of theological and institutional disputes and the internal pressures of economic difficulties and a decaying property. Again, as elsewhere, we see the community events — the ales and the morris events — giving way to individual financial levies. The Great Marlow accounts confirm the slow drift away from the communal life of truths commonly held to the individual life of a justified soul standing alone before his God.

NOTES

1 Lawrence Blair, A List of Churchwardens' Accounts (Ann Arbor, 1939), 13.
2 Lawrence Blair, English Church Ales (Ann Arbor, 1940), 31.
3 Notes and Queries, 5th series, 5 (1876), 228.
4 Aylesbury; Buckinghamshire Record Office rm/140/5/1. I want to thank, particularly, Sarah Charlton of the Bucks for bringing the book to my attention.
5 Reading; Berkshire Record Office b/23/5/1, f 17. This inventory is for 1623 but it repeats, with slightly more detail, an earlier entry for 1602.
6 See John Nichols, The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth (London, 1823), iii, 130ff. Lady Russell had been one of the circle of Protestant gentlewomen educated with the young Elizabeth.
7 For a discussion of the actions leading up to this apparently final legislation see W. E. Tate, The Parish Chest (Cambridge, 1969).

JOHN H. ASTINGTON

The King and Queenes Entertainement at Richmond

On their return from a visit to Oxford in September 1636, King Charles and Queen Henrietta Maria were entertained at Richmond Palace by a masque in which their six-year-old son, the future Charles II, was the chief masquer: he took the role of Britomart and performed in two dances. The occasion evidently arose from the Queen's 'signifying her pleasure that she would see her Sonne the most illustrious Prince in a dance', but such a casual origin must have lain some months prior, since the preparations for the show were evidently elaborate, for all the apology of the anonymous author of the published text that 'it came to be what it is, without any designe, but rather out of a kind of necessity urging it.'

From a critical point of view the Entertainement certainly is a rough-and-ready assemblage of motifs. It begins with an antimasque of four countrymen, who, in time-honoured theatrical fashion, have wandered into court and are bemusedly searching for the Queen. They serve to introduce a pastoral dance and shepherd's song, and the scene then changes to a military camp. A Romano-British captain and a 'Druyd' debate the relative virtues of Mars and Apollo; they are followed by a song of priests, and a wild dance of soldiers. The arrival of Britomart and his knights adventurers, 'The springing hopes of Armes and Arts,' is announced by a messenger, but their appearance is preceded by an entirely gratuitous comic Spaniard, who dances, and by a further chorus from the priests. The scene opens to reveal Britomart and his knights, dressed 'in a Warlike habit, after the Roman fashion', seated on a triumphal arch: they descend and dance. Six dwarf squires present impresion shields painted with the devices of their knights to the Queen, after which the masquers dance for a second time and then return to their seats, the scene closing on them. The masque ends with a valedictory song from the priestly chorus.
However unsatisfactory the masque may be as an artistic whole, it is of interest in a number of other respects, not least of which is the continuing royal myth whereby the Prince of Wales is praised as the living representative of a heroic British past, partly historical but mostly fabulous, which deliberately blends classical solidity with medieval fantasy. The chivalric impulse in Tudor and Stuart entertainments, tournaments, masques, plays, and disguisings is frequently marked by a blend of high seriousness with a rather light and playful posing. By the date of the Entertainment the references to the past could include previous theatrical incarnations of the Prince of Wales, and the famous entertainments of 1610 and 1611, The Speeches at Prince Henry’s Barriers and Oberon, clearly behind the Richmond masque. Charles continues in the mould of promising English princes that was begun with the Tudor Arthur, behind whom stretches, deliberately vaguely, a heroic lineage reaching back to Brut.

The particular cult of the past expressed in the motifs of the masque was interestingly strengthened, I believe, in a specific reference from the stage to the theatre. As the players in the masque step forward to address and to honour the audience — the countrymen speak to the Queen in naive respect, the soldiers lay their weapons at her feet, and the dwarves present their devices to her — so both the costumes of the actors and the invocation of a heroic history which promises a glorious future were reflected in the decorations of Richmond Palace, which had been made for the first of the Tudor kings.

The site of the performance of the masque is not given either in the printed text or in the Office of Works accounts which record some of the expenditures on the occasion. Plays were habitually performed at Richmond within the royal apartments, as at the other palaces, but a rather larger space than such chambers was usually chosen for masques; however, Richmond Palace did possess a large building, the hall, which was very similar to spaces in which masques were performed at Whitehall. One of the two shows which might be compared to the Entertainment, a mask of amazons and knights performed for the Queen and the French agent de Simier in January 1579, was certainly performed in the hall. What I find entirely unlikely is the suggestion, made by H. M. Colvin and John Summerson in The History of the King’s Works, that the 1636 performance took place either in ‘the galleries about the first court’, which would have been impossibly narrow for such a purpose, or, perhaps, that it took place in the courtyard and was watched from the galleries. In the latter case we would have an entirely unprecedented instance of an outdoor performance of a masque, with proscenium stage, music, and dancing, and an audience watching from covered, latticed galleries. Masque was a form firmly rooted in indoor performance: apart from the question of the vagaries of weather, which ruined several outdoor shows during Elizabeth’s reign, one major feature of masques was the presence of the attendant torchbearers, who accompanied the masquers during their formal entry. Lighting effects on the scenic stages, primitive as they may have been, were also very important in Stuart masques, while singing and instrumental music, which had to be clearly audible to the dancers, were always more effective indoors. The Colvin and Summerson account is nonsense, and is the result of simply reading together two consecutive entries in a list of work which was paid by the item: the order of such lists is invariably random and unrelated, no doubt as a result of transcribing a sheaf of separate docketts. The masque would never have been performed outdoors, and if temporary, roofed masque houses or theatres were occasionally built in courtyards, there is certainly no evidence that any such work was done at Richmond. To have built such a structure within the first court would have been to ignore entirely suitable space which lay alongside it. Quite startlingly ‘modern’ theatres could be built within old walls, as the Oxford scholars had demonstrated at Christ Church immediately before the Richmond Entertainment.

The masque, which like all other royal masques includes scenes, elaborate costumes, vocal and orchestral music, dancing, and dramatic speeches, would necessarily have been acted indoors in a fairly large room. The Queen was evidently seated, in the usual fashion,
opposite the stage and immediately facing the dancing floor below it. Not only was the hall the eminently suitable space in which to build the temporary stage and scaffolds for the audience, but its interior decorations linked it directly with the historical heroism of the entertainment itself. The Parliamentary Survey of Richmond, made in 1649, informs us that the hall had a screen with a gallery over it, as at Hampton Court and Whitehall, and a dais at the higher end. It had a tiled floor, with a central hearth below a lantern in the roof. 'It is very well lighted and seel'd', the report continues, 'and adorned with eleven statues in the sides thereof.' The significance of these figures is to be appreciated only through an earlier account, which describes the hall as it had appeared during the reign of Henry vii:

The pleasënt halle is uppon the right hand of this curtillage [the inner court].

The interior of Richmond Palace hall symbolised the continuity of the heroic past with the Tudor present, and although its decoration may have changed somewhat by 1636, much of it evidently remained. The hall offered not merely the bare floor area required for a masque, but the whole ambience invoked by a Stuart revival of the historical ideal. If the Entertainement sounds an echo of a Tudor myth of successive military kingship, then, in its performance the echo was amplified by the sculpted and painted presence of the founder of that myth and of the legendary monarchs it invoked. The audience, performers, and painted scenery were surrounded by representations of the heroes of the historical and fabulous past, and thus the lineage of Prince Charles was expressed as is that of Banquo in Macbeth, but in retrospect rather than in prospect. The 'show' of 'Kings' enclosed the performing area.

A dramatic performance in the hall would also have constituted a revival of early Tudor practice, although practicality would have been the main motive for staging the Entertainement there. Almost as soon as Richmond had been completed Henry vii presided over elaborate shows in the hall, notably for the marriage of Prince Arthur to Katherine of Aragon in 1501, and for Princess Margaret to James iv of Scotland early in the following year. Pageants and revels continued to be held there until 1527, and were
revived in the Elizabethan period. The mask of 1579 in particular provides an interesting parallel with the *Entertainment*. It was rather a pointed show, given its connections with the marriage negotiations with the Duc d'Alençon. It began with processional entry of six amazons, in armour and bearing impresa shields, accompanied by torchbearers in female dress, and 'one with A speach to the Queenes majestie delivering A Table with writings unto her highnes comying in with musitions playing on Cornettes'. The written document was learned — it possibly explained the impresa and their mottoes — having been composed, and perhaps illuminated, by Petruchio Ubaldino, a Florentine scholar patronized by the Queen. The amazons, wearing what was evidently real armour, then danced, somewhat remarkably, and six knights then entered, following which 'the Amazons and the Knightes after the Knightes had daunced A while with Ladies before her majestie did then in her maisties presence fight at Barriars'. The outcome is described by the Spanish ambassador, who was also present at what he calls 'an entertainment in imitation of a tournament between six ladies and a like number of gentlemen, who surrendered to them'. Later records concern only the performance of plays at the palace, and these were usually staged in the Great Chamber. The masque of 1636 marks a return, I believe, to the location of the early court entertainments which were one of the chief ancestors of the mature Stuart form.

The Office of the Works accounts for 1635–6 record payment to Edward Pearce for painting both the scenery and the impresa shields which were presented to the Queen (see note 7). The latter were presumably of pasteboard, in the elaborately curved and fretted style which had become conventional for tournaments and related entertainments, and which can be seen in Nicholas Hilliard's painting of George Clifford, Earl of Cumberland (c 1590) and Inigo Jones's costume design for a knight *à la Romaine* (c 1610–1622). As for the scenes, the entry is unique in the Works payments in identifying the work of a scene painter; Orgel and Strong point out that Pearce was certainly employed by Jones, who considered him 'the only man that doeth understand perspective of all painters in London'; subsequently he worked under Jones in painting the surviving decorations at Wilton House. Pearce is not likely to have been, on these grounds, the designer of the scenes; the printed text of the masque is silent on this matter, although it names both the composer of the music (Charles Coleman) and the choreographer (Simon Hopper). Since the *Entertainment* was mounted by the Office of the Works, however, it is certainly possible that the Surveyor himself designed both setting and costumes. The text provides no comprehensive description of the stage, but it was evidently an entirely traditional curtained proscenium, with a cartouche above it of the kind that can be seen in the design for *Florimène* (1635): 'In a compartment was written, *EXPEEDITIO BRITOMARTIS*'. The designs for the scenes were conventional, based for the most part on Serlian satyrical and tragic motifs. What may be gathered from the descriptions in the text about their realisation on the stage suggests a fairly simple arrangement of the scenery.

The countrymen who begin the entertainment are described as 'standing at the entrance of the Scene' (viz., at the proscenium line), and behind them was 'a pleasant Country for the most part champain'. Whether this was painted on the flat (shutters or a drop) or on receding wings is not clear, but the scene was probably not very deep; behind it was the triumphal arch on which Charles and his knights were sitting, ready for their revelation, and during the opening episode no significant action appears to take place on the stage itself. The men soon descend to the dancing floor, and both dance and song were performed there.

The pastoral scene changed into 'a well ordered Campe, in which were scene severall tents carriages, all kinds of warlike ammunition, and a trench cast round about it'. For all the elaboration of the description, the central part of this picture was evidently painted on the flat, on a pair of shutters. The next change occurs 'When on a suddaine the Scene flew open, and five Knights Adventurers were discovered afarre off, sitting on an arch
Triumphant, Prince BRITOMART overtopping them all. This practical set piece lay furthest upstage and provided the focal point of the scene during the culminating dances and presentation of devices: its design presumably was, like that of the costumes, 'after the Roman fashion'. Following the dances the Prince and his fellow masquers returned to their seats on the arch, and a second pair of shutters hid them from view: 'the Scene chang'd into a beautifull Temple'.

The general style for the costumes, aside from the antimasque of 'Clownes', was Romano-British. The particular interpretation of such style in masque costumes is apparent in several surviving designs by Inigo Jones, to the most impressive of which I have made reference above. The costume of the knights adventurers was similar to Jones's undated drawing in several respects, although the 'armour' appears to have been designed to be lighter and less constricting: 'They were all attired alike in a Warlike habit, after the Roman fashion, of watchet and crimson Taffita, cut upon silver in scallops, the bases and the buskins of the same, and their caps after the manner of the Roman Petasus, with great plumes in them'. Perhaps a less noble Romanism is suggested by the similar description of the costume for the Captain, who was 'attired in a Souldiers habit after the old Brittish fashion, taken from the Romans, which was a short coat reaching almost to his knees made in scales, and on his head a Petasus, Buskins or short Bootes on his legs'.

What Jones or his imitators may have understood by the 'Brittish fashion', as distinct from the Roman, is apparent in designs for Oberon (1611) and for Coelum Britannicum (1633). Orgel and Strong describe the former as 'basically early Tudor although not accurate in details', and such a style is likely to have governed the treatment of the costumes for the squires, which are described as 'short coats of Taffita, bonnets of the same, with feathers round about them'. If the bearers of the impresa shield were dressed in a fanciful early Tudor style, the references to the decoration of the hall could only have been strengthened, since it would have been within such a style that the images of the kings would have been conceived and interpreted. The effect of the dwarf bearers, who 'come leaping in', was intended partly to be grotesque and comic, but they are engaged on a serious errand, and they would have presented their masters' arms with appropriate dignity. That they may also have appeared as envoys from the legendary England depicted in the carvings around the hall would have been entirely fitting to the occasion of the masque, and to its eclectic style. The King and Queenes Entertainement also marks, with suitable symbolism, the end of a building which had housed gatherings of the royal court since the beginning of the sixteenth century. By the time 'Prince BRITOMART' returned to England as Charles II, Richmond Palace lay in ruins.

NOTES

1 The King and Queenes Entertainement at Richmond (Oxford, 1636), 5-6.

2 THE PRINCES

The Sunne scarce risen. Only peeping behind a mountaine, and shedding light vpon the world

THE WORD

Nondum
conspectus illuminat orbem.

MY L.DVKE of Buckingham's

A firme welspread tree, and tall, blowne down to the ground by a tempest, and out of it a streight young tree springing, ouer which a black cloud dropping, and through that cloud the sunne breaking with his beames, and shining vpon that young tree

16
THE WORD

Sub his radiis
sic iterum resurgam.

My L. Francis Villars

A square Altar of green turfe, vpon which is placed a heart crowned, ouer against this Cupid with a bow in his hand broken with a shot. At the bottom of the Altar a shaft fastned as shot from the bow, and a second shaft in the middle way betweene Cupid and the Altar, yet flying towards it

The word

Etiam fracto arca huc destinatur.

My Lord of Backhurst's

An Altar of stone, vpon it a burning heart, Cupid looking sadly towards it, and putting vp his arrow in his quiser, from the Altar to Cupid written

The word

Non tibi, sed patriae.

My L. Carr's

Vnder the Princes Armes a Youth lying on the ground, the Sunne shining on him through the feathers

The word

Sub istis lucem non impedit umbra.

M. Sackville's

A Cupid picking for his arrowes yet vnfeathered, out of the Princes Armes, a Youth opening his breast

The word

Hinc tibi pro calamis si data pluma, feri.

(Entertainment, 27–9)

The Prince's symbol of the rising sun, although a commonplace, may be a deliberate reminiscence of a device used by Prince Henry, and shown in an equestrian portrait by Robert Peake (c 1608–1612). See Roy Strong, Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance (London, 1986), 115 and plate 45.

3 In 'Ben Jonson, Inigo Jones, and the Transformation of Tudor Chivalry' (ELH, 47 (1980), 259–75), Norman Council claims that the entertainments for Prince Henry, with their praise of classical virtue rather than truly chivalric, military virtu, represent a significant change in attitude. I find that this argument overemphasises and isolates parts of a characteristically promiscuous and fantastic approach to the past in the Tudor and Stuart chivalric tradition. Tudor shows, like that of the Nine Worthies in Love's Labour's Lost, freely mixed the historical and the fabulous, the classical and the legendary, as Baroque art continued to do. Strong (117) notes that in the portraiture of Prince Henry 'Spenserian knight and Roman imperator rolled into one in the same way that the Elizabethan iconic tradition continues to live side by side with ... new up-to-date essays in a more international style'.

4 Its dimensions were 100' by 40'; the hall at Whitehall Palace was identical in size.

5 The Revels payments include an item to Richard Warby, an ironmonger, 'for great spikes to straine the wiers in the hall', from which hung chandeliers to illuminate the show. See A. Feuillerat, Documents Relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth (Louvain, 1908), 295. A second entertainment, in 1564, featuring a castle, an arbour, trumpeters, and men at arms, probably was also performed in the hall (Ibid, 116).
A second error lies in the statement that 'the king and queen presented a masque for the young prince'.

The relevant information is given under the heading of 'Taskwork', always a miscellaneous category. The context is as follows: 'Taskewoorke viz to Robte ffletcher ffor Clxviij’ foote of Latticing sett vp in the Galleryes aboute the first Courte at vj’ ob the foote o-iiiij’ xi’ Edward Pearce Painting a Scane & for making painting and guilding vj’ Shields with Amppressas all for a Masque presented before the Prince'. PRO E/3513269. Neither the galleries nor the lattice windows were new: they were part of Henry vii’s original building, and are mentioned throughout the extant yearly Works accounts.


I consider that the payment to Theobald Peirce, Keeper of the Standing Wardrobe at Richmond, for 'making ready the Lodgings against the Prince his Masque' (Chamber Accounts for 1636 as quoted in the Malone Society Collections vi (Oxford, 1961), 123), covers general preparations for the occasion, rather than a specific indication of the place of performance – 'the Lodgings' is, in any case, a very vague phrase. The royal household had newly arrived at the palace, and the privy lodgings would have to be made ready. Moreover, preparations for masques frequently involved the provision of dressing chambers for the royal performers. See, eg, 'making ready the lower end wth certayne other roome of the Hall' for the Queen and her ladies 'against their maske' (Hampton Court, 1604; ibid, 98); 'Making ready the Banqueting house and the Lord Threars lodgings ... for the Maske' (Whitehall, 1608; ibid, 102); 'makeing ready the Lord Chamberleines lodginges' for the Queen 'to make her ready for the maske wth the rest of the ladies' (Whitehall, 1609; ibid, 104); 'making ready ... the presence, and other Roomes' for Queen Henrietta Maria 'for a Maske' (Denmark House, 1627; ibid, 123).

Quoted from the transcript given by W. H. Hart, 'The Parliamentary Surveys of Richmond, Wimbledon, and Nonsuch, in the County of Surrey, A.D. 1649', Surrey Archaeological Collections, v (London, 1871), 77.

Quoted from Francis Grose, The Antiquarian Repertory, ii (London, 1808), 315.

No detailed accounts of the interior survive for the period between the Tudor and Commonwealth surveys; the Office of the Works accounts mention only minor repairs to the fabric, most often to the tiling of the floor.

Feuillerat, 287.

Ibid, 301 and note.

Ibid, 287. The armour worn by the combatants had been sent from the armoury at Greenwich and had been gilded in the Revels Office workshop; hence the fight was perhaps somewhat more than an elegant ballet. The reference in the accounts to wigs for the amazons and their attendants make it plain, I think, that the parts were taken by men. See Feuillerat, 299.

The painting is reproduced in S. Orgel and R. Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court (2 vols, London and Los Angeles, 1973), i, 45, and in R. Strong, Artists of the Tudor Court (London, 1983), 134–5; Jones’s design appears in Orgel and Strong, i, 185, 188.