arms and knighthood, presumably to be used as models; twelve **proclamations** or **declarations** of intent for tournaments, passages, enterprises, and pardons of arms, and gages of battle; twelve detailed **descriptions** of *particular* ceremonies or events in which heralds took part; three **chronicles** or histories recounting feats of arms; nine **genealogical tables**, mostly of the princes probably served by the compilers of the manuscripts (of which there were only four); four **epitaphs**, all of the same prince in the same manuscript; and a miscellaneous collection of **blazons** of arms and **poems** in some way related to nobility in general or some particular lineage.

Although no fewer than five manuscripts of the corpus include the type of document called a *pardon d'armes*, none of them includes one of a related type of rather more interest here: the ***jugement d'armes***, stating the decision of a court of some sort assembled for the purpose of settling a dispute over the right to use certain arms or armories.[122] Although various superior courts (including the Tribunal of the Constable and the Marshals of France, the Great Council of the King, and the provincial *parlements*) would eventually accept jurisdiction over disputes of this type brought before them, from the Second Age onward armorial cases were normally judged in an *ad hoc* court made up largely or entirely of noble men from the district or region who were generally regarded as knowledgeable in armorial matters, and advised by the king of arms and heralds in whose march it lay. We know about one such case, involving rival claims to the plain arms of the House of Brimeu, and heard by such a tribunal in the court of the Duke of Burgundy on 13 August 1435, because it was described in his histoire by Jehan le Febvre de Saint-Remy, who in his capacity as Golden Fleece King of Arms was called upon to present to the court the opinion of all of the heralds present. Other such cases are known from 1424, 1425, 1449, 1494, 1501, at least partly from official records. Such records are obviously of considerable interest here.

The presence of **genealogical** tables in these manuscripts is symptomatic of the continuing intensification of the value placed on

[122] See MATHIEU, *Système héraldique français*, pp. 55-60, 66-67, and 104-108.

distinguished ancestry by the nobles of this Age. Although the construction of tables of descent (in English called from c. 1410 *pedicrus*, *pedegrewes* or the like, and from 1547 *pedegres* or *pedigrees*) had begun as early as the ninth century, and had been especially common in Scandinavia and its French colony of Normandy, it had been reserved almost exclusively to persons of royal or (from c. 1180) princely rank.[123] And although elements of genealogies had been represented through the arrangement of effigies and shields of arms on tombs from c. 1270, these had always included various relatives not actually ancestral to the occupants, and neither their names nor their relationships to the occupant had been expressed in words.

In the fifteenth century, however, the growing concern with both the *antiquity* and the *purity* of one's noble descent led to the production of various forms of genealogical representation in which arms or effigies or both were arranged in tabular form, and identified by name. This was especially prevalent in the domain of the Dukes of Burgundy and the lands around it that fell under its cultural influence. One of these was the Duchy of Cleves, where a genealogical table was prepared for the duke in a form in which successive dukes and duchesses were identified by their name and arms. Within the Burgundian lands themselves, Jacques de Lalaing — knight of the Golden Fleece and the subject, as we have seen, of two knightly biographies — displayed at the Order's meeting in Bruges in 1448 a banner on which were set the arms of six generations of his ancestors in all lines. After his death in 1453 the same thirty-six *quartiers de noblesse* were set on his tomb in the church of Lalaing. A similar set of the 'thirty-two roots of his inverted tree' of ascent would be set out in 1471 for Jacques de Luxembourg-Lannoy (another knight of the Golden Fleece and later of St. Michael, encountered above as the beneficiary of *La Salade*) in a manuscript prepared for him by Clément de Sainguin. These are all preserved, along with four others, in ms. français 5229 — which in fact contains all but two of the works of this kind in the Bibliothèque nationale.[124]

Thus — at least in France and the Burgundian Domain — the growth in the practice of composing treatises on armory — almost always published in the context of the sort of heraldic-nobiliary anthology I have just described — must be understood as part of a more general growth in the practice of writing treatises on a whole series of related subjects for a largely overlapping readership.

### 3.1.3.d. Linguistic, literary, and cultural developments in England

From the history of the linguistic, literary, and intellectual culture of France in the Third Age, I must turn to the history of the same phenomena in England. In the linguistic sphere, our Third Age corresponded roughly with the last phase of **Middle English**. Quite early in the Age, the regnal

[123] On the history of genealogical ideas and practices down to the end of the Third Period, see Pierre DURYE, *La Généalogie*, Que sais-je no. 917, (4th edn., Paris, 1975), pp. 7-12; Germain BUTAUD et Valérie PIÉTRI, *Les enjeux de la généalogie, XIIe-XVIIIe siècle: Pouvoir et identité* (Paris, 2006), pp. 11-52; and Christiane KLAPISCH-ZUBER, *L'Arbre des familles* (Paris, 2003).

[124] See BUTAUD & PIÉTRI, *Les enjeux*, pp. 46-47

vernacular was transformed by the triumph in many contexts of a new London Standard — representing a blend of the midlands dialect of Chaucer and the formal dialect adopted by the Chancery in Westminster in 1430, when it began to issue most of its documents in its own distinctive form of English, rather than either the Latin or the Anglo-Norman it had employed until that time. It was no coincidence, therefore, that the use of English of any type (and more particularly of the new London Standard) in both letters patent of armigeration, and in the composition of treatises on armory and other heraldic subjects, began between 1430 and 1450, and that it soon superseded Anglo-Norman in all but the most formal and technical contexts. What is now called **Early Modern English** developed from this more standardised form of Middle English after the introduction of printing into England by William Caxton in 1476 (a subject I shall discuss below).[125]

Despite these positive developments in the state of the language in which literary works were generally expressed, however, with a few exceptions the works produced in England in Third Age were little more than inferior sequels to those of the Second. The traditions of Chaucer and Gower dominated the Age, and indeed the fifteenth century as a whole, though in different forms and to different effects. The new works of the Age of most interest to us are on the one hand John **Lydgate**'s *Siege of Thebes* and *The Fall of Princes* of 1431-38 (the latter a translation of Premierfait's French translation of Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium*); and on the other hand a number of gargantuan retellings of French romances: (1) the anonymous *Gest Historiale of the Destruction of Troy*, (2) Henry **Lovelich**'s *Merlin* of 1425 and later (3) *History of the Holy Grail*, and (3) a vast prose *Alexander* composed in Scotland in 1428. Two other works of note were also written north of the border: King **James** I's autobiographical *The Kingis Quair* of c. 1424, and 'Blind Harry the Minstrel's *The Wallace* of c. 1475 — a knightly biography in poetic form.

By far the most important literary work of the Age, however, was Sir Thomas **Malory**'s similarly vast retelling of the entire Arthurian legend on the basis of various earlier versions in both French and English: the *Morte Darthur*, presumably composed between his imprisonment in 1451 and his death in 1471. As we shall see, Malory's *Morte* would be printed by Caxton in 1485, and has since remained the best-known version of the stories it recounts. But as Caxton himself admitted, it was effectively the swan song of traditional knighthood in England.

**England** also saw the production of considerable number of heraldo-nobiliary miscellanies and anthologies. These included many of the French treatises and comparable texts just reviewed, but they also contained comparable texts related to the distinctive rights and duties of the English heralds, along with English armorials, and versions of the

[125] On the state of English language and literature in the Third Age, see STRANG, *History of English*, ch. III, and BAUGH, *Literary History of England*, chs. XX-XXI.

treatises on armory produced in England in both Latin and English.[126] Some of these anthologies have been given a distinctive name by scholars (like the ones called 'Mowbray's French Treatise', 'The Normandy Treatise', '*Les Droits d'Armes*', and 'Cottell's Book' by Rodney Dennys,[127] and 'The Book of St. Alban's' by scholars in general), as if they were unified works by a single author. This practice is quite misleading, however, as the treatises and other texts included in these manuscripts often had quite different origins and circulated either completely independently of one another, or in small groups that came for some reason to be treated as sets by copyists.

Translations of works on other subjects of some nobiliary interest, including a number collected in the anthologies just reviewed, were also produced by English poet-translators in this Age.[128] Stephen **Scrope**, stepson of the Garter companion Sir John Fastolf, translated and presented to the latter the curious pseudo-historical work called the *Dits des philosophes*, later re-translated (after 1473) by Anthony **Wydville**, Earl Rivers: the brother-in-law of King Edward IV. Scrope also translated Christine de Pisan's treatise on nobility, the *Epistre d'Othéa a Hector*, which was similarly re-translated later in the century by Anthony Babyngton.

The Third Age also saw the publication in manuscript of a number of **treatises on armory**, all of them difficult to date, and only three of them clearly independent of earlier ones. What seems to be the earliest treatise of this Age (it was completed by 1446) was composed, like its immediate predecessor of 1395, in learned Latin, and took the form of several chapters of the ***Libellus de militari officio et insigniis armorum*** '*Booklet on the office (or duties) of a knight and the signs of arms*'. Its author, **Nicholas Upton**, was a civil lawyer and cleric under the patronage from 1431 of Humphrey Plantagenet of Lancaster, Duke of Gloucester (founder of the original library of Oxford University, and a patron of scholarship generally).[129]

Within a few years of the appearance of Upton's substantial Latin treatise, two much shorter treatises were composed in English, making it possible for the first time to get a sense of the heraldic lexicon employed in the principal vernacular language of England. Both are only roughly datable to the years around 1450, and as only one of them has been edited, the order in which they were composed cannot yet be fixed. The better known of the two is the work now known as ***John's Treatise*** from the forename of its author: possibly the lawyer **John Dade**, and in any case probably someone like him who was a lecturer in law in the Inns of Court. The other was the as-yet-unedited work called the ***Hague Tract***, from the current location of its sole manuscript. All of the later treatises currently believed to have been composed in England before 1485 (possibly

[126] Among these manuscripts are London, British Library, mss. Add. 30495, 17351, 26,700, 28549, 4101, 5958, 8933; Arundel 26; Egerton 795, 1906; Harley 992, 1481, 1952, 2259, 3504, 3526, 4145, 6097; and Sloane 3744, all of which I have examined and partially transcribed.

[127] DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, pp. 214-17.

[128] See BAUGH, *Literary History of England*, pp. 302-303

[129] On this and the following treatises produced in England, see below, § 3.2.3.

including the *Hague Tract* itself, and certainly including the one called ***Strangways Book***) seem to derive directly or indirectly from John's Treatise. Thus, in contrast to the twelve treatises of the same genre produced in France in this Age, the three original works produced in England in the same Age, and at least some of their derivatives, were composed by lawyers rather than heralds, and none of their authors seems to have been in the direct service of a prince.

It will be useful to conclude this section with a brief discussion of the emergence of **antiquarianism** in England.[130] The production of at least some of the types of treatise catalogued in the previous infrasection reflected not only the growth of literacy and curiosity about the details of heraldic and nobiliary institutions, but a parallel growth of more broadly *historical* and *antiquarian* interests. In the Fourth Age these interests would be increasingly influenced by the doctrinaire neo-Classical antiquarianism that since the First Age had lain at the centre of Italian 'Humanism', but they would never be entirely subsumed by the latter, and would re-emerge later in the Third or early in the Fourth Period in distinctive national avatars.

In any case, a less self-conscious sort of antiquarianism had already enjoyed a long history in our two kingdoms by the beginning of the Third Age around 1420, going back at least to the dawn of armigery in the twelfth century, and works including significant antiquarian elements were produced in both of them even before the first French invasion of Italy. In England the most important of these works were composed by two authors of very different occupations but similar attachments and interests: (1) the secular cleric **John Rous**, and (2) the 'gentleman bureaucrat' **William Worcester**.

**Rous** (v. 1411-91) completed his studies at Oxford about 1445, and spent the rest of his life as chaplain of a small chapel maintained by successive Earls of Warwick of the Houses of Beauchamp and Neville. He was the first known antiquarian-historian since Matthew Paris two centuries earlier to compose works of particular interest to heralds and heraldists, especially two pictorial rolls setting out the history of the Earls of Warwick from the time of the legendary giant Guy to that of his own patrons: one in Latin and the other in English. Both were initially composed and illustrated between the death of George Duke of Clarence in 1477 and the death of the last king of the York line, Richard III, in 1485, but the Latin version was revised to support Lancastrian doctrines at some time between the accession of Henry VII in that year and his own death in 1491. This latter is now commonly called *The Pageant of the Birth, Life, and Death of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick*, but is also known as the *Warwick* or *Rous Roll of Arms*.[131] In all of his works, a knowledge of history

[130] On English antiquarianism in the fifteenth century, and the lives and works of both Rous and Worcester, see GRANSDEN, *Historical Writing* II, pp. 308-41, and the works cited therein.

[131] Viscount DILLON and W. H. ST JOHN HOPE (eds.), *Pageant of the Birth, Life, and Death of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick K. G.* (London, 1914). See also E.

(much of it legendary), heraldic emblems, and such antiquarian matters as seal-design and the forms of dress and armour worn by noble men and women of earlier times, are impressively displayed.

**Worcester** had a rather similar career in the service of another prominent nobleman. On leaving Oxford around 1438, he became the private secretary of the same Sir John Fastolf who was the step-father of Stephen Scrope. Fastolf (the model for Shakespeare's Falstaff), was a Knight of the Garter from 1426 to his death in 1459 and (as we have seen) one of the richest knights in England in the first half of our Third Age; he served for a time as the Master of the Household of John Plantagenet of Lancaster, Duke of Bedford, and Governor of Anjou and Maine in the 1420s. Worcester's best-known work is probably his *Boke of Noblesse*,[132] begun around 1451 to persuade Henry VI to pursue the traditional English claims to the throne of France, and finally presented to Edward IV on the eve of his French campaign of 1475. It is full of antiquarian scholarship, but his broad interests in antiquities of all kinds are still more evident in his *Itinerarium*, a miscellaneous collection of observations preserved in a single manuscript completed at some time after 1480.

Rous and Worcester may therefore be seen both as the last of the old breed of English antiquarians, and as the harbingers of the new, more systematic and ecumenical antiquarian tradition — heavily influenced by Italian Humanism — that was to serve as the basis of the heraldistic tradition of the Fourth Period.

### 3.1.4. THE FOURTH AGE, C. 1483 – C. 1520 (IN FRANCE)/ C. 1485 – C. 1530 (IN ENGLAND)

In England the Fourth Age corresponded to the reign of the first king of the new Tudor dynasty, Henry VII (1485-1507), and to the (distinctive) first half of the reign of his son and successor, Henry VIII (1507-47). In France it corresponded to the reign of the last Capetian of the senior Valois line, Charles VIII (1483-98), to that of the only king of the senior branch of the Valois-Orléans line, Louis XII (1498-1515), and to the first half of that of the first king of the junior, Angoulême branch of that line, François I (1515-47).

In the broadest terms, the Age was characterised by a relatively rapid transition from the traditional ideas, values, and tastes of the Gothic Epoch to those of the emerging Renaissance Epoch. The former had been distinguished by a social culture in which nobility had been embodied in knighthood and lordship, both patronal and territorial, and a political culture in which kingship had been conceived of as the highest form of

---

Maunde Thompson. 'The Pageants of Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick', in *The Burlington Magazine* 1 (1903), p. 160; and Anthony Richard WAGNER, Richmond Herald [later Garter], *Aspilogia* I: *A Catalogue of English Mediaeval Rolls of Arms* (London, 1950), pp. 116-120.

[132] J. Gough NICHOLS (ed.), *The Boke of Noblesse: Addressed to King Edward IV on his Invasion of France in 1475* (Roxburghe Club 77 [1860]). See also Christopher ALLMAND and Maurice KEEN, 'History and the Literature of War: *The Boke of Noblesse* of William Worcester', in Christopher ALLMAND, ed., *War, Government, and Power in Late Medieval France* (Liverpool, 2000)

territorial lordship, raised above the lesser forms primarily by the unction that gave the king a quasi-episcopal character, and a particular duty to protect the Catholic Church and the Faith against their foes. The new Epoch would be distinguished by a strong infusion not only of Classical Roman tastes in decoration and architecture, but of Classical Roman ideas about the absolute *imperium* of kings. These ideas were soon used to justify both the subordination of the Church, the nobility, and the institutions of government to the royal will, and a policy of promoting the wealth and power of royal dynasties and their governments and states with little or no regard for Christian principles. Among the consequences of the latter doctrine was the massive expansion of royal armies in times of war, their organisation into a variety of specialised divisions of roughly equal importance based on the type of 'arm' they represented — light and heavy infantry and cavalry, artillery, and the like — in which noblemen of all ranks came to serve either as contractual captains, subaltern officers, or common troopers in units of heavy cavalry.

In addition, the new Epoch — and more particularly, the Fourth Age of our Period — was marked by the discovery of the 'New World' of the Western Hemisphere, and the exploration, conquest, and colonisation of lands in both of its two continents by agents of the newly-united Spanish kingdom: men of knightly vocation who, fresh from their conquest of the last remnant of Islamic power on their own peninsula in the same year as the great Discovery, were eager to continue their crusade to the lands of the pagans, as well as to enrich themselves and their masters. These developments would feed into the growing rivalries among the monarchies of the Atlantic coast of Europe, and lead to the often ferocious competition for trade and colonies with the 'Indies' that would dominate interregnal relations for the next four centuries.

More positively from a scholarly perspective, the culture of the new Epoch — while retaining the high value traditionally placed upon such established nobiliary qualities as courage, prowess, liberty, liberality, and courtesy — placed a growing emphasis upon intellectual and educational attainments, even among noblemen destined for a military or political careers. This (assisted by the growing availability of printed books) would gradually give rise to a whole class of men who spent much of their time on serious scientific and historical research and publication. Among these men would be many who took an interest in historical and antiquarian materials, and among these would be a surprising number who took a particular interest in heraldica.

Not all of the developments I have listed had a comparable impact on the phenomena with which we are concerned, especially in our Fourth Age, but several of them certainly did. The growth of royal authority and the decline of that of the nobility in both France and England (especially on the field of battle) did contribute in a major way to the final decline and disappearance of most of what remained of the truly knightly culture that had given rise to both the **armorial** and **para-armorial families** of signs, to their virtual disappearance in military and ludic contexts, and to the expansion of the use of signs of the former family in non-martial contexts. These changes also led to the emergence of new species of emblem of what

I have called the **hybrid-heraldic family**, used especially on flags, to replace both the armorial and the strictly para-armorial species. The revolution in style also had a profound effect on the manner in which all emblems were depicted in the secondary mode — to which they were thenceforth largely restricted — and the fashion for Classical forms encouraged the development of the emerging **allegorical family** of emblems derived from the reverse-designs of Roman commemorative coins.

The Fourth Age itself may be seen as a time of transition between the old Gothic culture and the new Renaissance culture whose salient characteristics I have just sketched. This can be seen most clearly in the forms given to works of architecture, in which a veneer of neo-Classical decoration and symmetry was imposed on structures that retained most of the characteristics of their Gothic precursors.[133] It can also be seen in the forms of court spectacle, entertainment, and visual propaganda, which vacillated between Gothic and Antique models, and various hybrids of the two, and made increasing use of such Classical forms as the triumph and the triumphal arch.[134]

It can finally be seen in the continuing taste for knightly literature, and for an ideology in which of which many older works were made more widely available by translations and printing, and new works were composed that combined knightly plots and heroes with neo-Classical details and contemporary sensibilities. By far the most successful of the newer works of this sort in our Period was **Ludovico Ariosto**'s ***Orlando furioso*** (*'Roland Deranged'*), a verse romance set in the court of Charlemagne, of which the first version was published in 1516, and the third and final version in 1532.[135]

Popular as *Orlando* was, however, its actual influence was overshadowed by that of a contemporary *treatise* that effectively transferred and redefined the ideal qualities of nobility long associated with knighthood to another of the positions long occupied by noblemen: that of *courtier*, or refined servant of a prince. The work in question was of course ***Il Libro del Cortegiano*** (*'The Book of the Courtier'*), written by Count Baldassare Castiglione: an Italian learned in both Latin and Greek, who spent most of his life in the courts of the Marquises of Mantua and the Dukes of Urbino, which at the time were the most elegant and intellectual in Italy. His treatise — which, like most earlier works on the subject, drew heavily on Cicero's *De officiis* and *De oratore* — was published in the year

---

[133] On this transition in France, where it was more significant in our Period, see Claude WENZLER, *Architecture du château Renaissance* (Rennes, 1999); in England, where it had relatively little effect below the level of palaces and grand country houses, see Thomas Beaumont JAMES, *The Palaces of Medieval England, c. 1050 – 1550* (London, 1990), pp. 144-164.

[134] On these, see esp. Sidney ANGLO, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford, 1969), and Nicole HOCHNER, Louis XII: Les *dérêglements de l'image royale* (1498-1515) (Paris, 2006), and my review of the latter in *The American Historical Review* (2008).

[135] Lodovico ARIOSTO, *Orlando furioso*, ed. Cesare SEGRE (8th edn., Milan, 2001)

before his death in 1529, and was soon translated into Spanish, German, French, and Polish, and finally into English (by Thomas Hoby) in 1561. It was destined to become a veritable bible for ambitious noblemen in much of Latin Europe for the next four centuries.[136]

The Early Renaissance was thus a period of decline, emergence, and transformation, and in the areas of interest to us, none of these processes was complete until around the end of our Fourth Age in 1530.

### 3.1.4.a. Heraldic and heraldistic erudition in the Fourth Age

For the heralds in most of Latin Christendom, including those of France, the Fourth Age seems to have been the last in which they retained most of the functions they had acquired over the previous two centuries (or in most countries, since their first institution at some time between 1350 and 1410), and in some countries — including France — the Age saw the beginning of what was to be a serious decline in their fortunes. The English heralds, by contrast, retained most of their functions, and under the leadership of the two Garter Kings of Arms of the Age they seem to have flourished. The Garters in question were **John Writhe**, in office from 1478 to 1504, and his son and successor **John 'Wriothesley'** (as he preferred to call himself and his kinsmen), who held the office to his death in 1535. The latter not only held the office from 1505 to 1535, but was the first English king of arms to be knighted — an honour which indicated that his office was now regarded as comparable in rank to such older offices as judge and sheriff, whose incumbents had normally been elevated to knightly rank for several centuries.

It is not clear to what extent the English heralds of this Age continued to prepare armorials, as the survey begun by Wagner in his first volume of the *Aspilogia* series was terminated quite artificially in 1500, only fifteen years after the accession of the first Tudor king. In those fifteen years, at least eight new armorials were completed, including (1) the *Warwick* or *Rous Roll* mentioned above; (2) the armorial in *Ballard's Book*, compiled by William Ballard, March King of Arms under Edward IV, Richard III, and Henry VII; (3) the armorial of the knights of the Garter made by Writhe and his son Wriothesley; (4) another armorial by Writhe called *Writhe's Garter Book*, arranged by stall, in which are painted shields of arms, crests, and badges, sometimes set on banners, with biographical details in the margins; and (5) yet another armorial of knights of the Garter, now called *Meyrick's Roll*.[137] At least four of the eight armorials listed by Wagner — fully half — were certainly prepared by heralds.

Garter Wriothesley also seems to have begun one of the earliest collections of beast-badges, called *Wriothesley's Beasts*, to which additions were made well into the Fifth Age. Two other comparable collections were made in the same period, the better known of them called rather

---

[136] Baldassare CASTIGLIONE, *Il cortegiano*, ed. Amedeo QUONDAM (Milan, 2002). Hoby's translation as edited by Walter Raleigh was republished in London in 1900; the definitive study of reception of *The Courtier* is Peter BURKE's *The Fortunes of the Courtier: The European Reception of Castiglione's Cortegiano*, (State Coll., Pa., 1995)

[137] WAGNER, *Aspilogia* I, pp. 111-125.

misleadingly *Prince Arthur's Book*.[138] In addition, four lists of kings with their beasts, and a collection of painted banners of kings held up by beasts, have come down to us from this and the following Age.[139] Most or all of these were probably prepared by English heralds, though their authorship is unknown.

In **France**, following the failure of a project of King Charles VIII in 1487 to establish an office with the authority to prepare an official register of arms in his kingdom comparable to those maintained unofficially by the English kings of arms, the French heralds tended to lose what little authority they had in the Fourth Age, and to accept the reduction of their official functions to giving advice on aspects of their expertise when asked to do so by royal officers and courts in which rights related to armories were in dispute, and performing various ceremonial rôles whose nature was increasingly decorative rather than useful. A number of them, as we shall see, took second jobs of various kinds, becoming what in England would be called 'heralds extraordinary'. Only those heralds who devoted themselves to antiquarian (and particularly genealogical) studies would continue to make significant contributions to their field — including in the Fifth Age works of increasingly sophisticated heraldistic erudition.

In the meantime, the stream of **heraldistic works** that had characterised the Third Age of the Third Period in both France and England dried up almost entirely in the Fourth Age. In the former kingdom, only three original treatises on armory were produced in this Age, and in the latter kingdom only one — though the first such treatise in *Scots* English, the ***Deidis of Armorie*** appeared in or about 1495, in a manuscript including several earlier treatises. The first of the three new French treatises, composed between 1482 and 1492, was the anonymous work called the ***Argentaye Tract***. A second (nameless) treatise, dated by Boudreau to the years around 1500, and possibly composed by the much-published heraldist **Roland Bournel de Boncourt**, dealt for the first time with the armigeral practices of the members of the ecclesiastical Estate. The third independent treatise, the ***Grand blason d'armoiries*** of **Jehan le Feron**, appeared at the very end of the Age, in 1520. In the meantime, two composite works, both attributed to Sicily Herald (whose treatise of c. 1437 they included), had been published in *print*: ***Le blason de toutes armes et escutz***, in 1495, and ***Le blason des couleurs en armes*** shortly after 1500.[140]

The one original English work published in this Age (and the only one to be *printed* before 1562) is that described by its anonymous author as ***The Buk of the Lynage of Coot Armuris***. It is preserved only as part of the composite work on armory called ***The Boke of Cote-Armuris,*** printed in 1486 by the schoolmaster of the town of St. Alban's in the anthology now known as *The Boke of St. Alban's*. The other part of the armorial treatise included in the latter was lifted almost entirely from Upton's *De militari officio*, but translated from Latin into Middle English.

---

[138] Michael Powell SIDDONS, Wales Herald Extraordinary. *Heraldic Badges in England and Wales*. Society of Antiquaries, (3 vols., Woodbridge, 2009), I, p. 4.
[139] *Ibid*., p. 5.
[140] On the treatises on armory of this Age in all languages, see below, § 3.2.4.

In both England and Scotland this didactic drought would persist until the end of the Period around 1560, and even in France only a handful of treatises on armory would be produced in the Fifth Age. There seems to have been a similar drought in both countries in the broader fields of knightly and nobiliary studies: complete in England to 1562, but only moderate in France, as we shall see.

**3.1.4.f. The introduction and spread of printing and its effects on the production and distribution of heraldica and dialectal standardisation**

It was no doubt partly for this reason that the arrival of publication by **printing** made such a small impact upon the dissemination of heraldistic erudition before the end of the Third Age, more than a century after its introduction in Germany at the hands of Gutenberg. In **France** the first press was set up in 1470 in the University of Paris, and concentrated on publishing Classical, Scholastic, and Humanist texts before turning to religious and popular works in 1472. By 1500 presses had been established in Lyon (in 1473) and forty other French towns, but the vast majority of the books they published before about 1550 were in either Scholastic or Humanistic Latin: the languages of serious discourse, traditional or current. The first book to be published in Middle French was **Bonhomme**'s *Croniques de France*, which appeared in 1476. It was followed around 1500 by books of poetry, mystery plays, and knightly romances, but very few *new* works in the vernacular were published in print before the end of our Period around 1560. As we shall see, the first works including material that could be described as 'heraldistic' to be printed in France would be produced by the presses of Paris and Lyon in the 1530s and '40s — well after the beginning of our Fifth Age.

In **England** the first printing press was set up in Westminster in 1476 by **William Caxton**, who had already printed the first book in English while living in the Burgundian capital of Bruges in 1473: *The Recuyell of the Histories of Troye*, which he had translated himself from its French original. Between that year and his death in 1491 Caxton published eighty-seven distinct works, most of them of some interest to members of the English nobility. These included classic Middle and Early Modern English works like Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (1476) and Mallory's *Morte Darthur* (1485), the latter of which, though composed in a non-standard dialect, was the first print best-seller in English. Caxton also published twenty-six other works of this type that, like the *Recuyell*, he translated himself from French. Among the latter of particular interest to us were Llull's ***Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry or Knyghthode*** (1484, translated into Scots English in 1494 by Adam Loutfut, Kintyre Pursuivant, as ***The Buk of the Ordour of Chevalry or Knychthed***),[141] and Christine de Pisan's ***The Book of the fayttes of armes***

[141] Alfred T. P. BYLES (ed.), *The Book of the Ordre of Chyualry, Translated and Printed by William Caxton from a French Version of Ramón Llull's "Le Libre del Orde de Cauayleria", together with Adam Loutfut's Scottish Transcript* (Harleian ms. 6149) (EETS, London, 1926)

***and of chyualrye*** (1489).[142] The major principle that guided Caxton's approach to translation was a desire to reproduce the sense of his text as precisely as possible, and one of the results of this principle was the introduction into English of many French words for which he knew no equivalent. Among these words, as we shall see, were a number that came to serve as standard elements of the heraldic lexicon — most of which was of French origin in any case.

Caxton also had to confront the problem of how to deal with the variety of English dialects and registers in which the works that were presented to him for publication were composed: a problem he discussed himself in the preface to his *Eneydos* (a version of Vergil's *Aeneid*), but did not address in a systematic way. In fact, the first serious attempt at dialectal standardisation was only begun in the year after his death, when **Richard Pynson** established his press in London, and began to impose something resembling the new Chancery Standard on the works he published. In 1509 Pynson was appointed the king's official printer by the new king Henry VIII: an appointment that must have enhanced the prestige of the form of English he had chosen, already used in all documents issued by the royal government. Nevertheless, it was probably **William Tyndale**'s unauthorised translation of the Bible into English, printed in 1525, that had the greatest impact on the progress of the new Standard, as it was not only widely read itself, but served as the principal source for the first authorised English Bible, **Myles Coverdale**'s *Great Bible* of 1539, which was to be read every Sunday in every church in England.

A few years after Caxton's death, in 1495, his press was taken over by his former assistant Jan van Wynken, of Woerth in Alsace, called '**Wynkyn de Worde**' in England. Moving from Westminster to Fleet Street the City of London, he carried on and improved upon his master's practices, and published more than 400 books in 800 editions before his death in 1545. One of the first of these was the anthology called *The Book of St Albans*, which included the only English treatise on armory to be composed between 1485 and 1562, and the only one to be printed before the latter date.[143] Other printers also set up shop in and after the 1480s, but because the Stationers' Company of London soon acquired a legal monopoly on Printing in England — with special dispensations to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge — printing in that kingdom long remained confined to those three cities, and especially to the capital.

Most of the works published by these early printers seem to have been written in previous Ages or Periods, but for that very reason they include many of the words and expressions of particular interest to us, and often include the first (or at least very early) attestations of English forms of French terms. Strictly contemporary works both of literature and of

---

[142] A. T. P. BYLES (ED.), *The Book of the fayttes of armes and of chyualrye, translated and printed by William Caxton from the French of Christine de Pisan*, (EETS 189, Oxford, 1932)

[143] On the *Book of St. Albans*, see below, p. 97

historiography were far less likely to deal with knightly themes, and thus to include descriptions of knightly armour or emblems that would contribute to my current investigation of the taxonomic lexicon, but as we shall see, a few works on contemporary history do provide us with material of interest in this regard.

### 3.1.5. THE FIFTH AGE, C. 1520 (IN FRANCE)/ 1530 (IN ENGLAND) – C. 1560

The Fifth and last Age of the Third Period in the history of heraldistic erudition and didacticism corresponded in England with the second part of the reign of Henry VIII and the whole reigns of his son Edward VI (1547-53), his great-niece Jane Grey (1553), and his elder daughter Mary I (1553-58) — who from 1534 associated in her rule her husband, Felipe (or Philip) von Habsburg, King of Naples, Archduke of Austria, ruler of the Burgundian netherlands, and future King of Spain. In France the Age corresponded with the latter part of the reign of François I (1515-47), and the whole reigns of his son Henri II (1547-59), and of the eldest of the latter's three sons, François II (1559-60). It is of some interest to the heraldist that, while still Dauphin of Viennois, the future François II in 1558 (the very year of the accession of Henry VIII's Protestant younger daughter Elisabeth to the throne of England) married Elisabeth's cousin Mary Stewart, Queen of Scots (1542-67), who at the same time laid claim to the English throne as the legitimate (and Catholic) heir, and assumed a quartering of the arms of France quartering England. The Period thus ended much as it had begun in sphere of armorial claims by the king of one of our two kingdoms to the throne of the other, though the death of François in the year after his accession terminated the more recent assumption much more quickly than the older one.

As these events suggest, the Fifth Age was most distinctively characterised not only by the continued spread of the distinctive ideas of the Renaissance and the literary, decorative, and architectural forms by which they were characteristically expressed, but also by more limited spread of the ideas of what is commonly called the 'Protestant Reformation': essentially a set of regional revolts against the established doctrines, practices, and governance of the Catholic Church. These soon gave rise to wholly new 'Protestant' 'communions' or 'confessions' of various stripes, supported in much of northern Europe by kings, territorial princes, or republics — the last both old (in Switzerland) and new (in the old Burgundian Netherlands). These developments not only destroyed forever the theoretical unity of Latin Christendom, but paved the way for a series of wars between princes and states of different confessions and types that would continue to 1648. In France, the spread of Calvinism soon divided the nobility into increasingly hostile camps, and led eventually to a series of civil conflicts, while in England the temporary secession of the national church from Rome ordered by Henry VIII in 1534 and its adoption of some Calvinist ideas under his son Edward VI had a similar (if milder) effect, and isolated England culturally both from France and from all of the southern lands of the continent, which remained staunchly Catholic.

### 3.1.5.a. Erudition among the heralds and antiquaries in the Fifth Age

Despite these radical changes in the religious situation in our two lands, in most areas of interest here the cultural tendencies of the Fourth Age (some of which had begun in still earlier Ages) simply continued in the Fifth, in several cases resulting in the complete cessation or abandonment of traditional heraldic and knightly practices — including the display of arms and other armories in the primary mode outside of the context of funerals.

The effects of the latter developments on the profession of the heralds were predictably dire. Although the authority of the English provincial kings of arms over armigery was significantly increased in 1530 when they were formally charged with conducting regular 'visitations' of the counties within their marches, that of their French brethren actually declined. So did the number of the lesser heralds of both kingdoms, and their importance in all areas of their established profession not directly concerned with armigery and armory. I shall examine the nature and causes of these declines in the corresponding subsection of the next Subdivision, and comment here as usual only on matters related to heraldic erudition.

Both in France and in England some of the heralds developed a more serious interest in genealogy in this age, and in France a few of those appointed to heraldic offices in this Age (most of them effectively heralds extraordinary) were notable antiquarians, who produced not only genealogical works, but substantial treatises on armory and other subjects of broadly heraldic interest. Aside from providing advice on the design or armories and conducting genealogical research for those in search of noble ancestors, however, the surviving heralds of France were largely reduced in this Age to their purely ceremonial rôles, most of which required only a superficial knowledge of armory. It is therefore likely that the majority of them were relatively ill informed on the subject, and certain that their rôle in the production of heraldic erudition declined steadily in this Age, as we shall see.

On both sides of the Channel the quality of antiquarian scholarship in general improved steadily in the Fifth Age, and gave rise to a not insignificant number of new works. Unfortunately, only a handful of these were concerned with topics of any relevance to the history of heraldic terminology, and all of those works were composed in France or neighbouring Francophone regions. Some of the new works were still composed in Latin, but a growing number of them — including a few of interest to us — were written in the vernacular. A number of antiquaries on both sides of the Channel began to take an interest in the history of dignities and their insignia, and in the history of heraldic emblems. Much of the latter interest seems to have arisen from the various forms of physical object bearing representations of such emblems that gentlemen of antiquarian interests began to assemble in their collections of 'antiquities', which were increasingly displayed in 'cabinets of curiosities'. These included not only coins, seals, metallic badges, and the like, but manuscripts in which armorials and treatises on armory were to be found.

In the Fifth Age itself, however, most antiquaries with interests in such matters did little more than collect, sort, and catalogue their collections, or make new copies of manuscripts in the collection of fellow antiquaries. That copies were indeed made in this Age of many of the treatises on heraldic subjects produced during our Second and Third Ages can be seen from the large proportion produced in the sixteenth century not only of the manuscripts whose contents I analysed above, but of the surviving manuscripts including rolls of arms catalogued by Wagner. Such copying (which continued well into the seventeenth century) not only preserved many texts that would otherwise have been lost with their manuscripts, but disseminated knowledge of those texts within a growing community of antiquaries, and helped to lay the groundwork for the new, more sophisticated works that would be produced in the Fourth Period.

Some antiquaries of this Age collected quite a substantial number of book, and their number included some, at least, of the more senior heralds. As I observed above in § 3.1.2, the first heraldic library of which we possess an inventory is that of Thomas Benolt, ninth known Clarenceux King of Arms of southern England and Wales from 1516 to his death in 1534, who had previously served as Windsor Herald from 1504 and Norroy King of Arms from 1510, and may have been a pursuivant under Edward IV and Richard III in the 1480s. Having been born and raised in France, he spent much of his life as a herald on missions to the continent, where he presumably met most of the other important heralds of his day. As might have been expected, his library — left to his colleague Carlisle Herald for his life and thereafter to his successor as Clarenceux — was both large and comprehensive, including not only books of **visitations**, **pedigrees**, and **ceremonies** of particular interest to a herald, but numerous **romances** (among them the *History of Troy*, the *Book of Galahad*, and the *Nine Worthies*), **histories** (including the *Chroniques* of Froissart and a printed history of France), a French translation of the **Old Testament**, an **encyclopaedia** (Brunetto Latini's *Livre du tresor*), and finally a set of **treatises** of precisely the sort found in the heraldo-nobiliary anthologies of the previous century: Vegetius' *De re militari*, Egidio Colonna's (*alias* Giles of Rome's) *De regimine principum*, Charny's *Livre de chevalerie*, two copies of Bovet's *Arbre de Batailles* with its epitome of Bartolo's *De insigniis et armis*, two bestiaries, and many other similar works. It was on the basis of such collections that the English treatises of the Fourth Period would be constructed by a later generation of antiquaries.

For reasons that are not entirely clear, however, very few of antiquaries who collected and copied heraldic manuscripts in the Fifth Age of the Third Period composed a new treatise. Indeed, so far as we know, not a single new work on an heraldic subject of any sort was written in England between 1495 and 1562. In France, by contrast, between 1535 and 1562 antiquarians published not only three new **treatises on armory** in *manuscript*, but four *printed* works on heraldic themes — two of them by the author of the last treatise of the Fourth Age, **Jean le Feron**. One of the latter four works was on a specialised armorial theme, but the other three were on the history of nobiliary dignities and the profession of the heralds.

I shall identify and examine all of these treatises as a group in § 3.2.5 below, and say no more about them here.

### 3.1.5.b. Linguistic developments in the Fifth Age

On a more positive note it can be said that both France and England finally acquired a **standard formal language** in this Age. In **France** this was brought about by the law of 1539 called the Ordinance of Villers-Cotterêts by which French as spoken in the court was declared the only official language of government in the kingdom. Significantly, the first French-Latin dictionary (that of Robert Estienne) was published in the same year, to assist those who had to convert from the traditional to the modern official language.

In **England**, by contrast, the achievement of a standard vernacular language was a result of the publication of the first officially sanctioned English Bible (Coverdale's *Great Bible*) in 1539, and of Thomas Cranmer's first *Book of Common Prayer* in 1549, both of which (the latter with revisions after the accession of Elisabeth I in 1559) were thenceforth to be read every Sunday in every church in the kingdom, and were in fact read every day by many English subjects in their own homes until the former was replaced by the King James Bible in 1611.

The forms of both the French and the English languages established in this Age are still quite comprehensible to the native-speakers of their current derivatives, and most of the important changes after 1560 would be in the lexicon, which continued to grow steadily both through borrowings from Classical Latin and Greek, and through the creation of new words to represent new concepts or phenomena.

In the linguistic sphere of particular interest to us, however, the changes of the Fifth Age were largely negative. As we shall see, not only were very few new taxonomic terms of any real value introduced, but in both France and England — and indeed throughout Latin Europe generally — many of the traditional terms related to matters of heraldic interest were either abandoned, or employed in a number of new senses not easily distinguishable from context. These new senses were themselves often shared with one or more other terms, and both the new polysemy of the terms and the new polylexy of the concepts undermined considerably the value of all of the words thus affected.

In the lexicon related to more narrowly heraldic phenomena, as we shall see, the term *blason* acquired a whole series of distinct senses in French, most of them shared with the terms *armes, armoirie,* and *armories*. To make matters worse, the reflexes of those four terms in English underwent a very different semantic evolution in the same period, giving rise to endless misunderstandings in translingual contexts. At the same time, the cognate words *heraut* and *herowd*, while retaining essentially the same sense in French and English, were not provided either with any commonly used coordinate *adjective* (comparable to the later *héraldique* and 'heraldical'), or with any commonly used *abstract nouns* (comparable to the discarded *heraudie* and *heraldie*) until various dates between 1570 and 1632.

It thus became even more difficult to discuss the history of both armory and heraldry in contemporary terms than to discuss that of knighthood.

## 3.2. Treatises on Armory Composed in Latin Europe before 1560

I have finally arrived at the point where I may turn from the history of literary and didactic works of all types related to heraldica, to that of the type of work in which the armoristic erudition of the Period was principally embodied: the treatise on armory. I have already taken note of the treatises of this type composed in France and England in their historical contexts, but here I shall not only discuss them in more detail (both individually and as a class), but shall discuss in a similar manner all of the treatises on armory known to scholarship that were composed in the other countries of Latin Christendom in the Third Period.[144] This will serve to place the treatises with which we are especially concerned in a different thematic and broader cultural context, and at the same time reveal the small numbers of the other treatises, the relatively late dates at which most of them were composed, and the extent to which they were dependent upon French models.

I shall again review these treatises, along with a number of related works, under the headings of the Ages in which they were composed — all of which were distinctive in this as in other respects. I shall follow this with a systematic discussion of the treatises from the perspective of my general study of taxonomic terminology, and shall finally set out the full set of treatises in the context of a comparative chronological table at the end of the whole discussion.

### 3.2.1. TREATISES COMPOSED IN THE FIRST AGE, C. 1330 – C. 1380

As we have seen, despite the many important and relevant developments that occurred in the cultural sphere shared by nobles and heralds between 1330 and 1380, relatively few treatises on nobiliary or heraldic matters of any kind were composed in the Age bracketed by those years. It is therefore less surprising that they saw the production of only two treatises on any aspect of heraldica, the first composed by an unnamed English author in Anglo-Norman verse, and the other by a famous Italian legal scholar in Latin prose. The two were very different from one another in both purpose and register, but they are both of considerable interest to the historian of heraldistic erudition, as they represent the starting points of two distinct traditions.

---

[144] When I began this project nothing resembling a comprehensive list of such treatises had been published, so I had to put one together from various works dealing with related questions in each of the countries in which related works like armorials were produced in the Period. It is therefore more than likely that I have missed works produced in countries I did not investigate, as well as some in those for which at least partial lists had been published. Any information on such works would be greatly appreciated.

/1/[145] The earlier of the two works is alternatively called by scholars ***De heraudie*** (after the first words of its text) or the ***Dean Tract*** (after its first editor),[146] but is entitled in the sole manuscript in which it has been preserved ***Descriptio armorum sive scutorum diversorum in Gallicis***: '*The description in French of diverse arms or shields*'. It is a short work, including about 1350 words, and occupying only three pages in the manuscript. Like many vernacular treatises of the period, its explanatory part, occupying the first fifty-three of its one hundred and forty-five lines, was composed in verse — specifically rhymed octosyllabic couplets. The second part, composed essentially of examples in blazonic language, was naturally left in prose.

The *Dean Tract* is almost certainly the first known treatise that was even partially concerned with a narrowly heraldic subject. Unfortunately, it is impossible to date it precisely, but given the identities of the persons whose arms serve as examples, it was almost certainly composed before 1345, and probably after 1341. It is worth noting that the sole manuscript in which this treatise has been preserved is an anthology compiled soon after 1382 in St. Alban's Abbey in Hertfordshire, just to the north of London: the richest and most important Benedictine abbey in the kingdom, with close ties to the royal court. This manuscript also contains treatises on agriculture, orthography, the art of writing letters, the rules of grammar, and several lists of words. As all of these are peculiar to the manuscript, it seems likely that most if not all of them were written at the request of the librarian of the abbey for the use of its monks.

The treatise on armory was clearly included in the manuscript as one of many practical guides to matters the monks of the abbey might need to deal with. Like those of the other works in the manuscript, its author is

---

[145] To assist the reader in identifying and keeping track of the treatises produced in different domains or countries, I have numbered each set separately and placed the numbers in distinctive forms of brackets: / / for the **English Domain**, // // for Scotland, \ \ for **Italy**, () for **France**, <> for **Germany**, <<>> for **Poland**, [] for the **Castilian Domain**, {} for the **Aragonese**, and | | for **Portugal**. I have given distinctive primary numbers only to wholly or largely original treatises, including those that were published as chapters in larger works, but have *italicised* the number of the latter. Translations of earlier works are distinguished by minuscule letters added to the number of the original (1b, 1c), and revisions by capitals (1B).

[146] The treatise called the 'Dean Tract' after its editor Ruth J. DEAN (one of my professors at the University of Pennsylvania), is uniquely preserved in the manuscript Cambridge, Univ. Lib., Ee.4.20. It was by far the earliest treatise of its type, but seems to have been little known to contemporaries, and to have had no influence on its successors. Dean published her edition in *Romance Studies in Memory of Edward Billings Ham*, ed. Urban T. HOLMES (California State College Publications 2; Hayward, Calif., 1967), pp. 21-29. On it and its manuscript see also DEAN and BOULTON, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, No. 390. Prof. Gerard BRAULT, AIH, has dated it to somewhere between 1341 and 1345 ('The Relationship between the Heralds' Roll, Grimaldi's Roll, and the Dean Tract', *The Coat of Arms*, n.s. 1, 95 [1975], pp. 211-19), but Rodney DENNYS pointed out that, on the basis of the arms cited, it could well have been composed at any time after 1280 (DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, p. 59).

not identified in any way, but the text itself suggests that it was composed by someone who took instruction from a herald, but was probably not a herald himself. Lines 5 to 8 state: '*Primer vous dirray les colours / — Ore, l'entendez par amours —/Et puys des armes les devis/ Des heraus come l'ay apris*./ ('First I shall tell you the colours — Listen now, for love — and then the descriptions of arms, as I have learned them from the heralds'). The author might, therefore, have been a monk of the abbey, who had asked a herald for instruction in his *misterie*.

Given the fact that the treatise was composed several decades before the manuscript in which it is preserved was itself created, however, it is at least possible that the author was a member of one of the other social groups with an interest in such matters — lawyers and secular prelates — and that the librarian of St. Alban's Abbey was given a copy of it and transcribed its text into his little guidebook for the use of the monks of the abbey. The likelihood of such an authorship is increased when it is considered that all of the other works of its genre composed anywhere before 1400 — and in England almost all of those composed before 1560 — appear to have been written by men of one or the other of these categories.

Of course, it is just possible that an earlier version of the treatise had been composed by a herald (possibly by dictation) to provide basic instruction for one or more apprentices (not yet called 'pursuivants') in his service, and that the librarian merely copied it into the formulary when it was shown to him by one of the apprentices in question when he had become a senior herald. It is at least probable that some apprentice heralds were literate even as early 1341, as the ability to read in the vernacular, at least, would have been useful for their functions as messengers.

In any case, the anonymous author did little more than set out the basic elements of armal design and description in a rather incoherent manner. Significantly in the present context, the only terms he used to achieve his limited purpose were those already employed in armorials to indicate precisely and succinctly the nature, colours, orientation, postures, and dispositions of the particular motifs involved in those designs. The only term of interest first attested in Anglo-Norman in the treatise is *heraudie* itself, which occurs only in its first line, and is not defined.

The *Dean Tract* does not seem to have been known to any of the later authors of the tradition it inaugurated,[147] and may well have been

[147] The armorial didactic tradition has only recently attracted serious interest from heraldic scholars outside Germany (where Gustaf A. SEYLER presented a relatively detailed survey of the tradition in his own country in his classic general work *Geschichte der Heraldik (Wappenwesen, Wappenkunst, Wappenwissenschaft)* (Nuremberg, 1890, repr. Neustadt an der Aisch, 1970), pp. 551-680. The earlier phase of the tradition in England — before the general substitution of print for handwriting — was the first to receive scholarly attention, especially in H. Stanford LONDON, 'Some Medieval Treatises on English Heraldry', *The Antiquaries' Journal* 33 (1953), pp. 169-183; and Rodney DENNYS, *The Heraldic Imagination* (New York, 1965), pp. 59-86. Several particular treatises (including three in Latin, one in Middle Welsh, and one in Middle English) were published in JONES, *Medieval Heraldry*, and the earliest Scottish treatise was published more recently by HOUWEN, *The Deidis of Armories* (1994). I have myself agreed to collaborate with

unknown outside the community of St. Alban's Abbey. It is also the only treatise on an heraldic subject preserved in Anglo-Norman. Nevertheless, as most of its successors resembled it in the (primitive) level of their conceptualisation and organisation, it probably represented the level of thinking about armory current among the heralds of the First of our Ages, and their essentially practical concerns.

\1\ It may have been no more than a decade later that the second treatise on armory was completed, in 1355: the ground-breaking ***Tractatus de insigniis*** (recte *insignibus)* ***et armis***[148] ('*On signs and arms*') of **Bartolo da Sassoferrato** (v. 1313-58)**.** This was an altogether more impressive work, written in learned Latin by a famous jurist who had already composed numerous treatises on other subjects. Bartolo (in Latin called *Bartolus de Saxoferrato*) had studied Civil Law at Perugia, graduating as a doctor in 1334, and served in various legal capacities in Todi, Pisa, and Bologna before returning first to Pisa in 1340 and finally to Perugia in 1351, to take up the professorship he held until his death in 1358. While in Pisa and Perugia he composed highly respected treatises on a variety of subjects, including a commentary on the Code of Justinian which, like the *Tractatus* in question, was published in the year after his death. Bartolo also served his city as an ambassador to the court of the Karl IV von Luxemburg, Emperor and King of Bohemia, who in turn appointed him a Privy Councillor and conferred emblematic arms upon him for his rôle in preparing the Golden Bull regulating Imperial elections that was promulgated in 1356.

As might be expected in these circumstances, Bartolo's treatise of 1355 on 'signs and arms' was much more sophisticated than the *Dean Tract*, and took an entirely different, more theoretical approach to its subject — which was itself conceived of in a very different way. Indeed, it was as much concerned with *armigers* and *armigery* as it was arms, and as we shall see, it not only proposed clearly-defined categories of both, but set out a

---

Erik Kooper of the University of Utrecht on editing all of the remaining texts composed in England and published in manuscript, but this project is only in its early stages. The treatises in Catalan (all associated with armorials) have recently been published by Martí de RIQUER, *Heràldica Catalana des de l'any 1150 al 1550* (2 vols., Barcelona, 1983), II, pp. 575-623. On the French didactic tradition, by far the most important work is Claire BOUDREAU, *Les traités de blason en français (XIVe - XVIe s.)*, unpublished doctoral thesis, 3 vols., École des Chartes, 1996. Claire was kind enough to Xerox the whole three volumes of her thesis for me several years ago, so I have had access to it for some time. She has now published the source material for her thesis — the treatises themselves — organised in the form of a dictionary, by topic: *L'Héritage symbolique des hérauts d'armes* (3 vols., Paris, 2006), but plans to publish a version of her thesis itself in the near future.

[148] This treatise has most recently been published in *Bartolo da Sassoferrato, De insigniis et armis, il più antico trattato di araldica medievale* (Florence: G. Pagnini, 1998), pp. 27-43. It was earlier published by Evan John JONES, *Medieval Heraldry: Some Fourteenth Century Heraldic Works* (Cardiff, 1943), preceded by a short biography of the author (pp. 221-252). See also DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, p. 213, and BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 70.

number of principles governing the legal acquisition and use of arms and other types of emblem (the theme of the first thirteen of its chapters) and established a completely new way of analyzing their meaning.

Indeed, more than half of its text of about 4300 words is concerned with the wholly novel questions of the (imagined) *symbolic significance* both of the *beasts* (in chapters 14-22) and the ***tinctures*** included in arms (chapters 23-27), and of the *orientation* of their designs and of the 'nobler parts' of their animate charges (chapters 28-33): charges of which it mentions specifically only the *lion*, *bear*, *horse*, *lamb*, and *man*. It ignores completely the identification and technical description of the many other elements of armal design that had been the central concern of the *Dean Tract*, and would remain that of most later treatises. It was thus in many respects a very peculiar work, reflecting the interests of a lawyer of philosophical inclinations rather than those of a herald or noble armiger. As the first Latin work of its type it is of some interest for the history of taxonomic terminology in that language, but because of its emphasis on legal and theoretical questions, and its concentration on arms to the exclusion of other armories, its value for my subject is quite limited.

Unlike the *Dean Tract*, of course, Bartolo's *Tractatus* was destined to be widely read, translated, and epitomised, and in consequence its distinctive doctrines (unfortunate as most of them were) would have a major influence on most of the later works of its type, throughout and beyond our present Period. As we have seen, his doctrine that the basic elements of armal design represented abstract qualities was to be taken up and expanded upon by most of the later authors of armoristic treatises, who in some cases (the first being 'Bado Aureo' in 1395) made many additions to his basic bestiary.

Nevertheless, the influence of Bartolo's treatise was not exercised immediately, for as we have seen, new didactic works on both nobiliary and heraldic subjects remained rare between 1355 and 1380, and only one of them took the slightest interest in armory. As I noted above in § 3.1.1.b, (*1*) the anonymous dream-vision of 1376 called the ***Somnium Viridarii*** or '*Dream of the Pleasure Garden*', and (*1a*) its French translation of 1378 called the ***Songe du Vergier*** (made by Evrart de Tremaugon in 1378 for Charles V of France), included in their chapter cxlviii an epitome of the *De insigniis et armis*.[149] The latter chapter constitutes the earliest use of Bartolo's treatise I have found in any language, and the earliest discussion of armorial matters in continental Middle French, but (to my knowledge) it has yet to be examined from a heraldistic perspective. Its value as a source of taxonomic terms in Middle French, however, is limited for the same reasons as those given for its Latin source.

### 3.2.2. TREATISES ON ARMORY OF THE SECOND AGE (C. 1380 – C. 1422)

The year 1387 — less than a decade after the beginning of the Second Age

[149] See Marion SCHNERB-LIÈVRE. *Le Songe du Vergier, édité d'après le manuscript Royal 19 C iv de la British Library*. CNRS (2 vols., Paris, 1982), esp. I, pp. 294-314.

— saw the publication of the second work in Middle French to incorporate material from Bartolo's treatise: (2) ***L'Arbre de Batailles*, Honoré Bovet's** vast and much-copied treatise on the laws and customs of war, which as I noted above, included a chapter on armory. Significantly, the chapter in question of this Middle French work was again based entirely on Bartolo's Latin treatise, and replicated most of its contents in a language accessible to lay noblemen as well as learned lawyers and clerics.[150] In consequence it, rather than the *Songe*, was to be the principal vernacular source for the Bartolan doctrines in the later works dealing with armory.

Bovet's *Arbre* was not primarily about armory, of course, but was rather one of the fourteen or more works produced in French in the Second Age on broadly military or knightly themes — including a second treatise of a similar nature with an essentially similar chapter on armory, as I noted above. Given the considerable increase in the production of treatises generally in the decades after 1380, however, it cannot be surprising that the practice of composing new, independent treatises on armory finally took off in the Second Age, beginning around 1390.

(2?) What might have been the first *original* treatise on armory by a Frenchman was the Latin ***De picturis et armis*** (*On Pictures and Arms*), attributed to an otherwise unknown author whose Latin name **Franciscus de Foveis** has been tentatively Gallicised as **François des Fosses**. This work must have been composed (if it existed at all) at about the same time as Bovet's *Arbre*,[151] but like its purported author, it is now known only from the (possibly spurious) acknowledgement of it as a model that was made by the author of the first such treatise in the continuous tradition to be composed in Britain. It is therefore impossible to say anything further about it save that, if it did exist, it probably borrowed some of its material directly from Bartolo's original treatise in Latin.

/**2**/ The work whose author claimed the *De picturis* as a source was the Latin ***Tractatus de armis*** or *Treatise on Arms*: the second such work to be composed in the Domain of the Crown of England — though not in England or by an Englishman. This treatise is itself of somewhat uncertain authorship, but it was attributed in one of its surviving manuscripts to a certain '**Johannes de Bado Aureo**', and its most recent editor has made a

---

[150] DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, pp. 67, 218. The standard edition is that of Ernest NYS, *L'Arbre des Batailles* (Brussels, Leipzig, 1883), and an English translation was made by G. W. COOPLAND, *The Tree of Battles of Honoré Bonet: An English version with introduction by G. W. Coopland, with a hitherto unpublished historical interpolation* (Liverpool, 1949). What is probably the oldest surviving manuscript is London, B. L., ms. Royal 20.C.viii, which may have been presented by the author to his patron Jehan de France, Duke of Berry and Auvergne.

[151] The author of the *Tractatus de armis* of c. 1395 claimed that his work was based on the treatise *De Picturis Armorum* by an otherwise unknown Frenchman whom he called Franciscus de Foveis, which in French would be François des Fosses. This work is also referred to in the prologue to *John's Treatise* of c. 1446, but no trace of it has yet been found. See DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, p. 213, and BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 71.

convincing argument that the gentleman thus designated was **Siôn** or **John Trevor** II, a Doctor of Civil and Canon Law who served as Bishop of St. Asaph's in Wales from 1394 to 1410. The treatise, completed in 1395, has been preserved in different versions in several manuscripts,[152] and was well known to some later authors, at least. In marked contrast to its only British predecessor, the *Dean Tract*, but like Bartolo's *De insigniis* (upon which its author drew heavily and explicitly for his discussion of colours and beasts) the *Tractatus de armis* was a reasonably substantial and relatively sophisticated work of about 9600 words in its shorter version, and about 13,600 words in its longer one.

Like Bartolo's similarly named work, Trevor's *Tractatus de armis* was clearly aimed at a learned audience of the sort found only among the clerics of cathedrals, monasteries, and universities, and the luxurious quality of some of its surviving manuscripts indicates that it was of interest to men of considerable wealth. Although it resembled Bartolo's treatise in devoting an inordinate amount of space to the imagined symbolism of colours (which after an introductory discussion of the meaning of the words for arms, occupy ten pages in the edition) and beasts (adding to Bartolo's set of four the *leopard*, *pard*, *deer*, *goat*, and *dog*, while omitting the lamb, and then adding ten 'birds', including the *dragon* and *griffin*, and two 'fishes': together occupying about fourteen pages of the edition); and resembled the *Dean Tract* in discussing the various patterns and geometrical charges used as elements of arms (especially *crosses*), it was much more prolix than either. It also replaced the former's discussion of the categories of armiger with one of differencing for cadency and bastardy, and in consequence introduced a number of previously unattested terms in their Latin form. Not surprisingly, the treatise as a whole was destined to have a major influence on later English treatises of what may be called the 'learned tradition'.

/2a/ Trevor's Latin *Tractatus* was soon followed by a Welsh translation, the ***Llyfr Dysgread Arfau*** — almost certainly made by its author, and the sole work of heraldic didacticism produced in that language not only in our Period, but for a long time afterward.[153] It probably introduced most of the established blazonic terminology of French into the Welsh language.

(**4**) Back in **France**, a set of short, unsophisticated treatises in Middle French — probably composed in the 1390s by one or more anonymous

[152] The *Tractatus de Armis* was first published by Sir Edward BYSSHE (Garter King of Arms under the Cromwellian Protectorate) in a collection of 1654 (*Nicholai Vptoni, De Studio Militari, Libri Quattuor; Iohan. de Bado Aureo, Tractatvs de Armis; Henrici Spelman, Aspilogia*) but was published in a modern edition, in two distinct redactions, in Evan John JONES, *Medieval Heraldry: Some Fourteenth Century Heraldic Works* (Cardiff, 1943): Red. I, pp. 95-143, and Red. II, pp. 144-212. Jones argued persuasively that Bado Aureo meant 'Trevor'. See also DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, pp. 67-71, 213, and BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 71.

[153] This was published, with a facing-page translation, in JONES, *Medieval Heraldry*, pp. 2-94.

heralds — was finally published shortly after 1400 in the form of a compilation that Claire Boudreau (the first to identify as well as to examine them) has named the ***Livres des armes et des héraulx***.[154] This composite work is only preserved in three manuscripts (two of the fifteenth and one of the sixteenth century), but it is important not only because it was the first truly original work to be produced in the French vernacular, but also the first work in any language to set out a version of a doctrine that would appear in one form or another in many of the later treatises composed on both side of the Channel: namely, that both arms and heralds had been the creation of a famous monarch of Greek or Roman Antiquity. Given the very limited circulation of this compilation, and the great variety of the later versions of this doctrine, it seems likely that the doctrine had been invented in a less explicit form at a somewhat earlier date, and circulated orally in heraldic circles before being set down in its various written forms — the next of which was that found in the treatise on the office of arms composed by Calabria Herald in 1408.

The main text of the compilation otherwise resembled that of *De heraudie* in being concerned primarily with the design and description of arms — the central element of the heraldic *mestier* — and while it borrowed from the Bartolan tradition in assigning meanings to the tinctures it distinguished, the meanings themselves were all related to the martial virtues of the noble knights it presented as the only legitimate armigers.

(**5**) Another work that may have been composed before the end of the Second Age (if its author was indeed Nicolas Villart, Calabria King of Arms under Duke Louis II of Anjou) is the treatise on the origin of the use of ermine and vair that I have called the ***Traité des fourures***. Its full text is found only in one manuscript, compiled after 1454 (B.n.F. ms. fr. 1983), but it is preserved in an abbreviated version in one other (ms. fr. 5242). Given its very narrow, blazonic subject, it is of limited interest here.

So far as anyone has yet discovered, no further original treatises on armorial themes were produced in either France or Britain before the end of the Second Age in 1422. Thus, the forty-two years of that Age saw the production of only between two and four truly original works on armory — the precise number depending on the extent to which Trevor's work was based upon the lost work of des Fosses, whether the latter even existed, and whether the treatise on furs was actually composed by Villart. All but the last of the works in question were apparently written in the decade or so between about 1390 and 1400: a time when the heraldic profession had just achieved its classic structure in both France and England, and the royal heraldage was about to achieve its collegiate character in the former kingdom. For that very reason — and also because the only treatises accessible to a lay audience seem to have had a very limited circulation — one would have expected the creation of at least one or two additional treatises in the first two decades of the fifteenth century, but apparently no need was felt for such a work before 1422, and possibly

[154] BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, pp. 71-72. Unpublished as a unit; preserved in Paris, B.n.F., ms. fr. 19811, fols. 13v-20, and Douai, Bib. Mun., ms. 1197, fols 108.

for a few years after that.

Nevertheless, as I noted above in my general survey, the Second Age did see the production of two additional works of a more comprehensive nature that included a discussion of armory in one of their chapters.

(2*A*) The first of these chapters formed part of a longer work composed both in **France** and in FRENCH. The chapter in question took the form of an epitome of the Bartolan chapter in Bovet's *Arbre,* and the containing work was the highly successful treatise on the art and laws of war rather misleadingly called the ***Livre des fais d'armes et de chevallerïe*** of 1407. This treatise (a good deal of which was in fact based on Bovet's *Arbre*) was composed by the first and only woman author in either tradition, **Christine de Pisan**, who was also the author of many serious books on a variety of themes, and arguably the first female public intellectual.[155] As we have seen, the *Livre des fais d'armes* would eventually be translated into Early Modern English by Caxton and published in print early in the Fourth Age, but in the meantime it was probably little known outside France itself. In any case, it added nothing of consequence to armoristic knowledge or discourse.

<***1***> The second of the more general works of this Age that included a discussion of armory was the first and only work to include what amounted to a treatise on armory that would be composed either in **Germany** or in GERMAN before 1560. This treatise was published as a chapter in a more general treatise on nobility and war, composed in the form of a *Lehrgedicht* or didactic poem, that was completed at some time between 1404 and 1414: the ***Ritterspiegel*** ('*Mirror of Knights*') of **Johannes Rothe**, now preserved in a single manuscript in Kassel. Rothe (d. 1434) was a learned priest from Kreuzburg, near Eisenach, in Thuringia, who was attached to the collegiate church of St. Mary in the latter town from 1387, holding the rank of canon from 1418 and scholastic from 1422. While there he also composed three chronicles (of Eisenach, Thuringia, and the world); a life of Saint Elisabeth; the devotional works *Liber devotae animae* and *Johannes Rothes Passion*; and two other treatises on legal and political subjects: the *Eisenacher Rechtsbuch*, and the so-called *Ratsgedichte*. The

[155] Until the late Charity Canon WILLARD's own critical edition of the *Livre* is published, one is obliged to rely for the text on individual manuscripts and on the partial edition included by Christine Moneera LAENNEC in her unpublished Yale dissertation of 1988, *Christine* antygrafe: *Authorship and Self in the prose Works of Christine de Pisan with an Edition of B.N. Ms. [fr.] 603 Le Livre des Fais d'Armes et de Chevallerie*. On the chapters based on Bartolo via Bovet and the *Songe*, see D'A. J. D. BOULTON, 'The Treatise on Armory in Christine de Pisan's *Livre des Fais d'Armes et de Chevalerie* and its place in the Tradition of Heraldic Didacticism', in *Contexts and Continuities: Proceedings of the IVth International Colloquium on Christine de Pisan (Glasgow, 21-27 July 2000), published in honour of Lilane Dulac*, ed. Angus J. KENNEDY, with Rosalind BROWN-GRANT, James C. LAIDLAW, and Catherine M. MÜLLER (Glasgow, Univ. of Glasgow Press, 2002), Vol. I, pp. 87-98. See also DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, pp. 213-14.

armorial chapter of the Ritterspiegel itself resembled the earlier unlearned treatises both in its content and organisation, and while it may have introduced into the written tradition of Germany a number of previously unrecorded terms, few if any of these were of interest to this enquiry.[156]

The association of armory and the laws of armigery with the laws and art of war in the unitary works of Honoré Bovet, Christine de Pisan, and Johannes Rothe suggest the close relationship that existed in the minds of contemporaries among these matters, and this is borne out by the inclusion of similar materials in most of the manuscripts in which the various independently-composed treatises on armory have been preserved in the century and a half after 1390, as we have seen.

### 3.2.3. TREATISES ON ARMORY OF THE THIRD AGE (C. 1422 – C. 1485)

As I noted in my general survey above, after a hiatus of about a quarter-century, the rate of production of original treatises on heraldic, knightly, and nobiliary themes finally began to take off again in the 1420s, and from that time to c. 1490 — a span of time corresponding almost exactly to our Third Age — works of these types continued to be composed on a more or less regular basis in France, if much more sporadically in other countries, including England. The vast majority, as we have seen, were published in anthologies composed of works of various origins on related subjects. Here we are primarily concerned with the treatises on armory included in these anthologies.

Like that of treatises of related types, the rate at which treatises on armory were produced increased significantly in the Third Age, but only slowly in the roughly half of the Age before 1450, which saw the publication of only five or six independent works of that type (four in France and one or two in England), one major treatise incorporated in a larger work (in England), and two brief discussions included in larger works (both in Germany). If we may judge from the number of manuscripts in which they have been preserved to the present, a few of these works reached relatively large readerships in their day, while the others were probably little read outside the circles of their authors.

The first four of the full treatises that appear to have been produced between 1422 and 1450, and all of the independent treatises produced before about 1448, were composed in MIDDLE FRENCH, probably in France itself, and probably between 1430 and 1444. Though none of them can be dated precisely, the earliest of them were probably the two anonymous works now known after a later owner (the surgeon John Banyster) as the (**6**) ***First*** and (**7**) ***Second Banyster Treatises***. They were both apparently composed by a Norman in the service of King Henry VI and II of England

[156] See Christoph HUBER and Pamela KALNING (eds.), Johannes ROTHE, *Der Ritterspiegel* (Berlin, New York, 2009). It is preserved as Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek, 4° Ms. poet. et roman. 8. The armorial treatise constitutes most of chapter 4 (pp. 54-64 in the edition), to which the editors gave the title 'Wappen und Heerschild-ordung' — roughly translatable as 'Arms and the order of noble ranks'.

and France, at some time between his birth and accession in 1422 and his assumption of full authority in 1437 (but on internal evidence probably after 1430). They both survive in only one contemporary manuscript, now in the College of Arms, and in one much later copy, and are therefore unlikely to have been widely copied and read in their original form.[157] Nevertheless, they would both be translated into Scots English near the end of the century by Adam Loutfut, Kintyre Pursuivant, in his *Deidis of Armorie*, and would therefore have some influence on the thinking of the heralds and heraldists of Scotland in the sixteenth century.[158]

The author of the two *Banyster Treatises* was probably either a herald himself or moved in their circles, as the **first treatise** places a considerable emphasis on the dignity and authority of the heraldic profession, whose founders are described as judges of military affairs, and whose current members are compared to the doctors of the Church. It also presents for the first time a clearly-conceived *definition* of arms, and a logically organised exposition of the principles of blazon. The **second treatise** begins with another short definition of arms and an account of those of the Old Testament Worthy Joshua, and then sets out an elaborate bestiary, followed by a discussion of the 'less noble' inanimate charges, itself divided between the larger and 'nobler' charges that filled the field, and the smaller ones primarily used as brisures.

(**8**) The *Banyster Treatises* seem to have been followed by the very similar work Boudreau called the ***Traité en forme de questionnaire*** ('*Treatise in the form of a questionnaire*'). This, as we have seen, was composed shortly before his death in 1437 by the eminent herald **Jehan Courtois**, who had begun his career as Enghien Herald in the service of Pierre de Luxembourg-Enghien (d. 1433), had next been made Jerusalem Herald in the service of Duke Louis III of Anjou (d. 1434), and had finally become Sicily Herald in the service of Louis' rival for the throne of Naples, Alfons 'the Magnanimous', King of Aragon and Sicily. The treatise is preserved in no fewer than twenty manuscripts of the fifteenth century, ten of the sixteenth, and three of the seventeenth: unprecedently high numbers, which suggest that it was widely read in its day. After a brief introduction on the legendary origins of arms, the work sets out a series of questions and answers between a pursuivant and a master herald, and promulgates the distinctive doctrine that *azure* was the most noble of the armorial tinctures. The treatise was destined to serve as a basis for the

[157] BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, pp. 72-3. This treatise is the first to use the expression *cote d'armes*, and the fact that its author saw it as a kind of tunic comparable to that worn by deacons would suggest a date after 1430, as tabards of that form are unknown before that date. First treatise ed. by J. A. J. R. HOWEN and M. GOSMAN, 'Un traité d'héraldique inédit: le ms Londres, Collège des hérauts [= College of Arms], M 19, f. 79v-95', *Romania* 112 (1991), pp. 488-521. Second treatise ed. by L. HOWEN and P. ELEY, 'A Fifteenth-Century French Heraldic Bestiary', *Zeitschift für romanische Philologie* 108, (1992), pp. 460-514.

[158] See T. O'Neill, 'Adam Loutfut's Book', *The Coat of Arms* 4 (1957), pp. 307-10; DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, pp. 73-74, 213, BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, pp. 72-3. The editor of the *Deidis*, however, identified its source as the next work.

doctrine and organisation of a whole succession of comparable treatises composed in France, and was to form both the first part of a composite work printed under the title *Le Blason des toutes armes et escutz* in 1495, and (in a truncated form) the introductory part of the slightly later work *Le Blason des couleurs*. Boudreau has also demonstrated that the treatise had initially formed the fourth and last part of a vast work prepared by Sicily — the largest of its kind composed in French before the Fifth Age — which included treatises on the heraldic office, tourneys, jousts, and trials by battle, and commentaries on earlier treatises on the art and laws of war. [159]

(**9**) Next in order among the treatises of this period was probably the ***Blason d'armes en douze chapîtres*** ('*Blazon of arms in twelve chapters*'), which is now thought to have been written by an anonymous author at some time before 1444, but was later claimed by the courtier **Clément Prinsault**, and has traditionally been associated with his name.[160] It is known from twenty-three or four manuscripts of the fifteenth century, twenty-three of the sixteenth, and eight of the seventeenth century, and seems therefore to have been the most widely-read and influential work of its kind composed in this Age. It was essentially a reorganised version of the *Traité en forme de questionnaire*, differing primarily in being addressed not to pursuivants but to noblemen.

The remaining four treatises of this quarter-century were composed in **England**, between about 1445 and 1455, the first in LATIN and the others in Middle English. /3/ The first that can be dated precisely forms part of a more comprehensive work entitled the ***Libellus de militari officio et insigniis armorum*** ('*Booklet on the office of a knight and on the signs of arms*'), which was composed, as we have seen, by the learned civil lawyer and cleric **Nicolas Upton**, who at the time of its publication was a Canon of Wells and the Canon-Precentor of Salisbury Cathedral. As it begins with a dedication to Upton's patron Duke Humphery of Gloucester, it must have been completed before the latter's death in 1446.[161] Since the seventeenth century the containing work has been more commonly known by the rather misleading name ***De studio militari*** ('*On military [or knightly] study'),* but as its original title suggests, the work as a whole is concerned with various aspects of the culture of the knightly nobility, of which the armorial code was but a part. It thus constituted a sort of rational

[159] BOUDREAU, *Traités de blason*, I, pp. 152-72; *Héritage symbolique*, pp. 73-4. Sicily's compilation is in P. ROLAND, *Parties inédites de l'oeuvre de Sicile* (Mons, 1867).

[160] BOUDREAU, *Traités de blason*, I, pp. 176-81; *Héritage symbolique*, pp. 74-5. Unpub. as a unit, but transcribed in *ibid*. from Paris, B.n.F, ms. fr. 1983, fols. 44-51.

[161] DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, pp. 76-82, 215. The original version of Upton's work is preserved in London, B. L. ms. Cotton Nero C. iii, Oxford, Bod. Lib. Eng. misc, d.227, among many others, while a version transcribed but extensively rearranged by a person named Baddesworth has been preserved in a comparable number of copies, including B. L. ms. Add. 30946 and Coll. Arms ms. Vincent 444. The former was first published in print by BYSSHE in 1654 in his *Nicholai Vptoni*, Pt. I. It is discussed in JONES, *Medieval Heraldry*, pp. xxiii-xxiv; F. P. BARNARD, *The Essential Portions of Nicholas Upton's De Studio Militari, translated by John Blount* (Oxford, 1931), and COOPLAND, *Tree of Battles*, pp. 22-23.

integration of much of the material included in the heraldo-nobiliary anthologies of the Period examined above.

The *Libellus* is divided in all of the surviving copies into four long books, the first three of which are divided in turn into chapters, and the last of which is divided into numerous short sections. The nineteen chapters of Book I, *De milicia et nobilitate* ('*On nobility and knighthood*') are concerned with warfare, knighthood, and the heralds in their imagined capacity as 'veteran knights'; the fourteen chapters of Book II, *De bellis et actibus exercitus* ('*On wars and acts of an army*') deal with different types of war, duels, trial by battle, and safe-conducts (all matters that could come before the Court of Chivalry); the sixteen chapters of Book III, *De nobilitate colorum in armis depictorum* ('*The nobility of colours depicted in arms*') deal in great detail with the relative 'nobility', precedence, and symbolism, not only of the strictly armorial tinctures, but of the newer ones of para-armory; and finally Book IV, *De regulis et signis in armis* ('*On rules and signs in arms'*) contains a rambling account, in one hundred and ninety-five sections, of the beasts, birds, fishes, flowers, ordinaries and subordinaries, especially the twenty-eight different types of cross. Thus, the two armorial chapters — clearly inspired by the equivalent parts of Trevor's Latin *Tractatus* of 1395, but expanded and modified along the lines of the *Second Banyster Treatise* of c. 1430 — take up much of the work.

The *Libellus* is preserved in many manuscripts, and seems to have been as influential over the next century or so as the *Tractatus de armis* had been in the preceding half-century. Roughly contemporary with it, but probably composed closer to 1450, were two works composed in MIDDLE ENGLISH. /**4**/ The better known of these is the one now called **John's Treatise**, from the forename of its apparent author. His identity is yet again uncertain, but a likely candidate is the lawyer **John Dade**, who was a lecturer in law in the Inns of Court in London in this period. It has been preserved in six distinct versions in seven manuscripts,[162] and as we saw above, was to become the direct or indirect model for a whole series of mainly anonymous and undatable variants composed over the next few decades. Most of these are preserved only in a single manuscript, and known either from the name of a later collector, or that of the library in which they came to be kept.[163]

---

[162] DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, pp. 82-86, 216, with a summary of the contents on pp. 84-6. What Dennys believed to be the **original** version is preserved in London, B. L., Additional ms. 34,648, and Dennys, ms. 10. The other versions are the **Harleian** (B. L., ms. Harley 6097), the **Laudian** (Oxford, Bod. Lib., ms. Laud Misc. 733; the **Ashmolean** (Bod. Lib. ms. Ashmolean Rolls 4); **Dethick's** (London, Coll. of Arms ms. F. 14, fols. 1-48), and **The Heralds'** (Coll. of Arms, ms. Treatise on Heraldry circa Henry IV'). The original version was published on the basis of the first three manuscripts in JONES, *Medieval Heraldry*, pp. 213-20; the Ashmolean by Cecil R. HUMPHERY-SMITH, FHS, 'Heraldry in School Manuals of the Middle Ages', *The Coat of Arms* 6, pp. 163-70.

[163] The later works in English include the **Bradfer-Lawrence Tract** of c. 1445/50 (B. L., ms. Add. 61,902), **Patrick's Book** of c. 1465 (Antwerp, Plantin-Mortus Museum, ms. OB 5.6), the **Sloan Tract** of c. 1470 (B. L., ms. Add. 3744, **Cottell's**

What is thought to have been the original version of *John's Treatise* itself has been edited and published along with the other early English treatises by Evan Jones. Like its many variants and derivatives it is a brief work, containing about 1600 words, and occupying only about seven pages in Jones' edition. It was a practical rather than a learned work, and both its organisation and its presentation were very like those of its earliest predecessor, the *Dean Tract* of 1341/5. It begins rather surprisingly with an obviously false claim to be a direct translation of 'Ffraunces de Ffoueys *De Picturis Armorum*', proceeds to a short account of the origin of arms at the siege of Troy as 'marks of worship in token of doughtiness' (each of which had to be differenced by the sons of their first bearers by a set of minor brisures); then to an account of the conquest of Britain from the giants, and of the origin of the expression '*cote of armes*'; and finally to explanations of the *tinctures* and their *lapidary* equivalents; of the *ordinaries*; of basic *marshalling* by quartering; of *minor charges*; and of *varied lines*; concluding with the fifteen *attitudes* of *lions*, and the fifteen forms of *crosses*.

Though quite unsophisticated, *John's Treatise* is of particular interest because it may have been the first such work to be written in English, and because it would dominate the vernacular tradition of treatise-writing in England for the next century and more. It is also significant that its composition coincided closely with that of the first grant of arms expressed in our language — that to the Haberdashers' Company, made in 1446 — as this coincidence suggests that the use of English for armorial purposes dates from about that time.

/**5**/ The other treatise composed in English around 1450 (which might also be the first) was the one called from the current location of its sole manuscript (in the royal library of the Netherlands) the ***Hague Tract***.[164] As it remains unedited, it is difficult to say much more about it, its relationship to *John's Treatise*, or its possible influence on later works.

The later versions and related treatises — including the one called /4B/ ***Strangways Book***, apparently based on a set of notes taken by Sir **Richard Strangways** on lectures in one of the Inns of Court based on John's Treatise at some time between 1452 and 1488[165] — have not yet been published or studied systematically, so it is difficult to comment on them.[166] As they are the only other known English works of this type that appear to date from the latter half of our Third Age, between c. 1450 and c. 1485, we are obliged to conclude that armoristic erudition made no real progress in England in that period.

In **France** the second half of the Third Age saw the production of a rather larger number of original treatises, but most of these were also very short and of minimal originality — as well as being in most cases of very

---

**Tract** (B. L., ms. Harley 992), the **Cambridge Tract** (Cambridge, Cam. Univ. Lib. ms. Dd.X.52), and **Kimbey's Tract** of 1558 (B. L., ms. Harley 3526).

[164] Preserved in The Hague, Kong. Bib., ms. 75 A 2/2

[165] Preserved in London, B. L., ms. Harley 2259.

[166] Most of these are listed and briefly described, along with a number of minor French treatises, by DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, pp. 216-17.

uncertain date.

The first three of the seven such works identified by Claire Boudreau were (**10-11**) two unnamed ***traités*** and (**12**) the associated work called the ***Créquier de noblesse*** (*'Plum-tree of nobility'*), all composed by the otherwise unknown **Hungary King of Arms**, and explicitly intended for the education of pursuivants of arms. As I observed above, it is likely that the author was a herald in the service of René 'the Good', Duke of Anjou and King of peninsular Sicily, in his pretended dignity of King of Hungary between 1435 and his death in 1480. The work is preserved in six manuscripts of the fifteenth century, three of the sixteenth, and seven of the seventeenth.[167] It has been dated to the period 1460/66-1480 because that is the apparent date of an armorial attributed to the same herald placed immediately after it in one of the manuscripts containing it (BnF, fr. 5242), but of course it could have been written significantly earlier.

The first nameless treatise sets out a list of all of the figures used in arms with all of the different uses of each, but not their symbolic significance. The second nameless treatise was clearly modelled on the *Traité en douze chapîtres*, but similarly omitted the symbolism of the tinctures. The *Crequier* is concerned exclusively with presenting the armorial tinctures and their equivalents in *virtues* and *precious stones*: two of the many symbolic associations with colours the Age gave rise to.

(13) The fourth work of this period is what Boudreau called the ***Traité en figures*** (i.e., lacking any text), associated in its earliest manuscript with the romance *Le Jouvencel*, and preserved in two manuscripts of the fifteenth and one of the sixteenth century.[168] It is obviously of no interest to us, and barely meets the minimal criteria for classification as a treatise.

The next three works listed by Boudreau are all more substantial, but still very brief. First among these was (**14**) the ***Avis de Toison d'or sur le fait d'armoirie***, composed in 1464 by **Jehan le Febvre de Saint-Remy** (who as we have seen was Golden Fleece King of Arms to the last two Valois Dukes of Burgundy), and preserved in three manuscripts of the fifteenth century, three of the sixteenth, and six of the seventeenth.[169] Aside from emphasising the authority of the kings of arms and the hereditary character of armigery, it concentrated on the themes of differencing for cadency and the parts of the field of the arms and their proper proportions.

The second work of this period was what Boudreau called (**15**) the ***Concertation héraldique***, composed by the Burgundian courtier **Olivier de la Marche** in consultation with several kings of arms and heralds during the siege of Neuss in Germany in 1474. Although it is a very short work, of

---

[167] BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, pp. 75-6. The whole set of works by this otherwise unknown herald are preserved in Paris, B. n. F., ms. fr. 5242, of whose texts the relevant parts are transcribed in the entries of Boudreau's book, but not otherwise published.

[168] *Ibid*., p. 77. The oldest version seems to be that preserved in Paris, B.n.F. 24381.

[169] *Ibid*., p. 76. It was ed. by Michel POPOFF, 'Une consultation héraldique à la fin du Moyen Age', *Histoire et Généalogie: Annales de généalogie et d'héraldique* 27 (1990), pp. 23-26. The text in BOUDREAU was transcribed from Paris, B.n.F., ms. fr. 1968, fols 159r-161v

only 305 words, it is important as the first (and only work of its Age) to deal with the rights to use a crown on a helm, to bear a gilded helm, to quarter one's mother's arms, and to change one's name or arms. It is preserved in three sixteenth- and four seventeenth-century manuscripts.[170] (I1*a*) a bestiary I shall call the ***Bestiaire héraldique***, which was the first and only complete translation into French of the bestiary that formed a large part of Bartolo's *Tractatus*. It is found only in ms. fr. 14357, datable to 1492.[171]

None of these works appears to have been widely read, but several of them did deal with new subjects, and introduced a few new terms into the lexicon.

The practice of writing about armory was also maintained in the Third Age in Germany, and spread from there to its eastern neighbour Poland. As we have seen, the first treatise on armory to be composed either in **Germany** or in a dialect of GERMAN — Rothe's *Ritterspiegel* — had appeared in our Second Age, between 1404 and 1414. No comparable treatise is known from either the Third or the Fourth Ages, but the great German heraldist Gustav Seyler did identify short discourses on armorial questions in four works of the former Age: <2> a poem of c. 1440 by Meister **Altswert** called **'Der Kittel'** ('*The Frock*'), of which a passage quoted by Seyler discussed the meaning of six armorial tinctures; <3> the Latin treatise of 1440 by the Zurich priest **Felix Hemmerlin**, ***De nobilitate et rusticitate*** ('*On nobility and rusticity*'), of which chapter 29 dealt with armorial questions; <4> the civic armorial of 1460 called the ***Wappenbuch Augsburgischer Geschlechter*** ('*Armorial of the Sexes of Augsburg*') in which the author (one **Grossenbrot**) discussed similar matters in a brief passage; and finally <5> the treatise of c. 1460 called ***De Imperio Romano, regis et Augusti creatione, inauguratione*** etc., by the canon **Petrus de Andlo**, in which Chapter 14 of Book II, *De Aquila et armorum insigniis* ('*On the eagle and the signs of arms*'), deals with the meaning of the imperial eagle in the tradition of Bartolo.[172] Not surprisingly, none of these works made any significant contribution to the German taxonomic lexicon.

<<**1**>> The first and only treatise known to have been composed in any of the kingdoms of central or northern Europe before 1560 was the ***Klejnoty*** (*Armorial Achievements*) of the **Polish** priest and chronicler **Jan Długosz** (v. 1415-1480), canon of Kraków, and at the end of his life Archbishop of Lwów. He served as an emissary of the Polish king in 1450, 1461, and 1466, and was rewarded for his success by being made tutor to the king's son in 1467: all experiences that would have exposed him to heralds and courtly culture. He is best known for his *Annales seu cronici incliti regni Poloniae*, covering events from 965 to the year of his death, but he also wrote (from 1455-80) a second history (*Historiae Poloniae Libri xii*),

[170] This work is not discussed by Boudreau in her *Héritage symbolique*, but it is the subject of a discussion in her thesis, and is listed therein among the treatises. I have transcribed a copy of it from B.L., Egerton ms. 795, fols. 73-v-74r.
[171] BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 78
[172] All of these works are discussed by SEYLER, *Geschichte*, II, pp. 564-565.

and (in or soon after 1448) a book on the Battle of Tannenberg in 1410 called *Banderia Prutenorum* ('*Banners of the Prussians*'). The *Klejnoty* was probably composed at some time between 1450 and 1480, but it is preserved only in a manuscript of the sixteenth century now in the Arsenal Library of Paris.[173]

### 3.2.4. TREATISES ON ARMORY OF THE FOURTH AGE, C. 1485 – C. 1520/30

The Third Age was both the golden and the final age in the history of the composition of armorial treatises of the original, primitive form. It was followed by one in which the rate at which treatises were composed in our two kingdoms fell off sharply — from fifteen to six, five in France and one in England — but the level of sophistication of those that were composed rose significantly. The numbers were also augmented by the extension of the practice of composing such treatises to two new kingdoms, which between them contributed seven, five of them original.

(**16**) The first of the three independent **French** treatises of this Age — composed at some time between 1482 and 1492 — was the anonymous work known from an early owner of its sole manuscript (Jehan Guillemet, Lord of L'Argentaye) the ***Traité d'Argentaye*** (or *Argentaye Tract*).[174] The fact that it has been preserved in a single, probably autograph manuscript, suggests that it was little known outside the immediate circles of its author, and its interest is therefore to be found exclusively in the high level of its discourse, derived from the erudition of unknown author. The latter, having dedicated his work to a noble readership, began with an introduction considerably longer than those of previous works of the genre (though including an account of the imagined origin of the heralds), and added to the usual contents of its text, various ideas derived from the encyclopaedic tradition, collections of laws, and the armorial chapter of the *Arbre des batailles*. It also proposed for the first time in the French tradition a set of brisures for cadency — a notion clearly borrowed from the English tradition going back to Trevor's *Tractatus de armis* of 1395 — and a discussion of the armigeral rights of bastards.

(**18**) The second independent French treatise of this Age, dated by Boudreau to the years around 1500, but not given a name,[175] is no less anonymous. This interesting work (which I shall call for convenience the ***Traité d'armorie ecclésiastique***) dealt for the first time with the armigeral

---

[173] On this work, see Józef SZYMEŃSKI, *Herbarz Sredniowiecznego Rycerstwa Polskiego* (Warsaw, 1993), pp. 16-17, and H. POLACZKÓWNA, 'Stemmata Polonica, rekopis nr 111 Kleinotów Długosza w Bibliotece Arsenalu w Paryzu', in *Prace Sekcij historii I kultury Towarzystwa Naukogo we Lwowie*, T. I z. 2 (1927), pp. 161-250.

[174] *Ibid*., p. 79. This original but little-known treatise was ed. by Alan MANNING, *The Argentaye Tract* (Toronto, Buffalo, London, 1983), after the sole manuscript, Paris, B.n.F., ms. fr. 11464, fols. 1-39.

[175] BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 80. The extracts of the text in that book are taken from Paris, B.n.F. ms. fr. 1969, but she has published an edition of it in 'L'héraldique ecclésiastique théorique de Bartolo de Sassoferrato (d. 1355) à Jean Scohier (d. 1607)', *Actes du Xe Colloque international d'héraldique (Rothenburg o. d. T., 1997),* (Munich, 1999), pp. 29-51.

practices of the members of the ecclesiastical Estate, thus breaking new ground in the subject-matter of such treatises. It also presented a theory of the nature of arms that combined the juridical conception of Bartolo with that of the French heralds. It is preserved in seven manuscripts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and is also inserted into a number of copies of the treatise of **Roland Bournel de Boncourt** published c. 1537, giving rise to the speculation that he might have been its author.

(**20**) The third independent treatise — the ***Grand blason d'armoiries et recueil de noblesse*** — did not appear until two decades later, in 1520. Its author was **Jehan le Feron**, an advocate before the Parlement of Paris and historiographer of the king, who seems to have devoted most of his time to genealogical and heraldic research. His massive *Grand blason* is preserved in only five manuscripts of the sixteenth and two of the seventeenth century, suggesting a limited distribution. Each of its seventy-seven chapters, set out in a logical order, discusses either a particular figure or a set of similar figures, beginning with its particular characteristics, and proceeding to the ways in which it or they could and could not be used, and how they were to be described. Although conceived in a relatively traditional way, the treatise represented a significant improvement on its predecessors both in its organisation and its thoroughness, and paved the way for the still more sophisticated works of the Fifth Age.[176]

The Fourth Age also saw the publication in *print* of two composite works on armory, compiled successively by **Pierre le Caron**, but attributed to **Sicily Herald**. (**17**) The first of these, published in 1495 under the title ***Le blason de toutes armes et escutz***, was indeed composed of the treatise by Sicily examined above, augmented by another of his treatises, headed *S'ensuyt la nouvelle maniere de blasoner les couleurs en armorie*. (**19**) The second work, published just after 1500 under the title ***Le blason des couleurs en armes livrees et devises***, included three distinct elements: (a) a much truncated version of Sicily's first treatise, (b) a lengthy discussion of the symbolism of armorial tinctures; and (c) a treatise on the meaning of colours in general, concerned with with *blason* not in its *heraldic* but in its more recent *poetic* sense. Despite this, the book would give rise to numerous later editions and translations, and establish its purported author as the founder of the French armoristic tradition in the minds of most scholars.[177]

/**5**/ The one original **English** work *certainly* published (but only *possibly* written) in this Age is that described by its equally anonymous author as ***The Buk of the Lynage of Coot Armuris*** (*The Book of the Lineage of Coat-Armour*). It is preserved only as part of the composite work on armory called ***The Boke of Cote-Armuris,*** printed in 1486 by the schoolmaster of the town of St. Alban's in the anthology now known as *The Boke of St.*

[176] On Le Feron see BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 81. His treatise has been preserved in different parts in several different manuscripts, the most important of which is a deluxe presentation copy of 1520: Paris, Bib. de l'Arsenal, ms. 5255. The (incomplete) autograph manuscript is B. n. F., ms. n. acq. fr. 2031, and Boudreau has supplemented it from a copy in the same library, ms. fr. 586.

[177] On the two printed works attributed to Sicily, see EADEM, *Traités de blason*, pp. 155-175.

*Alban's*.[178] The other part of the armorial treatise included in the latter was lifted almost entirely from Upton's *De militari officio*, but translated from Latin into Middle English. The incorporated *Buk of the Lynage* — about whose authorship and precise date of composition nothing whatever is known — was innovative in a number of respects, as we shall see, and the fact that it was the first such work to be published in print probably gave it a much larger circulation than its predecessors.

Its printing effectively marked the culmination of the manuscript tradition in England and the beginning of the printed tradition. As I noted earlier in the context of my account of the emergence of printing in England, the next work including a treatise on armory to be printed in England was **Christine de Pisan**'s classic *Livre des fais d'armes et de chevalerie* of 1407, whose chapter on armory and armigery had been based on that in Bovet's *Arbre de Batailles*, which itself was based on Bartolo's *De insigniis et armis*. /F2*Ab*/ Christine's work (stripped of any reference to her authorship) was translated and printed in 1489 by **Caxton** under the title ***The Book of the fayttes of armes and of chyualrye***.[179] Surprisingly, it was destined to be the last work with so much as a chapter dealing with armorial matters published in any form in England (though not in Britain) before 1562.

//F7a// It was in fact followed only a few years later by the only work in our field produced in **Scotland** at any time before 1680.[180] ***The Deidis of Armorie*** is not an original work, however, but rather a translation

---

[178] The *Bokys of Haukyng and Huntyng; and also of coot-armuris*, more commonly known as *The Boke of St. Alban's*, is a typical anthology of the period, including in its original edition of 1486 treatises on hunting and hawking as well as armory, and in the second edition, published by Wynkyn de Worde in London in 1496, an additional treatise on fishing. Wynkyn de Worde attributed the armorial treatise to 'Julyans Berners' (i.e., Dame Juliana BARNES), but it is more likely that she was the author only of the first treatise, and that the others are by three different authors or redactors. The treatise on armory is itself composed of two distinct and originally independent treatises, the first, designated in its *explicit* by the Middle English equivalent of *The Book of the Lineage of Coat Armour*, is known only from this collection; the second, marked by the *incipit Here begynnyth the blasyng of Armys*, corresponds very closely with the second half of book IV of Upton's *Libellus de militari officio*, and is almost certainly a direct translation of it. A third edition of the whole collection was published by G. MARKHAM in 1595, and James DALLAWAY published the armorial treatise both as the fifth part of his *Heraldic Miscellanies* of c. 1785 (pp. 65-112), and in an appendix to his *Inquiries Into the Origin and Science of Heraldry in England* of 1793. A facsimile of the original edition was published in London by Eliot STOCK in 1881, and another in 1901. More recently, David B. APPLETON has published the text given in Dallaway's appendix with a facing rendering into Current English. See DENNYS, *Heraldic Imagination*, p. 217, and E. F. JACOB, *The Book of St. Albans* (Manchester, 1944; repr. from The *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 28.1 [March 1944]).

[179] *The Book of the fayttes of armes and of chyualrye, translated and printed by William Caxton from the French of Christine de Pisan*, ed. A. T. P. BYLES (EETS 189, Oxford, 1932).

[180] The next was Sir George MACKENZIE, *The Science of Herauldry* (Edinburgh, 1780)

into SCOTS ENGLISH of a French treatise now preserved in the College of Arms (M.19, Banyster MS.B) that was primarily based according to its editor on Jehan Courtois' *Traité en forme de questionnaire* (but according to O'Neill, Dennys, and Boudreau, on the two *Banyster Treatises*[181]), and was augmented by its translator with short treatises on the offices of arms and modes of address, and a bestiary. This composite work was either made or copied between 1494 and 1496 by **Adam Loutfut**, Kintyre Pursuivant, at the request of Sir William Cumming, Marchmont Herald. It is now preserved in four manuscripts, all of which are heraldo-nobiliary anthologies of the usual type described above.[182] They include elements of many of the most important texts of interest to heralds existing at the time, including Bartolo's *Tractatus de insigniis et armis*, parts of Trevor's *Tractatus de armis*, Upton's *De militari officio*, and the then recently-published *Boke of Cote-Armoris* and *Book of the fayttes of armes and of chyualrye*, Vegetius' *De re militari*, Llull's *Livre del orde de cavayleria*, and treatises on investiture with nobiliary dignities, different forms of combat, and the like.

In Scotland, therefore, the manuscript anthology would remain the sole context for heraldistic treatises of all kinds until well beyond the end of the Third Period, while in England it would persist only to the end of the Period in a new (if limited) rivalry with the printed monographic book.

The practice of composing treatises on armory finally spread in the Fourth Age to the **Iberian lands** of both Castilian and Catalan speech, beginning in the former. [1] The first CASTILIAN treatise seems to have been the work called the ***Blazón General***, published in 1489 by **Pedro de Graçia Dey**, Principal King of Arms of the 'Catholic Monarchs', King Ferran of Aragon and insular Sicily (r. 1479-1516) and his wife Queen Isabel of Castile and Leon (r. 1474-1504).[183] In any case, the *Blazón General* is the earliest known treatise on armory expressed in the Castilian tongue,[184] and would later serve as the frame text for a comparable work composed by the contemporary Principal King of Arms of Portugal.

[2] It may also have inspired the creation a few years later, in 1496, of the treatise called ***Blasón d'armas***, attributed to **Garci Alonso de Torres**, Aragon King of Arms of Ferran 'the Catholic', which followed and built upon the doctrines of Sicily Herald on the symbolism of colours.[185] Its armorial seems to have included the arms of Aragonese and Neapolitan

---

[181] See above, p. 76, n. 157.

[182] See L. A. J. R. HOWEN (ed.), *The Deidis of Armorie: A Heraldic Treatise and Bestiary* (2 vols., The Scottish Text Society, 1994) After a lengthy introduction to text and manuscripts (pp. vii-cxxi) the text proper is printed on pp. 1-62.

[183] On this work, see Afonso de DORNELAS, *O Livro do Armeiro Mór ou o Livro Grande*, in Archivo do Conselho Nobiliarchico de Portugal, vol. I (1925)

[184] The only list I have found of treatises in Castilian is that published by W. T. COLLINS in 'Spanish Armorials', *The Coat of Arms* 161 (Spring 1993), repub. online on the website of The Heraldry Society. He omits the treatise of Graçia Dey, but includes all of the others that happen to be associated with armorials.

[185] It is preserved in a single manuscript of the sixteenth century, as yet unedited: Barcelona, Biblioteca de Catalunya, ms. 529. On its contents, see Martí de RIQUER, *Heràldica Catalana des de l'any 1150 al 1550* (2 vols., Barcelona, 1983), II, p. 64.

noblemen and the knights of the Burgundian order of the Golden Fleece. [2B] Around 1514/15 Torres revised his work to included Castilian and fabulous arms, and republished it under the title ***Blasón y recogimiento de armas*** ('*The description and recognition of arms*'.[186] [2C] A shortened version of the latter work was published a year or so later under the title ***Blason de armas abreviada***.[187] It is surely not coincidental that these treatises were produced in and after the marriage of Juana 'the Mad', daughter and eventual successor of both Spanish monarchs, to Philippe 'the Handsome' von Habsburg — who since the death of his mother Marie in 1482 had been titular Duke of Burgundy, and from 1494 the de *facto* heir to the Valois dukes in their principalities in the Empire. After his accession as King Consort of Castile in 1504, Philippe's entourage introduced many aspects of 'Burgundian' culture into the united court of Spain, and these persisted after the accession of his son Charles as Carlos I of Castile and Aragon, king jointly with his mother, in 1516.

The known treatises in CATALAN (all associated with armorials) have recently been published by the distinguished Spanish heraldist Martí de Riquer.[188] He notes in his introduction that they were preceded by three treatises on honour, nobility, and knighthood composed between 1471 and 1479: the ***Arbre d'honor*** ('Tree of honour') of **Gabriel Turell**, published in 1471;[189] and the ***Tractat de la noblesa*** and ***Tractat de cavalleria*** of the jurist Bernabé Assam, composed between 1474 and 1479.[190] Only the first of these contained any material related to armory, and it was scattered randomly throughout the work. {1} The first true treatise on armory was associated with an armorial prepared by the tambourinist of Kings Joan II and Ferran 'the Catholic' of Aragon, **Steve Steve** alias **Tamborino**. Both works were completed at some time between 1516 (when Ferran was succeeded as King of Aragon and Castile by his grandson Charles of Burgundy) and 1519 (when the latter succeeded his paternal grandfather as Archduke of Austria and Roman Emperor).[191] Tamborino's ***Tractat del blasó*** is preserved as one of a set of such texts in the manuscript called the *Armorial de Steve Tamborino*, completed around 1550.[192] {2} Another treatise of about the same date is the anonymous ***Tractat d'heràldica llatino-català*** included in the manuscript called the *Armorial de Salamanca*.[193]

Here I shall merely observe that — as the use of the imported terms *blasón* and *blasó* suggest — the six Iberian treatises of the Fourth Age that

---

[186] It is preserved in a single unedited copy of the sixteenth century by Pedro Morena: Madrid, Real Academia de Historia, ms. 9/268, Colección Salazar, C. 45.

[187] It is preserved in a single manuscript of the sixteenth century, as yet unedited: Paris, B. n. F., ms. esp. 247.

[188] RIQUER, *Heràldica Catalana,* II, pp. 575-623

[189] Preserved in Barcelona, Biblioteca de Catalunya, ms. 302; it was unedited in 1983, but an edition had been promised by Joan AINAUD.

[190] See RIQUER, *Heràldica Catalana,* II, p. 64. On Assam, see J. LLADONOSA, *Història de Lleida*, II (Tàrrega, 1974), p. 135. The texts are preserved in Barcelona, Biblioteca de Catalunya, mss. 509 and 46.

[191] This was published by Riquer in op. cit., Appendix I.

[192] Tolouse, Bibl. Mun., ms. 798, fols. 1-2, published by RIQUER in *ibid*., pp. 606-609

[193] Salamanca, Bibl. de la Universitat, ms. 2490, fols. 6r-11v.

have been preserved (two of them revisions of the second) drew heavily both from the *blazonic language* and from the *general approach* to armory of their French predecessors, and did little more than reproduce their taxonomic lexicon in appropriately naturalised forms.

\2\ I must finally mention here the second work on armory to be composed by an **Italian**, albeit in this case one of Aragonese ancestry. The Italian in question was **Federico de Trastámara-Aragón-Sicilia**, younger son of King Alfonso II of peninsular Sicily or Naples, who would succeed his elder brother Ferrante II on the much-disputed throne of that kingdom on his death in 1496, and would rule there as Federico II until he was forced to surrender it in 1501 to his Valois rival, King Louis XII of France — the designated heir since 1380 of the last Angevin king and long-time claimant René 'the Good' — who had just invaded them at the head of an army. Like the French treatise associated with the *Jouvencel*, Federico's treatise, completed shortly before his accession in c. 1495, was almost entirely pictorial in form, so Boudreau named it the ***Traité en figures des manières d'armoiries*** or '*Treatise in figures of the manners of armories*'.[194] The work survives in only a single late fifteenth-century manuscript, along with a copy of the seventeenth century. Only its introduction on the metals and furs (included in Boudreau's book under those headings) is of any interest to us here, and even its interest is minimal.[195]

### 3.2.5. TREATISES ON ARMORY OF THE FIFTH AGE, C. 1520/30 – C. 1560

In **France**, unlike England, the primitive tradition of armorial erudition, which as we have just seen seems to have petered out in 1492, was revived in the third decade of the sixteenth century by the first of a series of authors whose level of erudition, breadth of interest, and didactic ambitions were considerably greater than those of their predecessors. In consequence, the years between 1530 and 1560 saw the production of three new *traités de blason*, all of considerable length and growing sophistication.

(**20**) The first of the works of this Age was the ***Recuoeul en maniere de blazon d'armes***, composed before his death in 1537 by the prolific genealogist **Roland Bournel de Boncourt**, Captain of Auxy (a contemporary of Jehan le Feron) and preserved in four manuscripts of the sixteenth century and five of the seventeenth.[196] It represented a significant advance over all of its predecessors, not only in omitting any reference to the imagined symbolism of tinctures and charges, but in its presentation of

---

[194] BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 80

[195] Respectively Madrid, Bib. Nac., ms. 1467; and Paris, Bib. Ste Geneviève, ms. Réserve 524, fol. I

[196] *Ibid*., p. 82. Boncourt's treatise, aimed at nobles, was better organised than any of its predecessors, and replaced the traditional symbolic approach with a geometrical one that permitted the first clear discussion of geometrical partitions. The autograph manuscript is preserved in Brussels, Bib. roy. Albert Ier, ms. Goethals 555. It has not been edited, but a discussion of it and its successor was published by Boudreau in 'Les traités de blason de Roland Bournel et de Jacques Le Boucq', *Revue française d'héraldique et de sigillographie* 66 (1996), pp. 9-23.

the partitions and the placement of the charges, classifying the former on the basis of the direction (vertical, horizontal, diagonal) or combination of their defining lines. Its influence on the armoristic tradition in France was to be both profound and immediate.

(**21**) Indeed, the next French treatise produced in this Age, ***Le noble blason des armes***, was essentially a slightly improved version of the treatise of Bournel de Boncourt, made in stages between 1543 and 1572 by **Jacques le Boucq**, Lieutenant of the Order of the Golden Fleece under King Felipe II, and author of many other books. Among its additions was the second discussion of the armigeral rights of bastards. It has been preserved in five manuscripts of the sixteenth century and two of the seventeenth, and no doubt contributed to the propagation of Boncourt's doctrines.[197]

(**22**) By contrast, the coeval treatise ***Le blason des armes***, completed in 1557 by **Corneille Gaillard**, King of Arms of Felipe's father the Emperor Karl V (and yet another prolific author of books on heraldic and genealogical subjects), was essentially an amplification of the much older *Traité en douze chapîtres* of c. 1440, despite its novel claim to be aimed at various artisans with an interest in the subject in addition to the traditional gentlemen. It has been preserved only in a single contemporary manuscript, and seems to have had little resonance in the later tradition.[198]

(**23**) One last treatise was completed in manuscript at the very end of the Third Period: the ***Recoeuil et traicté du blason des armes*** completed in 1562 by the canon and protonotary apostolic **Jean Scohier,** who was also the author of a number of important genealogical works. It was long preserved only in the autograph manuscript, however, and was finally published in print in 1597 under the title ***L'Estat et Comportement des Armes***.[199] It will therefore be more useful to examine it in the next major Part of this essay, devoted to the works of the Fourth Period.

(24) Two other French treatises were published after 1562 in manuscript alone. One of these was the ***Livre blasonné de toutes sortes de couleurs d'armoiries*** of the part-time herald **Liphard Canlou**, which is preserved only in the autograph manuscript, completed on 1 September 1566. As it included almost no text, and consisted of little more than a series of arms both painted and blazoned, arranged in the manner of an ordinary, it is of no real interest to me.[200] (25) The last treatise is the one Boudreau called the ***Dissertation brouillone*** or 'Disordered Dissertation'; its authorship and precise date of completion are both unknown, and it is in any case of only slightly greater value to my project than Canlou's.[201]

Given the small number of surviving copies, it is unlikely that most of these works were much read outside the circles of their authors before 1560. The same Age, however, saw the publication in print of two much

197 BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, p. 83.
198 *Ibid*., p. 84. It is preserved in Lille, Bib. Mun., ms. 425, ms. 1r-26v.
199 *Ibid*., p. 86. It is preserved in The Hague, Mus. Mermanno-Westreenianum, ms. 10 C 27, fols. 1r-122r.
200 *Ibid*., p. 85. It is preserved in Paris, Bib. de l'Arsenal, ms. 50-26, fols. 1r-17r.
201 BOUDREAU, *Traités de blason*, pp. 258-62.

more comprehensive works of *heraldistic* erudition, in each of which the types of material on different aspects of nobiliary culture that had been included in the numerous short treatises of the manuscript tradition were finally combined in a single work by a single author.

*(1)* The first of these works to appear was the ***Catalogus Gloriae Mundi, laudes, honores, excellentias et preeminentias omne fere statum*** (‘*The Catalogue of the Glory of the World: The praises, honours, excellences, and pre-eminences of almost every status*’), written by the Lyonnais judge **Barthélemy de Chasseneu** (b. 1480). First published in Lyon in 1529 and again in 1546, it was later published in Venice in 1571 and in Frankfurt in 1603. As this suggests, it was extremely influential, and served as the basis for works in several other languages. It was the first work to deal systematically with virtually every aspect of the armorial practice not only of France but of Latin Christendom in general. [202]

*(2)* The later of the two comprehensive works published in print was ***Le Fondement et origine des tiltrez de noblesse*** … (‘*The Foundation and Origin of the Titles of Nobility* …’) by the Lyonnais physician and herald **Symphorien Champier**, published in Paris in 1535.[203] It had a much narrower theme, overlapping with that of Chasseneu, but was of a comparable level of erudition, and broke some new ground. Champier had earlier published (in 1525) one of the two biographies (the other published by Jacques de Mailles in 1527) devoted to the life of France’s last heroic knight: ***Les gestes, ensemble la vie du preulx chevalier Bayard***.

In addition to these general treatises, two more specialised works of heraldistic erudition were printed in France in the last decade of our Period. Both of these were composed by the author of the last treatise on armory of the Fourth Age, the Parisian advocate **Jehan le Feron**, and both of them were published in 1555.[204] One of the two, *(3)* ***Le Simbol Armorial des Armoiries de France et d’Escoce et de Lorraine***, was concerned with the significance in both symbolic and emblematic terms of the newly-quartered arms of Mary Queen of Scots and her husband the Dauphin François; it is notable both as the first French armorial treatise to be published in print, and as the work in which the adjective *armorial* was first introduced into

---

[202] Barthélémy DE CHASSENEU (alias CHASSANÉE and CHASSANEUZ, v. 1480-1541?), a jurisconsult and magistrate, was the Premier Président of the Parlement of Provence in 1532. I transcribed parts of this book from BnF RES – 363.

[203] Symphorien CHAMPIER, v. 1472? – 1539?, was a Lyonnais physician and antiquary who was said by the later treatise-writer SCOHIER to have been a herald of François I. He wrote numerous other works on related topics. The subtitle of this work was … *et excellens estatz de tous nobles et illustres, quant a le difference des empires, royaulmes, duchez, contez et aultres seigneuries … Petit dialogue de nobles auquel est déclaré que c’est de noblesse et les inventeurs d’icelle*. I copied most of this book from a microfilm in the Bibliothèque nationale de France in 2007.

[204] They are now preserved in the Bibliothèque National de France, where I examined them, as independently foliated parts of a miscellany that contained works by several other authors, including an account of the funeral of King Henri II in 1559 by François DE SIGNAC, King of Arms of the Dauphiné. The two works of LE FERON in question were foliated 1-41 and 1-48.

the heraldistic lexicon.[205] The second of Le Feron's late works, *(4)* ***De la primitive institutions des Roys, Heravldz, & Poursuivans d'armes***, was the first independent work on the history of the heraldic profession and office, and no doubt contributed significantly to the later impression that armorial emblems had been invented by the heralds, and could therefore be described as essentially *héraldique* as well as *armorial*.

Nothing like these French works was produced in England before 1562, so it has to be said that in the first two thirds of so of the sixteenth century, both the level of erudition and the rate of publication among the heraldists of France were far ahead of those of their English colleagues.

New treatises on armory were also composed in the Fifth Age in the two surviving domains of the Iberian peninsula. |***1***| In **Portugal** what seems to have been the first treatise on the subject (and the only one to be composed in our Period) appeared at some time after 1532 as a chapter of a more comprehensive work, compiled by **Antonio Rodrigues**, who had served as Portugal Principal King of Arms under King Manuel I (r. 1495-1521). Formally entitled ***O Tratado Geral de Nobreza*** ('*The General Treatise on Nobility*'), but more commonly known as the ***O Livro de Armeiro Mór*** ('*The Greater Book of Armory*'), the work incorporated chapters on a variety of related themes into a translation of the Castilian treatise on nobility and knighthood by Graçia Dey noted above: the *Blazón General* of 1489.[206]

In the united kingdom of **Spain** — and more particularly in the Domain of the Crown of Aragon, where Catalan was the official vernacular — one of the series of treatises examined and published by Riquer was clearly published in this Age, as it was based on the armorial chapter in Chasseneu's *Catalogus Gloriae Mundi* of 1546. {**3**} The work in question (dated by Riquer to some time between 1530 and 1545) was called in its manuscript ***Lo Art y Modo del Blasó*** ('*The Art and Manner of Blazonry*'), and attributed to one **Bernat Llupia**, who is otherwise unknown.[207] It was followed by the two remaining treatises composed in Spain before 1600, both of them by the same man, and both preserved once again in the manuscript called the *Armorial de Steve Tamborino*, and associated with armorials of the same names. Riquer named them after their author and their order of composition {**4**} the ***Tractat de Bernat Mestre I***[208] and {**5**} the ***Tractat de Bernat Mestre II***, and dated them to 1544 and 1544-56 respectively.[209] Mestre was a priest rather than a herald, and held the office of *domer* of the church of Sant Pere de Puelles in Barcelona, so he may be placed among the ranks of the learned clerics of middling rank who had played such an important rôle in the composition of armorial treatises in

---

[205] *Ibid*., p. 84.

[206] The *Tratado* is preserved in a single manuscript, Porto, Biblioteca Pública Municipal, Ms. 80 (no. 275 in the Catalogue of 1900). It was edited by Afonso de DORNELAS, *Tratado Geral de Nobreza por Antonio Rodriges Principal Rei de Armas 'Portugal' de D. Manuel I* (Porto, 1931), and studied by him in *O Livro do Armeiro Mór ou o Livro Grande*, in *Archivo do Conselho Nobiliarchico de Portugal*, vol. I (1925)

[207] Republished in RIQUER, *Heràldica Catalana des de l'any 1150 al 1550*, pp. 616-623.

[208] Published in *ibid*. pp. 610-12

[209] Published in *ibid*. pp. 613-615

the First through Third of our Ages.

These works brought the total number of such treatises produced in the Iberian peninsula before 1560 to ten, all composed between 1489 and 1556. Of these, four were in Castilian, five in Catalan, and one in Portuguese. Only three or four of these were more or less original works.

In **Germany**, by contrast, the second original work found by Gustav Seyler to deal extensively with armorial matters after Rothe's *Ritterspiegel* of 1404/14 would not be published until 1591: the *Adels Spiegel* (or '*Mirror of Nobility*') of the theologian Cyriacus Spangenberg (v. 1528-1604).[210] Not surprisingly, I have found no reference to a treatise of this sort composed before 1591 in any of the other lands of Germanic speech.

### 3.2.5. THE AUTHORS OF THE TREATISES AND THEIR READERSHIPS

In concluding this rapid survey of the history of treatises on armory composed in the twenty-two decades between 1340 and 1560, it will be useful to reflect briefly on some of the more salient characteristics of these works for the historian of armorial taxonomy and its verbal expression.

I shall begin with a consideration of the **professions of their authors**, to the extent that they are known. With the exception of those treatises concerned with their own profession and the rights and duties of its members, relatively few of the works on heraldica generally were *certainly* composed by heralds, and only one of those written before 1400 is even possibly the work of a herald: the very first work in the whole tradition, *De heraudie*. In fact, the principal works *certainly* composed by heralds between 1330 and 1400 continued to be armorials, both painted and blazoned, but containing no more than a few sentences of continuous prose. Some of these — like the *Armorial de Gelre* compiled by Claes Heinen between about 1370 and 1395, and the *Armorial de Bellenville* compiled by an unidentified herald a decade or so later — are impressive works of their kind, but such works required little more than a basic level of literacy to compose, and there is little to suggest that more than a handful of heralds (like Chandos Herald, who composed the life of his former master the Black Prince in 1385) rose above this basic level before the 1430s, at the earliest: our Third Age.

No doubt for this reason, most of the earliest original treatises on heraldica, including those on armory, were composed (like the earliest armorials) by amateur armorists, who either certainly or probably belonged to one of the two learned professions most likely to give rise to an interest in such matters — the legal and clerical — and who were well-enough educated to compose their works in Latin. As we have seen, the author of the second treatise, Bartolo da Sassoferrato, was an eminent Italian jurist and professor of law; the probable author of the third treatise, Siôn Trevor, was a Welsh Bishop; and the author of the second work, François des Fosses was probably a French cleric of a status comparable to that of his contemporaries: Canon Honoré Bovet, author of the *Arbre des*

[210] Summarised in SEYLER, *Geschichte der Heraldik*, II, pp. 569-73

*Batailles*, and Canon Johannes Rothe, author of the *Ritterspiegel*. The author of the third of the treatises in this Period produced in England, Nicolas Upton, was both a lawyer and the Canon-Precentor of Salisbury Cathedral, while that of the sole Polish treatise, Jan Długosz, was at the time a Canon (of the cathedral of Kraków), as was the author of the last work to treat heraldic questions in Germany, known to us as *Petrus de Andlo*.

In **England**, the dominance of amateur armorists in the field would continue throughout the Third Period, though after 1450 the canons would give way entirely to the lawyers. Indeed, all of the later English authors whose identities can be established would be either practising *lawyers* — the most important of them, John (Dade ?), probably a lecturer in the law schools of London — or sometime *students* of the law, like Sir Richard Strangways. In consequence, all treatises composed in England before 1445/50 were expressed in learned Latin, and only those written after that date (most of them at least *inspired* by *John's Treatise*) were expressed in one dialect or another of the vulgar tongue.

It is more surprising that not a single herald can be identified as the author of a treatise on armory composed in England or Wales before 1610 (when John Guillim, then Portsmouth Pursuivant Extraordinary, published his famous treatise *A Display of Heraldrie*), and that the only Scottish herald to contribute to the tradition was Adam Loutfut, who at best did no more than translate into Scots English some of the earlier French works in his *Deidis of armorie* of 1494. No doubt for that reason all treatises written in Britain seem to have been aimed primarily at an audience of non-heralds — including lords and lesser gentlemen as well as clerics and lawyers — who for various reasons wanted to have a basic understanding of the origins, components, and construction of arms, how they should be described in technical language, and what they were currently believed to mean in symbolic terms.

How the British authors themselves acquired their knowledge of these matters is another question, and one impossible to answer with certainty. Nonetheless, as most of the material included in their works had previously been preserved in an oral tradition best known to the heralds (of whose *misterie* it formed an important part), it is very likely that the earlier authors, at least, consulted one or more heralds before setting their quills to parchment. The later authors could then build upon the works of their predecessors — and most of the treatises composed in England between 1450 and 1560 clearly relied very heavily on earlier works.

In **France**, by contrast, heralds — primarily but not exclusively kings of arms in the service of the Dukes of Burgundy and Anjou — played a much more important rôle in the field of armorial erudition, beginning with the anonymous authors of the *Livres des armes et heraulx* of the 1390s. And both because few heralds could even *read* Latin, let alone write it, and because the blazonic terms that were central to the early treatise tradition had always been expressed in French, all of the strictly armoristic works in the French branch of that tradition were expressed in the vulgar tongue from its very inception in the 1390s. In addition to the anonymous founders, the author of the *Banyster Tracts* might also have been a herald,

as might the author of the *Blason d'armes en douze chapîtres*, though before 1450 the only treatises that can be associated with the name of a particular herald are the *Traité de fourures* attributed to Anjou or Calabria Herald Jehan Villart, and the *Traité en forme de questionnaire* attributed to Jehan Courtois, successively Enghien, Jerusalem, and Sicily Herald.

After 1450, however, the number and proportion of the new treatises that were composed by amateur armorists rather than heralds probably increased steadily in France, though the anonymity of most of the authors makes it impossible to know this for certain before 1520. Five of the nine treatises written in the second half of the Third Age (the three by Hungary King of Arms, the *Avis*, the *Concertation*), were certainly either written either *by* or (in the fifth case) *in consultation with* heralds. In our Fourth and Fifth Ages, however, the proportion of treatises on armory composed in France by non-heralds clearly surpassed that composed by heralds, rising to two out of two in the Fourth, and four of five in the Fifth, for a total of six out of seven.

In contrast to those of the English authors of our Period, we know nothing at all about the professions of most of the non-heraldic authors in France before 1520, but are well informed about those of the Fifth Age. Of the four authors of general treatises on armory, we know that one was a gentleman of middling rank holding a military post, one a senior lawyer and royal historiographer, one a royal officer of humbler birth, and one a cleric of the same middling rank as Bovet and Upton. The two authors of the comprehensive works noted above were respectively a distinguished physician who also held an heraldic post (presumably on what would now be called in England and 'extraordinary' basis), and an equally distinguished lawyer who rose to be chief judge of the Parlement of Provence. All six men seem to have been quite learned by the standards of their day, and it is not insignificant that five out of the six were laymen. All six of them may also be regarded as members of the emerging antiquarian community that was to dominate heraldic and most related forms of study between 1560 and 1870, when works in the field were almost all composed for publication in print.

Outside of both France and England the heralds seem to have contributed nothing to this field of erudition before the Fourth Age, and nothing in the Third Period as a whole in **Italy** (where the authors were a judge and a prince), **Germany** (where the authors were mainly priests), and **Poland** (where the sole author was a priest). In fact, it was only in the Iberian kingdoms that heralds played a significant rôle in this area after 1480 — and all of the treatises of that region were produced in or after 1489. In **Castile**, all four of the known treatises of the Period were composed by royal kings of arms, at dates between 1489 and 1516, and the same can be said of the one treatise composed in **Portugal**, after 1532. In **Aragon**, by contrast, the first treatise (completed around 1516), was composed by the royal tambourinist, and the second (of the same date) is anonymous, while two of the three later three, completed between 1544 and 1550, were the work of a priest, and the other was composed by a man whose occupation is unknown. Only two of the five, therefore, might have

been written by members of the heraldic profession.

From the professions of their authors I shall turn to the identities of the **intended readerships** of the treatises published in manuscript. Before 1444 the French treatises — composed perhaps exclusively by heralds — seem to have been aimed primarily either at **apprentice heralds** or at **learned clerics** and the better educated members of the **lay nobility**, who often took an interest in the same elements of nobiliary culture as the heralds.

From 1444 onwards, however, French treatises on armory — like those produced in England from the beginning — were all aimed at a much broader readership, many of whose members, for very different reasons, felt a practical need for a basic understanding of the nature and conventions of armory. The new readership — which was to change little before the nineteenth century — included (1) minor **gentlemen** pursuing both lay and clerical careers in close association with greater noblemen, and consequently feeling a need to understand their emblematic system; (2) **students of law** and established **lawyers** of relatively humble origins, interested in the constantly developing 'Law of Arms' (an expression attested in English only from 1500);[211] and finally (3) apprentice, journeyman, and master **painters**, **stainers**, **engravers**, **goldsmiths**, and other artists and craftsmen, who felt a need to understand the rudiments of a code they might be called upon to interpret through their particular art. This is most explicitly stated in the introduction of the last French treatise to be published in our Period: Corneille Gaillard's *Le blason des armes* of 1557. Therein he declared that his book was aimed not only at *gentils hommes*, but at those he describes as

> '… gens artyficieulx comme orfevres, painctres, brodeurs, tappiciers, imprimeurs, tailleurs de pierres et du boys, verroyers …' ('… *artificers like jewellers, painters, embroiderers, tapestry-makers, printers, carvers of stones and of wood, glass-makers* …')[212]

Few if any of the members of these sets of potential readers had either a need or a desire for a truly scientific understanding of the armorial code, let alone of its history, and it is likely that they found the treatises produced in our period were entirely sufficient for their very limited purposes.

### 3.2.6. THE NATURE OF THE TREATISES AND THEIR SHORTCOMINGS

It is worth reiterating here that, down to 1486, all of the treatises on armory produced in both kingdoms were 'published' exclusively in manuscripts, and that that only two exceptions to this rule are known before 1562. Again with a few exceptions, the manuscripts in question were of the composite type called 'miscellanies' or 'anthologies', in which the treatises on armory were associated with a variety of texts, all or most of which dealt with

[211] In the *OED* 2 (VIII, p. 714), the earliest citation of the English phrase *Law of armes* is in a poem of c. 1500, and the two others in our Period are in PALSGRAVE, *Lesclarissement* of 1530, and *Hall's Vnion: Henry VIII* of 1548.
[212] Quoted in BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, I, p. 84

broadly heraldic topics. These manuscript books thus constituted what amounted to general handbooks on heraldry, though no two of them were precisely the same, and they varied enormously in the number and length of their constituent texts. It is therefore important to distinguish throughout this Period between the *treatises* on a single topic (themselves sometimes composite works created through the more or less seamless fusion of all or part of two or more originally distinct works, like the *Livre des armes et des heraulx* and the treatise on armory in the *Boke of St. Alban's*) and *collections* of works on quite different subjects.

It is also important to emphasise that the treatises assembled in these manuscripts were essentially elementary *textbooks* on their various subjects, aimed at readers who knew little of nothing of their subject, and wanted little more than a basic understanding of it. Not surprisingly, therefore, before 1520 treatises on armory were all quite brief by modern standards: between about 1500 and about 15,000 words.[213] This length is comparable to that of such modern primers as the one published by the RHSC,[214] and obviously left little room for the sort of historical, theoretical, or comparative discussion that requires the types of taxonomic terms with which we are concerned in this essay — even if their authors had been capable of engaging in such discussions, which most of them were not. Furthermore, none of the treatises was based on anything that could be referred to as 'research' in historical sources other than the occasional armorial, and their 'historical' passages — intended to explain the origins of arms, armigery, and heraldry — were based entirely on speculation grounded in the contemporary understanding of political and social history, which was itself both factually challenged and ideologically distorted.

In practice these treatises — like many of their modern successors — were largely devoted to defining and naming the various tinctures and figural motifs that could be included in emblematic arms, especially crosses and 'beasts' or animals of all sorts, but including a handful of plants, natural phenomena, and geometrical charges. These were arranged in groups that were only gradually organised into distinct chapters and given collective names and numbers. Most of the treatises also devoted an inordinate amount of space to the imagined symbolic value of both tinctures and motifs, especially beasts. This, as we have seen, was an idea introduced by Bartolo in his *De insigniis et armis*, but was picked up and further elaborated by many of his successors to the very end of the Third Period around 1560. The idea that the elements of armal design were always (rather than only occasionally) symbolic was ultimately derived in part from the moralising tradition of the bestiary (which assigned a moral

[213] The number of words in some of the major treatises were as follows: *De Insigniis et Armis*, c. 3,000 words; *Tractatus de Armis* c. 10,000 words; *John's Treatise* c. 1600 words; *Argentaye Tract*, c. 14,000 words.

[214] Kevin GREAVES, FRHSC, *A Canadian Heraldic Primer* (Toronto, 2000). The text of that little book is about 9000 words long. This Subdivision of my essay is over six times as long: the sort of length required for detailed analysis and discussion.

and religious meaning to all known species of animal[215]), and in part from the Aristotelian doctrine of the relative 'nobility' of the primary colours.[216] Comparable ideas had long been part of the parallel traditions of the lapidary, astrology, and alchemy, many of which had themselves been influenced by the pre-Christian hermetic tradition — whose impact on learned ideas had been growing steadily since the publication by Alain de Lille before 1171 of his treatise *De planctu naturae*.[217]

In the context of the early treatises on armory, the assignment of meanings to tinctures and charges served in part to increase the significance of arms as esoteric signs; in part to insert them into the currently fashionable doctrine of the divinely-ordained set of symbolic relationships among all significant phenomena (including planets, gems, colours, and days of the week); and in part to allow individual armigers and lineages to boast of the glorious implications of the elements of their arms.

This last idea in its turn came to support another pair of doctrines quite alien to the teaching of Bartolo (who declared that anyone could assume arms as long as their design did not infringe on the rights of others in the same country), but promoted by most of the treatises composed after 1400. These doctrines maintained (1) that arms were as much *insignia* of noble ancestry as they were *emblems* of particular identity; and (2) that the *original* (and most *honourable*) arms had been created — along with the professions of both the knights who were to bear them, and the heralds who were to identify them — by one of the most honoured monarchs of the Ancient World: Priam of Troy, Alexander of Macedon, or Julius Caesar of Rome. As we have seen, all three of the latter had long been the central figures not only of pseudo- and quasi-historical works, but of whole cycles of romances in which their courts were assimilated — like that of their pseudo-historical successor Arthur of Britain — to those of the most knightly kings contemporary with the author.

Such doctrines on origins were first expressed in the compendium of treatises Claire Boudreau has called the *Livres des armes et des héraulx*, and were reiterated with numerous variations in length and detail in the introductory sections of many later treatises. The second of the doctrines was itself extrapolated from an older but equally fictive doctrine on the

---

[215] On the bestiary and the symbolic values attributed to beasts, see *The Bestiary: A Book of Beasts*, ed. and trans. by T. H. WHITE (New York, 1954); Ron BAXTER, *Bestiaries and their Users in the Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1998); and Michel PASTOUREAU, *Une histoire symbolique du Moyen Âge occidental* (Paris, 2004).

[216] See 'colours' in Jean CHEVALIER et Alain GHEERBRANT, *The Penguin Dictionary of Symbols* (London, 1996, trans. of the second French edition, Paris, 1982), p. 216.

[217] In that work Alain established a symbolic correspondence among the seven 'planets' (the Sun, the Moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn), seven 'metals' (gold, silver, mercury, tin, iron, copper, and lead), and seven gems (ruby, pearl, jacinthe, sapphire, amethyst, agate, and diamond). See 'Alain de Lille', in *Dictionnaire de lettres françaises: Le Moyen Age*, 2 ed. rev. by par Geneviève HASENOHR et Michel ZINK (Paris, 1992), pp. 32-35.

origins of knighthood.[218] Together they proclaimed above all else the noble antiquity both of the heraldic *profession* itself and of the *arms* whose design, description, and interpretation were central to it.

Nevertheless, except in complicating the language of blazon itself by adding planetary and lapidary synonyms to the established names for the tinctures when describing arms of particular importance, these doctrines contributed nothing whatever to the lexicon of armory. They also placed so great an emphasis on the *arms* that authors of our Period ignored almost completely the many other species of the armorial family — and *a fortiori*, of the para-armorial family — which had already been institutionalised when the second set of treatises was composed in the 1390s. In consequence, to discover the words related to all of these signs — extremely important throughout our current Period, despite the attitude of the treatise-writers — we have again to rely exclusively on other types of text, of which the most important was now the legal instrument by which arms and other armories were granted by kings and princes to their subjects.

### 3.2.7. TAXONOMIC TERMS INTRODUCED IN THE MANUSCRIPT TREATISES

What, then, did the primitive treatises contribute to the development of armoristic erudition that can be regarded as positive, especially in the area of taxonomic concepts and terms? Clair Boudreau addressed this question in a thorough and sophisticated manner in the introduction to her *Dictionnaire encyclopédique*, but limited herself to the French tradition, and concentrated on the distinctive doctrines expressed in the treatises, and the terms related to the blazon of arms.[219] I shall examine both the French and the English traditions much more briefly, but in the broader context of heraldic didacticism in Latin Christendom, and from a rather different perspective: that of the history of armoristic taxonomy.

I shall begin by conceding that the many treatises under review introduced the consideration of matters other than the simple description of arms and the imagined symbolism of their elements, and in the chapters or equivalent divisions that dealt with these matters their authors inevitably introduced both *concepts* and *terms* not found in any earlier work. Bartolo, as a judge and professor of law, was especially concerned with questions of armigery, and the first thirteen of the thirty-three chapters of his *De insigniis* were devoted to questions related both to different types of arms classified by the nature of the armiger they represented (a dignity, generic or unique, an office, society, lineage, or

---

[218] This was introduced in the anonymous *Lancelot do Lac* of 1215/20, the first of the so-called 'Vulgate Cycle' of Old French Arthurian romances, which were composed in prose rather than poetry, and were much longer than any of the poetic works on which they were based. The foundational form of the doctrine was placed in the mouth of the Lady of the Lake in a famous 'Discourse' addressed to her protégé Lancelot. Strikingly, the story was repeated in a legal treatise composed later in the century: *The Coutumes de Beauvaisis of Philippe de Beamanoir*, trans. F. R. P. AKEHURST (Philadelphia, 1992), § 1453, pp. 518-19.

[219] BOUDREAU, *Héritage symbolique*, I, pp. 1-68.

person) and then by the manner of their acquisition (by concession or assumption) — and to the rules governing who might use arms of each type or of a particular design, and how they might licitly be transmitted to descendants, legitimate or illegitimate. The ideas of classifying arms in these ways, and of setting out rules governing their use was to be transmitted to many later treatises, but Bartolo's precise classes, the terms he used to designate them, and the rules he proposed, were not transmitted in a consistent manner — in part no doubt because they were designed for the Holy Roman Empire in the mid-fourteenth century, and did not actually represent the practices of other kingdoms (especially England) in later centuries. In any case, no consistent taxonomy or taxonomic terminology was established in this area before 1562.

The next two authors, François des Fosses (assuming that he really existed) and Siôn Trevor, were also concerned with the more important aspects of the contemporary armorial code, and the latter, at least, dealt for the first time with the question of differencing for cadency: a practice ignored by Bartolo because it was rarely followed in either the Italian or German lands of the Empire. One or the other of the two later authors introduced the Latin original of the classificatory term 'difference' (*differentia*) to represent a practice that dated from the late twelfth century, but had never previously been given a name or described in a systematic way.[220]

Trevor (who used the Latin word ***signum*** 'sign' for arms) dealt with the subject in the context of his discussions of particular forms of *charge* or *partition*, as the latter constituted the organising principle of his work.[221] He first mentioned the ***signum capitale***, or what would soon be called the ***armes plaines*** or 'plain arms' of the chief, immediately following a series of chapters on divided fields (quarterly, paly, barry, bendy). He followed this with a discussion of what are now called the *augmentation* and *diminution* of inherited arms, and then, under the heading *De Labellis*, he presented his discussion of differencing for *cadency*. Trevor first declared that labels (*labellae*) are always 'differences of signs' (***differentiae signorum***) — the first attestation of the term 'difference' in this context in any language. It is possible that the Latin word *differentia* represented the established vernacular word *difference* (identical at this period in French and English), but if not, it must have given rise to the use of that word in both languages.

Upton, the next author to deal with the subject of differencing (albeit half a century later) used the same Latin lexicon as Trevor (from whom he lifted most of his chapter), and it was only in *John's Treatise* of 1445/50 that the English word appeared. Unlike his predecessors, John

[220] On the approaches of the authors of these treatises to the question of differencing for cadency, see BOULTON, 'Brisures of Cadency'.

[221] The fourteenth- and fifteenth-century writers all used a rather primitive form of organisation, and in no case set aside clearly marked chapters to deal with such subjects as differencing and marshalling. Typically they mentioned the former subject when they arrived at their discussion of the charges commonly used for differencing, with the label most commonly set first.

discussed differencing in the second section or chapter of his work, immediately after explaining the origins of arms at Troy — or in other words before anything else. He declared that a man's sons should bear the same arms as their father with '*divers* ***differences***' (or '***defferings***'): the eldest with a *label*, the second son with a *crescent*, and so on. The details of the system he proposed (ultimately adopted by the heralds) do not concern us here; what is significant is that the same *term* was used in all of the derivative works in English over the next century.

The only English treatise to introduce additional terms in this area was the anonymous ***Buk of the Lynage of Coot Armuris***. Its author was fond of sorting his subject matter into sets of nine (after the nine orders of angels) or some similar number, so the work includes numerous rather arbitrary taxonomies established on that principle. Immediately after discussing the nine different kinds of gentlemen, he turned to the nine 'divisions of coat armour', five of which he classified as **perfect** (the 'terminal', 'collateral', 'abstract', 'fixal', and 'bastard') and four of which he classified as **imperfect** (which he did not name but which I shall call on the basis of his definitions 'dominional', 'conferred', 'conquered', and 'extinct'). Arms in the first five of these nine divisions were subject to the addition of differences of different types classified on the basis of the relationship of their bearers to the founder of their lineage: (1) the **terminal**, or brothers of the 'right heir' (i.e., the heir apparent of the first chief), were to bear differences in the form of ***bordures***; (2) the **collateral**, or sons of the brothers of the 'right heir', were to add to their father's arms different *gemels*, or paired barrulets; and (3) the **fixal**, or descendants in the third degree from the 'right heir', were to add to their father's arms a *mullet*.

Later he proposed a quite different system, based on the *status* of the armigers. After a discussion of the differences that should be used by bastards, the author went on to discuss who might grant arms (a subject first introduced by Bartolo), and then to discuss the forms of what he called the **six differences**: two for the **excellent** (by which he seems to have intended the peers or lords of Parliament) and four for the **noble** (by which he seems to have intended the knights, esquires, and gentlemen). These, and the many other taxonomic terms he introduced into his treatise, show that it was at least possible for contemporary armorists to engage in systematic taxonomy. Perhaps because his delight in taxonomy was both excessive and often misguided, however, neither his *system* nor his *terms* seems to have recommended itself to his contemporaries or successors, and neither had any issue in the later tradition.

The authors of the FRENCH tradition did not address questions of differencing until later in the fifteenth century, in our Fourth Age, and only three of them did so before the end of the Period as a whole: Le Febvre de Saint-Remy c. 1475, the anonymous author of the *Argentaye Tract* c. 1482/92, and Scohier in 1562. All three employed the noun *difference* (which appeared for the first time in the first of these works), but only the second introduced a new term — the word ***jouveigneur***, equivalent to the later *cadet* — and it did not catch on with later writers.

Differencing, however, was actually the only systematic practice whose conventions were discussed in the treatises of this Period. Most say

nothing whatever about the even more complex practice of marshalling arms for various purposes — widely practiced by 1390 and increasingly common, especially in England, throughout the Period. The only exception were *John's Treatise* and the others derived from it, and their treatment of the subject did not go beyond simple quartering, which required no new terms at all. Similarly, almost all of the treatises ignore completely the elements of the outer achievement, the achievement as a whole, the para-armorial emblems as a class, and the various forms of flag on which emblems were commonly displayed throughout the Period. In consequence, most contributed nothing to the taxonomy of these phenomena, and introduced no new terms to assist in generalisation about them.

Given their emphasis on the design and elements of the arms, it cannot be surprising that the majority of the categories the authors of the treatises composed in the Third Period chose to recognise were classes of tincture, pattern, or figure, but even in these areas they introduced no more than a handful of new classificatory terms. The topics themselves were set apart from one another in our treatises in an increasingly conventional order, but were initially given collective designations only when such designations already existed in ordinary speech — beasts, fish, birds, crosses, and the like. The earlier treatises, for example, made no terminological distinction at all among what we now call 'colours', 'metals', and 'furs', but used *color* or *couleur* to designate all of them alike, even in discussions of the rules forbidding their superposition. The modern French terms for these categories (*couleurs*, *métaux*, and *fourures*) first appear in the *Créquier de noblesse* of Hungary Herald, composed as we have seen at some time after 1450.[222] The Middle English equivalents of the first two — *colours* and *metals* — appear in the slightly earlier *John's Treatise*, but the name 'furs' seems to have been introduced only at an uncertain date between 1450 and 1611, when it finally appeared in Guillim's *Display of Heraldrie*.[223] The still more general French term *émaux*, which includes all three categories, would not be introduced until some time after 1600, however, and its English equivalent 'tinctures' would not appear until 1610 — once again in Guillim's *Display*.[224] General terms for what we now call 'charges' and '(honourable) ordinaries' in English, and *meubles* and *pièces* (*honorables*) in French, were also absent from all of the treatises composed before 1560, and such motifs were instead referred to by such extremely vague words as *thynges* and *choses*.

Indeed, some idea of the primitive character of the explanatory language and organisation typical of the treatises of the fifteenth century can be gleaned from the following passages of John's Treatise:

> *And ye shal knowe that ther be IIII thynges that breken armes, that is to say, Bendes, ffecys, Cheuerons, and Barres. And if ther be any of thise IIII in armes, then ye most begin to blase them next the ffelde whatsomeuer thyng be thereinne else. … Also ye shal knowe that ther is non armes bot siluer or golde*

[222] *Ibid*., p. 495
[223] *OED* 2, XVIII, p. 118. On GUILLIM and his treatise, see below, Part II B.
[224] *Ibid.*

*be in them. And in blasying of armes ye most beware for reprevyng, for ther be IIII thynges in armes that a man shal not name bot onys: that is to say, onys of, onys in, onys and, and onys with. …*[225]

So low were both the goals and the rhetorical capacity of most of the treatise-writers of the Third Period (especially before 1483/5) that it can hardly be astonishing to discover that most of the new taxonomic terms that appeared in their treatises were *not* words intentionally chosen or created to serve as technical terms of discourse, but rather words or phrases of ordinary language that were either newly introduced in the Period into one or more vernacular tongues, or (much more commonly) simply acquired one or more new senses of relevance to heraldistic or armoristic discourse. Sometimes such words or phrases replaced older ones that for one reason or another had fallen into disuse in some or all of the relevant part of their semantic range, but in other cases they merely came to function as partial synonyms of long-established words.

Among these words were those of the *blason* and *armoirie* families, which came to be used both in *ordinary* language and in the *technical* languages of the treatises of this period in both France and England to represent a whole series of ideas related to the representation, description, and explanation of arms and other armorial signs, and in the process acquired both a different set of *lexical forms* and a different set of *meanings* for the corresponding forms. This history of these terms is therefore far too complex to examine even superficially here, and I shall postpone to § 3.6 below my discussion of that history, seen from both the lexical and the semantic perspective.

I shall conclude this Subdivision with a table (3.2), setting out in three columns a list of the independent treatises and chapters on, and substantial discussions of armory, known to have been published anywhere in Latin Christendom in the Third Period, arranged in the (sometimes approximate) chronological order established above. The table is divided horizontally into decades organized under the headings of the roughly corresponding Ages. The works published in Britain are given in the first column, those published in France in the second, and those published in all other countries — in practice only **Italy** (2), **Germany** (4), **Poland** (1), **Castile** (4), **Aragon** (5), and **Portugal** (1) — in the third column. I have retained the numbering established above, but have replaced the distinctive brackets used for the numbers of each national series with distinctive colours, indicated at the head of the table proper. I have set the names of independent and more or less original works in **boldface** and flush with the left margin in each column, and have set to the right of each column works that are essentially translations, revisions, or abbreviations of earlier works, along with works on restricted themes, works lacking text, and works forming chapters of longer works. The names of works that were derived largely from Bartolo's *Tractatus* are highlighted in yellow, and those of the works that were published in print rather than in manuscript are underlined.

[225] JONES, *Tretis on Armes*, in *Medieval Heraldry*, pp. 216-17

**Table 3.2. Works consisting of or** containing **a treatise on armory to 1574**
**Colours: Latin, French, English, Welsh, German, Italian, Castilian, Catalan, Portuguese**

| year | BRITAIN | FRANCE | OTHER LANDS |
|---|---|---|---|
| **THIRD PERIOD, FIRST AGE c. 1330 – c. 1380** | | | |
| **1330-1340** | | | |
| **1341-1350** | **1.** ***De heraudie*** **c. 1341/45** | | |
| **1351-1360** | | | **1.** B. da SASSOFERRATO, ***De insigniis et armis*** 1355 (pub. 1358) |
| **1361-1370** | | | |
| **1371-1380** | | *1. Somnium Viridarii* 1376<br>*1a. Songe du Vergier* 1378 | |
| **THIRD PERIOD, SECOND AGE c. 1380 – c. 1422** | | | |
| **1381-1390** | | 2. Honoré BOVET, *Arbre de batailles* 1387 | |
| **1391-1400** | **2.** S. TREVOR (Bado Aureo), ***Tractatus de armis*** 1395<br>2a. Id. *Llyfr Dysgread Arfau* | [? François des FOSSES, ***De picturis et armis*** c. 1390] | |
| **1401-1410** | | **4.** ***Livre des armes et des heraulx*** c. 1401/3<br>5. ***Traité des fourures***<br>*2A.* Christine DE PISAN, *Livre des fais d'armes* 1407 | *1.* Johannes ROTHE, ***Der Ritterspiegel*** 1404/14 |
| **1411-1420** | | | |
| **THIRD PERIOD, THIRD AGE c. 1422 - c. 1483/5** | | | |
| **1421-1430** | | **6.** ***1st Banyster Treatise***<br>**7.** ***2nd Banyster Treatise*** | |
| **1431-1440** | | **8.** J. COURTOIS, Sicily Her., ***Tr. en f. de questionnaire*** > 1437 | *2.* ALTSWERT, *Der Kittel* c. 1440<br>*3.* HEMMERLIN, *De nobilitate*, 1440 |
| **1441-1450** | 3. Nicolas UPTON, *De militari officio* 1446 | **9.** ***Blason d'armes en 12 chapistres*** >1444 | |
| **1451-1460** | **4.** ***John's Treatise*** c. 1450<br>**5.** ***Hague Tract*** c. 1450 | **10.** Hungary K. of Arms **1st treatise**<br>**11.** id. **2nd treatise**<br>**12.** id. ***Crequier de noblesse*** | *4.* GROSSENBROT, *Wap. Aug. Ges.* 1460<br>*5.* ANDLO, *Imperio Romano*, c. 1460 |
| **1461-1470** | 4B. *Strangways' Book* c. 1452/88 | 13. *Jouvencel tr. en figures*<br>**14.** J. LE FEVRE, G. Fleece K., ***Avis de Toison d'or*** 1464 | J. DŁUGOSZ, ***Klejnoty***, 1450/80 |
| **1471-1480** | (Other, unedited versions of *John's Treatise*) | **15.** O. de LA MARCHE et al. ***Concertat. héraldique*** 1474<br>**I1***b.* *Bestiaire héraldique* | |

| THIRD PERIOD, FOURTH AGE c. 1483/5 – c. 1520/30 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1481-1490** | **5**. ***Buke of coot-armuris*** **1486**<br>**F**2*Ab.* [C. DE PISAN, tr. W. CAXTON], *The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyvalrye* 1490 | **16**. ***Traité d'Argentaye*** 1482/1492<br>**17.** Héraut Sicile, ***Le Blason de toutes armes et escutz*** 1495<br>**18**. [Roland BOURNEL DE BONCOURT?] ***Tr. d'armorie ecclésiastique*** c. 1500<br>**19.** 'Héraut Sicile', ***Le Blason des couleurs en armes, livrees et devises*** c. 1502 | **1.** P. de GRAÇIA DEY, ***Blazón general*** 1489 |
| **1491-1500** | **F**7*a.* Adam LOUTFUT, *The Deidis of Armorie* c. 1495 | | **2**. Federico (II), *Tr. in figures* c. 1495<br>**2.** Garci Al. TORRES, ***Blasón d'armas*** 1496 |
| **1501-1510** | | | |
| **1511-1520** | | **20**. Jehan LE FERON, ***Grand blason d'armoiries*** 1520 | 2B. IDEM, *Blasón y recogimiento d'armas* 1514/15<br>2C. *Abreviada*,1516<br>**1.** S. TAMBORINO, ***Tract. del blasó*** c. 1516<br>**2.** ***Tractat d'heràldica llatino-català*** c. 1516 |
| **THIRD PERIOD, FIFTH AGE c. 1520/30 - c.1560** | | | |
| **1521-1530** | | | |
| **1531-1540** | | Symphorien CHAMPIER, *Le fondement et origine des tiltrez de noblesse* 1535<br>**21**. Roland BOURNEL DE BONCOURT, ***Recuoeul en manier de blason*** a. 1537 | **1.** A. RODRIGUES, ***Tratado Geral de Nobreza*** **p. 1532**<br>**3.** Bernat LLUPIA, ***Lo Art y modo del blasó*** 1530/45 |
| **1541-1550** | | **22**. Jacques LE BOUCQ, ***Le noble blason des armes*** 1543-72<br>Barthélemy DE CHASSENEU *Catalogus Gloriae Mundi* 1546 | **4.** Bernat MESTRE, ***Tractat* I,** 1544 |
| **1551-1560** | | Jean LE FERON, ***Le Simbol Armorial*** 1555<br>*Idem, De la primitive institution des Roys, Heravldz, & Poursuivans d'armes* 1555<br>**23**. Corneille GAILLARD, ***Le blason des armes*** 1557 | **5.** Bernat MESTRE, ***Tractat* II,** 1544/56 |
| **FOURTH PERIOD c. 1560 – c. 1850** | | | |
| **1561-1570** | **6**. Gerard LEGH, ***The Accidens of Armorie*** 1562 | **24**. Jean SCOHIER, ***Recoeuil et traicté du blason des armes*** 1562<br>25. Liphard CANLOU, *Livre blasonné* 1566 | |

***Sommaire français***.
*Dans cette première section de la deuxième Division de la deuxième Partie de son introduction aux hautes études héraldiques, le professeur Boulton continue son étude de la nature et des origines des défauts du vocabulaire technique utilisé par les héraldistes pour classifier les phénomènes héraldiques de toutes sortes: un vocabulaire taxinomique qu'il contraste au vocabulaire descriptif ou blasonique. Dans la Première Division il a initié une étude générale de l'histoire du vocabulaire taxinomique en France et en Angleterre depuis 1170, divisée en cinq périodes distinctes: (1) celle des sources strictement littéraires (v. 1170 - v. 1250); (2) celle des armoriaux blasonnés (v. 1250 – v. 1335); (3) celle des traités héraldiques en manuscrit et des lettres de donation d'armoiries (v. 1335 – v. 1560); (4) celle des traités imprimés de la tradition antiquaire (v. 1560 – v. 1870); et (5) celle de l'érudition scientifique (v. 1870 – présent). Dans cette Division (II.B) il s'agit de la Troisième de ces Périodes, et dans cette première section Boulton examine la nature et l'histoire des oeuvres littéraires et didactiques de cette Période — surtout les traités de blason ou d'armorie —qui peuvent contribuer à notre connaissance des termes taxinomiques des langues officielles des deux royaumes: le latin bas-médiévale, le moyen français continental et insulaire, et l'anglais moyen et premier-moderne. Il écrit en conclusion que — par ce que le but des traités de blason de cette Période en toutes langues n'étaient didactique qu'au niveau le plus fondamental, et qu'ils ne tenaient aucun compte des autres espèces d'armoiries — ils ont contribué très peu au lexique taxinomique en question, et qu'il est nécessaire encore une fois de chercher les termes héraldiques contemporains et de tracer leur évolution dans les oeuvres littéraires des types examinés ici, et dans les documents légaux qu'il examinera dans le prochain numéro de cette revue.*