

The Enigma of Richard III's Woodcut Portrait of 1529

CECIL H. CLOUGH

On the Continent from the mid-sixteenth century interest in printed portrait-books was such that in the following decades editions and reissues appeared in their hundreds.* A portrait-book, providing what often were claimed to be true-likenesses, can be defined as a volume with woodcut or metal engraved portraits, usually comprising a homogeneous group of individuals, such as emperors, or military commanders. In these books biographical information concerning each individual portrayed might be restricted to the caption, usually was confined to the facing page, though on occasion extended well beyond. In any event it was the portrait, rather than the text, that was intended to dominate. A portrait-book's theme often was associated with the locality of publication; for example, those with portraits of popes were published primarily in Rome, those of the doges of Venice for the most part in Venice.¹ The second portion of *The Pastyme of People* (a work sometimes referred to by historians as Rastell's 'Chronicle') because of its striking series of full-page woodcut portraits of the English kings appears to be an early promise in England of the genre of portrait-books, even if in its totality the text remains paramount. The volume is undated, but probably was printed in 1529 the date of its royal privilege, and compiled by John Rastell (c. 1475-1536), who published it, having printed it on his press then located in Cheapside, London.²

Sufficient evidence remains to appraise Rastell's character and to follow the vicissitudes of his career, which epitomised the breadth of talents and interests, as well as the turn of Fortune's Wheel, associated with the 'Renaissance Man'.³ Born about 1475 to a family of some standing in Coventry — his grandfather appears to have been the city's Warden — late in 1535, towards the end of his days, he was

confined to prison in London, dying there the following summer. Imprisonment was a consequence of his vehement opposition to a Royal Proclamation of 1535, that had found against the City of London in a long-standing dispute regarding the payment of tithes and offerings. Twenty years previously Rastell had been involved as a lawyer in the case of Richard Hunne, who refused to pay a mortuary fee to a curate, was murdered in prison and thereafter declared a heretic by an ecclesiastical court so that his estate was forfeit to the crown. Rastell became ward of Hunne's two young daughters and accepted responsibility for their dowries. In the 1490s he had received legal training, probably at the Middle Temple, London, and by 1504 was married to Elizabeth, the sister of Thomas More. Returning to Coventry to pursue a legal career, he became coroner there for two years, but perhaps discouraged by the city's economic decline, by 1509 was back in London. There his interests quickly embraced publishing and printing, since it was apparently in 1509 that he printed his first book: the statutes of the reigns of Edward V and Richard III. Of thirty-six known titles, which he printed over the following two and a half decades, about half were legal books or yearbooks, the rest covering such diverse subjects as history, astrology, liturgy and card-playing. In 1510 he published the translation from the Latin by Thomas More, his brother-in-law, of Gianfrancesco Pico's *The Lyfe of Johan Picus Erle of Myrandula with dyvers epistles and other workes of the seyd Johan Picus*; printing may have been without the translator's authority, as there may be evidence that More did not proof-read the printed text.⁴

Rastell was author of, and printed, a moral play, and his association with the London theatre was conspicuous, for shortly after 1524 in the grounds of his house at Finsbury Fields he had erected a permanent stage — the earliest recorded in England. He wrote the scripts and devised settings and costumes for several pageants performed before royalty, including that at Henry VIII's meeting in London with Charles V in 1522. Two years previously, with the king's painter and others, including the royal sergeant of tents, Rastell assisted in painting the roof of the temporary palace at Guisnes, which served as the English pavilion at the Field of Cloth of Gold. This involved painting knots, roses and heraldic devices, set off by gilt batons, on the seared canvas roof, itself painted to appear slated. Likewise in 1520 Rastell most probably worked on the painting of the roof of the Roundhouse, Calais, and certainly in 1527 he helped to decorate the theatre at Greenwich; its opening entertainment of 5 May was devised by him.⁵ Rastell knew the king personally and was associated with his court.

The heyday of printed portrait-books coincided with the epoch on the Continent when certain princes and nobles had a room in their residences decorated with oil-painted portraits of famous men — a tradition initiated by Petrarch.⁶ Today portrait-books are rare, and existing copies often imperfect. Apart from the ravages

of time one can suspect that these books were dismantled, or pillaged, for suitable portraits which, when coloured, could fittingly adorn the study of the less wealthy. Moreover, in the eighteenth century illustrated books were broken to enrich portfolios of engravings, while portraits in particular were removed to extra-illustrate printed books, in other words Grangerise them.⁷ These considerations perhaps explain the rarity of *The Pastyme of People*, which may only have had a small print-run. I know ten copies of it, and of these only four are complete (aside from repairs to individual pages).⁸ The volume was published with the clever punning title, set xylographically in a woodcut border: *The Pastyme of People. The Cronycles of dyuers realmys and most specyally of England*. A copy in the Library of Congress contains what was an inserted loose sheet of a trial printing in letterpress with the title: *The pastyme of people. The cronycles of Englande and of dyuers other realmes; breuely compyled with the pycles and armes of all the kynges of Englande syth the conquest*.⁹ Already in 1729, the year that the more perfect copy of the two now in the British Library was donated to James West, he noted in it: 'a most rare book'. Not surprisingly, when bibliomania was at its height facsimile woodcut blocks of the portraits were cut for a new printing, which Thomas Frognall Dibdin edited and published in London in 1811. Sixty-nine sheets entirely reproducing photographically the complete copy in the British Museum (now British Library) were published in 1926 by the Modern Language Association of America.¹⁰ Neither reissue is common.

The integral copy of *The Pastyme of People* examined for this study is that of the British Library, shelfnumber C.15.c.6 (its title page and the last ones — Fv to Gii inclusive — have been repaired). It belonged to Thomas Grey, second Earl of Stamford (1673-1720), whose coat-of-arms from a previous binding remain pasted inside the front cover. In 1729 James West received it from the Earl of Oxford, and at West's sale in 1773 it was purchased on behalf of George III, subsequently passing with the donation of his royal library to the British Museum.¹¹ The book's format is folio, comprising sixty-six unnumbered leaves in two, A-E, A-Gii in sixes. There are a number of very small woodcut representations of figures in the first portion, and eighteen full-page woodcut portraits of the English monarchs from William I to Richard III in the second portion. Each of the latter represents the king with his coat-of-arms, as the trial titlepage had promised. It may be that Rastell became aware of the importance of coats-of-arms as a result of his work at Guisnes, where they had prominence.¹² Samuel Redgrave's *Dictionary of Artists of the English School ...* (1874) stated categorically, though without indicating any source, that the woodcut portraits of the monarchs were 'by his [Rastell's] own hand', despite having been attributed to Holbein.¹³ Given Rastell's artistic talents, as mentioned already, it can be accepted as likely that at least he drew the portraits of the monarchs. It has been suggested that in origin they were designed for

stained-glass, but I believe them to have been devised especially by Rastell for his book, as will become clear in the course of this study.¹⁴

The woodcut representations of the first portion are so crude that they cannot be called portraits. They are very small, varying in size from those in a circle: 24 mm. in diameter, to those in an oblong: 32 by 15 mm.; a few are in an oval approximately 45 by 40 mm. These woodcuts are mere decoration with, for instance, the identical woodcut being used both for King Brute and for Charlemagne (ff. Aii^v, Div), that for Pharamond (supposedly a fifth-century Frankish ruler) being used also for Hengest ('King of Kent') (ff. Bvi, Ci^v). A longer oblong woodcut block which depicts the Apostles, together with the small blocks surrounding the title of the work, was either copied from a French Book of Hours or, more probably, purchased secondhand from a French printer. Indeed it seems likely that all the woodcuts of the first portion were what happened to be available in the printer's stock, acquired in France as a job-lot.¹⁵

The full-page forceful portraits of the second portion relate closely to that part of the book's text and, as I have already mentioned, appear specially cut. Each block is at least 25.2 by 20.3 cm., with at the most 5 mm. variation. Some of the figures have characteristics common to representations of English monarchs in the century prior to the early Tudor period. For instance, the first of the series, William the Conqueror, holds upright in his right hand what one supposes was intended as the sword of conquest, in his left hand the orb (f.Ai) (plate 1). His pose and garb, and the sword and orb, are much as in the late-fifteenth-century north-facing stained-glass window portrayal of him in St Mary's Hall, Bayley Street, Coventry; this was the hall of the Guild of Merchants of the city, and one can assume familiar to Rastell.¹⁶ The window has a tier of nine rulers standing erect, six of whom, being English sovereigns, are in Rastell's book. In the tier above are nineteen coats-of-arms of the local nobility.¹⁷ William I in Rastell's portrayal has a beard and a moustache, not found in his representation in the Coventry stained-glass. Rastell's Richard I, likewise bearded and moustached, is in full armour, seated astride a lion, his right hand plunged down its throat, his left gripping its mane for leverage, in the act of tearing out the beast's heart, as recounted in the accompanying text; this play on Richard 'the lion heart' conforms to the punning title of the book, and perhaps is supporting testimony that Rastell himself drew the king's portrait for the woodcut (f.Bi^v) (Plate 2). Most of Rastell's kings hold in one hand either the sword (perhaps the sword of state is intended) or the sceptre, with the orb held in the other hand. It will be shown that almost all the woodcut portraits from Richard II to Edward IV probably derive from a supposed likeness of their subject, yet the eighteenth and last portrait in the series, labelled 'Ricardus III' (f.Gi) (plate 8), which one would have thought most likely to be true-to-life is strikingly unlike any known portrait of that sovereign, although accredited portraits of the king existed

in 1529. This paper seeks to resolve the enigma of this woodcut portrait of Richard III.

First, what was Rastell's purpose in providing portraits, and what can be deduced regarding their sources? Certainly by the mid-sixteenth century the broad assumption that facial features reflected inner character promoted the publication of portrait-books. This belief, associated with Italian Renaissance values, was fostered by the supposed dominance of personality over events. Rastell's book essentially anticipated this development, and while interest in facial features perhaps played its part, I suggest that rather one should look elsewhere for the inclusion of the portraits. Almost certainly a direct inspiration was the book with woodcut portraits of French monarchs that was published in Poitiers some two years prior to Rastell's; I will return to this. Rastell was a publisher and a printer with an eye for the sale of his stock, and one can suppose that he judged benefits likely to accrue from providing his *The Pastyme of People* with what he must have known to be the first extensive published series of portraits of English kings.

Rastell was also a lawyer, who had printed statutes and royal enactments for the reign of Edward V, and for those of successive reigns, including that of Richard III. The series of portraits that he provided was typical visual testimony of the continuity of royal authority, a consideration underlined as each monarch grasps two symbols of that authority. Henry VII was fully aware of this aspect of kingship, as shown by the decoration of the Great Hall of his Richmond Palace, which he commissioned, where above tapestries, including a series illustrating episodes of the Trojan War:

... In the wallys and siddys of this halle betwene the wyndowes bethe pictures of the noble kinges of this realme in their harnes and robis of goolde, as Brute, Engest, King William Rufus, Kyng Arthur, King Henry — and many othir of that name — King Richard, Kyng Edward, and of thoës names many noble waryours and kinges of this riall realme with their fachons [that is broad curved swords] and swordes in their handes, visagid and appieryng like bold and valiaunt knightes, and so their dedis and actes in the croniclis right evydently bethe shewen and declared emonge thes nombre of famous kinges ...

The concluding portrait was that of Henry VII. From the passage above, written in 1503, it appears that the portraits were painted panels — 'pictures' — and on the basis of what was written of the robes and armour they may have been full-length rather than bust-portraits.¹⁸ Rastell's series of woodcuts provides full-length portraits showing the monarchs in robes and armour, his purpose being to illustrate their deeds as recorded in the chronicle — actually Fabyan's — that he was editing and publishing.

The Richmond Palace series of portraits may directly have influenced Rastell's

woodcuts, but this can only be a conjecture and does not advance matters, as they no longer exist and no copy of any is known. Again it is possible, but the existing evidence is not conclusive, that two other series of kings of England could have influenced Rastell's woodcuts. There were full-length stone statues, initially fifteen in number, each monarch crowned and with orb and sceptre, commissioned for Westminster Hall by Richard II in the early years of his reign; by 1533 there were seventeen kings and four queens, of which ten remain. A similar series of monarchs was executed from 1411 to 1430 for the screen of Canterbury Cathedral (six remain). A more useful way forward seems to examine what portraits of English kings were available in the late 1520s to serve as potential sources for the woodcuts; these likewise may have been the source, perhaps indirectly, in some instances at least for the pictures in the great hall of Richmond Palace, perhaps for some of the stone statues of Westminster Hall, and even for some of those of the Canterbury screen. An inventory of 1542 of the Royal Collection of paintings in the Palace of Westminster, which was familiar to Rastell in consequence of his legal work there, indicates it as having painted bust-portraits on panel of several monarchs and, in a few instances, a panel portrait of a wife or of a child. On the evidence of recent tree-ring examination three items in the inventory that still remain in the Royal Collection — namely the portraits of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III — were painted by the same studio about 1518-23; it appears likely that these were from earlier, now lost, portraits in the Royal Collection. What is known of the origins and development of this Collection? From the mid-fourteenth century a number of ruling dynasties on the Continent began to form a collection of true-to-life portraits of notable members of the family; the imperial house of Bohemia was one such dynasty. The English Royal Collection was probably begun by Richard II in consequence of his marriage to Anne, daughter of Charles IV of Bohemia. The portrait of Richard II enthroned, in Westminster Abbey, and that of his diptych (known as the 'Wilton Diptych') are the earliest known true-to-life painted likenesses of an English sovereign, closely conforming to his copper-gilt tomb-effigy in the Abbey, which the king commissioned in 1395, while alive. Perhaps in reaction, the first Lancastrian king appears to have shown little interest in a painted panel portrait of himself. It will be shown below that about 1597 two gaps were filled in the series of royal bust portraits of deceased monarchs in the Royal Collection: for Henry IV and for Edward V.

The 1542 inventory suggests the probability of fifteenth-century panel portraits, perhaps true-to-life, of Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III (these will be discussed below). One can suppose this embryonic Royal Collection was utilised by Henry VII for the Richmond Palace series of portraits. The description of this latter made in 1503 makes it clear that the portraits in the Richmond Palace began with Brute and Arthur; presumably most of the portraits

prior to Richard II were largely imaginative creations. The number of existing portraits of Henry VIII is evidence of his concern for portraiture from life, an interest confirmed by the evident renovation of portraits in the Royal Collection, as testified by the group of three painted about 1518-23, already mentioned, and by that of Edward IV's portrait painted for the Collection within a decade or so of this group. Henry VIII's interest in portraiture may have been stimulated by the fact that Francis I possessed an impressive collection of painted bust-portraits of his predecessors — some of the earliest of these obviously, as in the case of the Richmond Palace series, being merely representational, and others probably deriving from tomb-effigies. One suspects, too, that the French Royal Collection was the main source for the woodcut portraits of the Poitiers publication of 1527.¹⁹

The same duality of imaginative and authentic likenesses appears to be a characteristic of the woodcut portraits in Rastell's book. Such was inevitable, since true-to-life portraits of the earlier monarchs did not exist and one can assume that Rastell was aware of this. For instance, the representational face on the silver penny of King Henry II was still being used for King John. Seals of early English kings likewise provided only conventional representations. While realistic (though perhaps imaginative), the tomb-effigies of Henry II and of Richard I in Fontevrault Abbey (Maine-et-Loire) appear unknown to Rastell, there being no similarity between the tomb features and the woodcut portraits of the monarchs concerned (ff. Aiv, Bi'). Identification of possible sources for the woodcut portraits of the earlier kings in Rastell's series appears hazardous, but in any event my concern here is those after Edward III.²⁰

The style of dress and equipage of the kings in the Richmond Palace series as described in 1503 corresponds broadly to that of Rastell's woodcut portraits, but provides no certainty as to the latter's sources. The woodcuts from William I to Edward IV inclusive show the kings in armour of like style; some kings have a similarly cut flowing robe and mantle, without regard for the fashion of the monarch's day. There is a nod to historical accuracy, though, since from Edward III (f.Cv) all save two kings are featured with the Garter Badge, on occasion on the Order's mantle, sometimes in association with the Garter itself. The exceptions are Henry V (f.Ei), who has only the Garter, and Richard III (f.Gi) (plate 11), who has neither Badge nor Garter.

Facial hair is a striking feature of the woodcut portraits, though some monarchs appear clean shaven. One might suppose that this merely reflected contemporary taste in view of the beards and moustaches grown from the late 1520s by Henry VIII, Francis I and Charles V. However an examination of this adornment appears rewarding, since a correspondence is to be discerned between facial hair featured on the woodcut portrait and the same monarch's portrayal as available in the early decades of the sixteenth century; accordingly the similarity is

a suggestive pointer to the possible source for the individual woodcut portraits. The beards of the tomb-effigies of John, Henry III and Edward III (the former in Worcester Cathedral, the latter two in Westminster Abbey) are similar to those worn in their woodcut portraits (ff.Biii, Biv^v, Cv). The portrait of Richard II enthroned which is in Westminster Abbey shows him clean shaven and its features broadly correspond to those of the woodcut.

There appears to have been no portrait of Henry IV in the Collection of the earlier Tudors. His woodcut portrait (f.Div) (plate 3) was created by taking the drooping moustache and twin forked short beard from his tomb-effigy in Canterbury Cathedral (plate 4). As previously mentioned the very same process was adopted at the end of the sixteenth century to fill the gap for his oil-painted portrait in the Royal Collection. This latter panel also robed him in the clothes and head dress of his contemporary, King Charles VI of France, as found in the woodcut of a printed portrait-book of French kings that had been published some decades earlier. In 1597 a portrait-book with copper-plate engravings of the English kings was published in London and this reproduced the facial features and dress of Henry IV as in the oil-painting of the Royal Collection; presumably the painting in the Royal Collection was the source, which implies that it existed by 1597.²¹ This evidence relating to the creation of Henry IV's portrait reveals how a gap in the series of portraits of English kings could be filled and provides supportive testimony of what has been suggested regarding Rastell's methodology some sixty years earlier.

The inventory of 1542 lists a portrait of Henry V which, as mentioned, was apparently painted about 1518-23 and still exists. The woodcut portrait of this monarch in Rastell's series is entirely dissimilar, and appears rather to be of Henry V's younger brother, the duke of Bedford, identifiable by his conspicuous hooked nose. Occasional erroneous ascriptions are understandable features of portrait-books. The portrait of Henry VI in the Royal Collection, likewise in the inventory, and painted about 1518-23, has him clean shaven with a prominent long thin nose, and these features are in the woodcut portrait (f.Eii').²²

Perhaps the most obvious similarity is that between the panel portrait of Edward IV (painted for the Royal Collection some years after the group which included Henry V and Henry VI), and the woodcut portrait of him (f.Fii) (plates 5 and 6). In both the king is clean shaven, fat-faced, with dimpled chin and rather piggy eyes. Tree-ring dating assigns the panel to about 1534-40, but it may be a few years earlier and hence actually the direct source for the woodcut. In any event there is evidence that the panel was painted from an earlier one, perhaps a true likeness. What is believed to be an engraving related to the lost earlier portrait exists with annotations in the hand of Dr Hartmann Schedel (born 1440), compiler of the '*Liber chronicarum*', published in Nuremberg in 1493 (plate 7). Schedel,

who thought the portrait to be that of the Emperor Frederick III (1449-1493), died in 1514, hence the engraving is before then.²³

Edward IV's presumptive heir, Edward V, was never crowned, and he is represented in the woodcut of Rastell's book as a youth wearing a long Garter mantle, and holding orb and sceptre (f.Fv"); presumably following contemporary convention, the crown is suspended over his head, not resting upon it, symbolising that, though planned, his coronation never took place.²⁴ Apparently in 1542 no likeness of Edward V existed in the Royal Collection. Indeed not until the late sixteenth century, at about the time when Henry IV's portrait was added, was the gap for Edward V's portrait filled. Dr Tudor-Craig has put forward the suggestion that this portrait was created by modifying the costume of a true-to-life likeness of Edward VI — he too was a youth — and labelling the panel 'Edward V'.²⁵ Obviously such a procedure cannot account for Rastell's woodcut portrait of Edward V. There is no evidence that a painted panel portrait of the young king existed in 1529, but there were representations of him as prince of Wales in stained glass, in Canterbury Cathedral, and in the priory church of St Giles, Little Malvern; in both he wears his prince's crown, as he does in a miniature to be found in a presentation manuscript to his father. The screen painting in St George's Chapel, Windsor, of Edward V as king was posthumous by several years (probably commissioned by Henry VII) and shows his crown suspended, as in the woodcut portrait; he holds orb and sceptre and wears a robe with an ermine collar and trimmings, and his face is hairless. It is possible that this portrait in part inspired the woodcut, but it must be stressed that the facial features and hairstyle are dissimilar. These are more akin to the youth's face as depicted in the miniature of the 'Dictes des Philosophes' of Lambeth Palace.²⁶ All the above portraits of the youth, which anticipated the woodcut, were representations; Rastell's woodcut likewise was imaginative.

What conclusions are to be drawn from the above detailed analysis of the woodcut portraits of the kings in Rastell's book of 1529? First, there are instances of similarity of facial characteristics between the woodcut portrait of a king and its likely source. Secondly, the number of these examples in the series, possibly from Edward III, certainly from Richard II, to and including Edward IV, precludes the similarities being coincidental. Hence it follows that there was a conscious attempt to provide a woodcut portrait that would be recognized as faithfully delineating the individual it purported to represent for these later kings of the series; the erroneous Henry V and imagined Edward V reflect an attempt to provide a credible likeness. Since no likenesses were known, the woodcut portraits of the earliest monarchs, whatever their sources, were imagined and representational.

The woodcut portrait of Richard III (f.Gi) (plate 11) can now be considered in context, and its incongruity in not conforming to an available likeness appears all



1. Woodcut portrait of William I, Rastell, *The Pastyme of People*, London [c. 1529], f. Ai, London, The British Library, shelfnumber: C.15.c.6. Reproduced by permission of The British Library.



2. Woodcut portrait of Richard I, Rastell, *The Pastyme of People*, London, [c. 1529], f. Bi, London, The British Library, shelfnumber: C.15.c.6. Reproduced by permission of The British Library.



3. Woodcut portrait of Henry IV, cut for Rastell, *The Pastyme of People*, ed. F. Dibdin, London 1811.



4. Tomb-effigy head of Henry IV, Canterbury Cathedral.



5. Oil on panel portrait of Edward IV, perhaps c. 1529, Windsor Castle. Copyright Her Majesty The Queen. Reproduced by permission.



6. Woodcut portrait of Edward IV, Rastell, *The Pastyme of People*, London, [c.1529], f. Fii'. London, The British Library, shelfnumber: C.15.c.6. Reproduced by permission of The British Library.



7. Copper-plate engraving of Edward IV, assigned to the 1470s, in a printed Livy of 1472. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, shelfnumber: 2°L.impr.c.n.mss.39.



8. Copper-plate engraving of Richard III, T.T., A Booke, Containing the True Portraiture ... of the Kings of England ..., London 1597, f.Ei.iii, London, The British Library, shelfnumber: C.33.b.19. Reproduced by permission of The British Library.



9. Oil on panel portrait of Richard III, c. 1518-23, Windsor Castle. Copyright Her Majesty The Queen. Reproduced by permission.



10. Oil on panel portrait of Richard III, c. 1516-22, London, The Society of Antiquaries.



11. Woodcut portrait of Richard III, Rastell, *The Pastyme of People*, London, [c.1529], f.Gi, London, The British Library, shelfnumber: C.15.c.6. Reproduced by permission of The British Library.



12. Oil on panel portrait attributed to Joos van Cleve of Henry VIII, c.1536, Hampton Court. Copyright Her Majesty The Queen. Reproduced by permission.

the more evident. How was the king presented in Rastell's text? The entire text was based on Fabyan's 'Chronicle of England and France', first published in 1516 in London without the chronicler's name. Rastell either abridged Fabyan's work, or rewrote it, and on occasion he corrected it; for instance, Rastell denied that the Trojan Brute reached Britain to become progenitor of its people.²⁷ Fabyan had concluded his 'Chronicle' with the rule of Richard III presented as a cruel tyrant, and so did Rastell. This avoided dangers inherent in a continuation that might offend the Tudor monarchs and Tudor supporters; Henry VIII was known to be egotistical and easily offended. As previously indicated Rastell knew the king personally and was to name him as one of the executors of his will, dated 20 April 1536; no doubt this was in the desperate hope that, since he was dying in prison, the king's name might result in something of his estate being salvaged for his wife and family. Rastell also knew Wolsey apart from his work at Guisnes in 1520, which was under Wolsey's control. The latter's special commissions of *oyer et terminer* established to combat crime by enforcing existing law, sat in 1525 and 1526, reporting direct to the Star Chamber; both More and Rastell were among the commissioners.²⁸ Rastell's view of Richard III and his knowledge of King Henry VIII's character I believe to be crucial for understanding the woodcut portrait of Richard III.

In the woodcut portrait Richard III, uniquely without the Garter among those entitled to it, holds a broken sceptre, testimony of rule fractured by rebellion in consequence of his tyranny, just as narrated in Rastell's 'Chronicle'. The portrait in oils of the king by the so-called 'cast shadow workshop' assigned to the 1530s, depicts the monarch holding a broken sword (he died at Bosworth Field with 'sword in hand'), and its symbolism echoes that of the broken sceptre.²⁹ Richard's misrule was forcefully confirmed by Thomas More's 'Historia Richardi Regis Angliae eius nominis tertii', begun about 1513 and left unfinished some years later. This text was circulated in manuscript and Rastell, More's brother-in-law, came to own an autograph version of it. In it there is stressed the king's physical deformity, with his left shoulder higher than his right, and mention is made of his hard face, conforming to his mean and envious nature. There is no attempt in the woodcut to suggest any deformity, or to indicate hooded eyes, both features of the two earliest existing portraits of the monarch, namely that in the Royal Collection dated about 1518-23 (plate 9), and that assigned to about 1516-22 today in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries of London (plate 10). One can assume that there was a connection — even if only indirect — between More's description of the king's features and these two oil portrait paintings.³⁰ Neither More's history, nor the chronicles of Fabyan and of Rastell state Richard's age at the time of his death, which actually was thirty-three; Rastell clearly knew that he was the younger brother of both Edward IV and of the duke of Clarence, so not elderly at the time

of his death. Yet Richard's features in the woodcut are those of a rather elderly, care-worn man, even if his face, in part hidden by a full beard and moustache, does not suggest depravity. These features in no way conform to any of the early or subsequent bust portraits of Richard III, be they in oils or engraved, or to the contemporary full-length line drawing in pen and wash, and all of these show him clean shaven.³¹ Interestingly an early copper-plate engraving in the 1597 portrait-book, which became a model for later engravings, represents the monarch as very wrinkled and elderly (plate 8). This latter engraving appears to be related to a portrait attributed to the seventeenth century now in the Department of the Environment.³²

The significance of the imagined portrait of Edward V for this paper is that there was an obvious attempt to provide what was reasonable in terms of the supposed sitter's age and dress, and to conform to what was likely regarding his features. Rastell was a boy aged about eight when Edward IV died in 1483 and hence in 1529 Rastell could reasonably suppose that Edward IV, Edward V and Richard III would have been seen by some individuals consulting his *The Pastyme of People*.³³ Conformity to the tradition of printed portrait-books (which will be discussed shortly) required what were believed to be real-life features of kings, where these could be found, or at least a realistic representation, if a portrait did not exist, as has been seen to be the normal case with Rastell's woodcut portraits. Turning to Richard III, whose portrait was in the Royal Collection (supposedly the source for Rastell's woodcut portraits of Henry VI and of Edward IV), not only did Rastell provide an imaginative portrait, but one so unlike its subject in all respects that this striking discrepancy appears calculated.

In 1527 the printer Jean Bouchet published in his native Poitiers his *Les Anciennes et modernes Généalogies des Roys de France et mesmement du Roy Pharamond, avec leurs épitaphes et effigies*. Interspersed in a chronicle of French history were fifty-seven woodcut portraits of the series of French monarchs from Pharamond to Louis XII (died 1514); the features of the kings in this series of woodcuts were to become models for many of the representations in subsequent portrait-books, and Bouchet's volume became a best-seller.³⁴ The wealthier merchants of Coventry had a long association with the Wool Staple of Calais, a city which for a century and a half had been under English control; the city and the surrounding territory though 'English' remained French-speaking. Rastell knew the French language and resided perhaps continuously for two years in English-held France, as well as visiting it and French territory on various occasions. It is known that he acquired small 'secretary' type, probably produced in Rouen, for printing legal texts in French, and that he employed a French printer.³⁵ One can suppose that he was familiar with some books published in French on the Continent. My suggestion is that Rastell not only was aware of Bouchet's book, which first

appeared some two years prior to *The Pastyme of People*, but that it so impressed as to inspire his book, which it parallels in text and illustrations. The series of portraits of French monarchs in the French Royal Collection had been begun earlier than its English counterpart and was essentially complete. Bouchet's woodcut portraits, possibly based on this series, provided likenesses with some claim to be authentic from that of John the Good (1350-64).³⁶ There is no evidence that Rastell was aware of the French Royal Collection, but he was likely to have known that the woodcut portraits in Bouchet of the near-contemporary French kings were true-to-life. Accepting that Bouchet's work was Rastell's model, the enigma of the fictitious nature of Richard III's woodcut portrait is underscored.

Rastell was not without humour on the testimony of his punning title *The Pastyme of People*. More conspicuous, however, is his concern for accuracy, such as would be expected of a lawyer, reflected in his judicious corrections to Fabyan's 'Chronicle' incorporated into his own compilation.³⁷ The Royal Collection possessed a portrait of Richard III (plate 9), and x-ray recently has revealed that the latter's crookback and hooded eyes were an alteration made in the course of its painting, presumably to conform with the tradition regarding the monarch's appearance; this same tradition was recorded in More's history written at much the same time as the oil portrait was being painted.³⁸ Instead of accepting the two supposedly accurate testimonies of Richard III's features provided by his brother-in-law and by the Royal Collection's portrait, Rastell appears consciously to have chosen one entirely fictitious for his woodcut. Why was this?

There were obvious dangers in serving Henry VIII, as Wolsey became well aware in December 1530 when charged with offending against the Statute of Praemunire.³⁹ More, raised to the lord chancellorship following Wolsey's fall, was to be executed on the scaffold five years later. While there appears to have been a deterioration in the king's character in the late 1520s, already by about 1524 More had made it plain to his son-in-law, William Roper, that he had few illusions:⁴⁰

I find his grace [Henry VIII] my very good Lord indeed and I belleave he doth as singularly favor me as any subiecte within [this] realme. Howbeit, sonne Roper, I may tell thee I have no cawse to be proud thereof, for if my head [could] winne him a castle in France (for then was there warre between us [1523-1525]) it should not faile to goe.

More was never ardently pro-Tudor in his sympathies and the egotism of Henry VIII became ever more manifest from his accession to the throne in 1509, when More himself had first entered Parliament. More's *Utopia*, begun on his embassy to Flanders, where he was sent in May 1515 to renegotiate trade treaties, was published in 1516. In it More, as Hythloday, recognised that kings always ignored the advice of their councillors because they were satiated from youth with

corrupting ideas. More was to learn the truth of this observation from bitter experience in Henry VIII's service, but believed that he should try to prevail.⁴¹

It was More's fears of the monarch's tyrannical tendencies that diverted him to *Utopia* and away from completing his account of Richard III's reign. Certainly it is to be stressed that More believed this latter to be true history, and he was far from writing pro-Tudor propaganda. His intention in the work — and echoed with a lighter but still disguised touch in *Utopia* — was to indicate to a ruler, who was genuinely concerned to govern in the best interests of his subjects, the consequences of tyranny and how to avoid them. Seemingly over the years 1513 to 1515, when More was working on the history, he came to consider that the work might not influence the monarch for the good — presumably Henry VIII was to be the recipient — merely reveal how the ruler could avoid those mistakes that had brought Richard III's downfall.⁴² More's history, as Mackie put it, was 'an attack upon the *Realpolitik* practised by the princes of his day'. The work parallels Machiavelli's *Prince*, likewise written between 1513 and 1516 with the disguised objective of persuading a prince to rule as a 'civil' prince. Machiavelli actually presented his treatise to Lorenzo de' Medici and within two decades his work was misunderstood by his Florentine contemporaries, who thought that the author's aim was to teach the Medici how to become tyrants. By not finishing and presenting his history More at least avoided this.⁴³

Rastell was on intimate terms with his brother-in-law certainly until 1530, and likely to have known why More's *Richard III* was abandoned in favour of *Utopia*. He knew King Henry VIII and was aware that he governed increasingly in his own interests to the detriment of those of his subjects. In 1529 Rastell became member for a Cornish borough in what is known as the Reformation Parliament, and he was to show himself to be a man of strong religious conviction and a man of principle: his imprisonment in 1535 over the Royal Proclamation regarding tithes seems evidence of this latter.⁴⁴ My suggestion is that the woodcut portrait of Richard III published in Rastell's *The Pastyme of People* of 1529 represents none other than Henry VIII (plate 12), somewhat humorously disguised as in old age. The broken sceptre predicted that Henry VIII's rule would end in rebellion, as had Richard III's, and was not so wide of the mark. The woodcut was sufficiently discreet to make it hard to prove that Henry was actually intended, yet likely to be so interpreted by those opposed to the king's rule.

In 1530 after an exchange which included comic verse, the young Protestant John Frith converted Rastell to the reformed faith; apparently Rastell was also impressed by Frith's good humour and sense of fun in debate, which reflects on Rastell himself.⁴⁵ Thereafter Rastell became an agent of Thomas Cromwell, presumably seeing him as likely to promote the Protestant faith, while also curbing the monarch's tyrannical tendencies. Evidence of this is Rastell's draft 'Book of

the Charge', which he petitioned Cromwell to be allowed to print as issued from the king; it was to be sent to all judges and officials of legal courts so that they would learn 'the true faith and ... have no confidence in the pope nor his laws'. As Rastell became ever more radical in his religious views he looked to Cromwell for a privilege to publish treatises such as one which would prove that priests should be allowed to marry. Rastell's fervour was evident in an undated letter that he wrote to Cromwell shortly before he went to prison, where he died on 25 June 1536:⁴⁶

Syr, I am an old man, I loke not to lyf long, and I regard ryches as much as I do chyppes save only to have a lyffing to lyff out of aet. And I care as mych for wordly honor as I care for the flying of a fether in the wind.

Like Thomas More, Rastell was unwilling to bow before what he deemed to be tyranny, and chose to die in prison rather than do so.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

* I am indebted to the Leverhulme Trust for a Research Grant that enabled me to consult printed portrait-books in Continental libraries during the academic year 1995-96, and to the University of Liverpool for granting me research leave. This article would not have been possible without that research.

Professor Sydney Anglo most kindly read an earlier version of this article and made detailed suggestions for its improvement. These have been incorporated and I am much indebted to him.

1. For printed portrait-books see C.H. Clough, 'Italian Renaissance Portraiture and Printed Portrait-Books', in *The Italian Book, 1465-1800, Studies Presented to D.E. Rhodes on his 70th Birthday*, ed. D.V. Reidy, London 1993, pp. 183-233.
2. For a bibliographical description see the text below note 11. A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave, *A Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*, rev. ed. W.A. Jackson, F.S. Ferguson and K.F. Pantzer, 3 vols., London, 1976-1991, vol. 2 (1976), p. 266, no. 20724 indicates its printing as: [1530?], as does *The British Library General Catalogue of Printed Books to 1975*, vol. 270 (1985), p. 438; *The National Union Catalog Pre-1956 Imprints*, vol. 481 (1976), p. 669, card 0065060, gives: [1529?], which I accept as more likely.
3. E.G.D[uff], 'RASTELL, John', in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 47, London 1896, pp. 304-05 is extensively revised by the following: A.W. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama*, London, 1926, chapter 1, 'John Rastell, printer, lawyer, venturer, dramatist and controversialist', pp. 1-28 and eight appendices, pp. 187-233; S. Anglo, 'Le Camp du Drap d'Or...', in *Fêtes et Cérémonies au temps de Charles Quint Les Fêtes de la Renaissance*, 2, Paris 1960, pp. 130-31, 134; A. Hyatt King, 'Rastell Reunited', in *Essays in Honour of Victor Scholderer*, ed. D.E. Rhodes, Mainz 1970, pp. 213-18; A. Hyatt King, 'The significance of John Rastell in early music printing', *The Library*, series v, vol. 26 (1971), pp. 197-214. Anthony Wood who assigned Rastell to Oxford appears to have conflated him with another John Rastell, a M.A. of Oxford in 1457, who died in 1472, see A.B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1957-1959, vol. 3), p. 1548.

4. For his marriage by 1504 see Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), p. 2; More visited Rastell and his wife in Coventry in 1506, see *ibid.*, pp. 2-3; for the birth of William Rastell in 1508 see *ibid.*, p. 18. For Coventry's decline see C. Pythian-Adams, *Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages*, Cambridge 1979, pp. 33-258.
The earliest known book printed by Rastell is: (I Edw. V and I Ric. III), *Incipit annus primus E. quinti (Incipit annus primus Ricardi tertij)*, in fol., for which see Pollard and Redgrave, *A Short-title Catalogue...* (see n. 2), vol. 1 (1986), p. 445 no. 9895, indicated as printed: [1509?]. For the printing of Pico's *Lyfe...*, see *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 236 no. 19897, indicated as printed: [1510?]; there are copies in London, British Library, shelfnumber C.33.e.41 and 276.c.27; the colophon at p. [78] states it printed by Rastell at the Abbot of Winchcombe's Place, Fleetbridge (St. Bride's), London. *The British Library General Catalogue* (see n. 2), vol. 324 (1986), p. 240, also indicates it as printed: [1510?]. For a space left in the text, which perhaps implies More did not see it to correct, see Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), p. 8 n.1. For the range of Rastell's printings see Pollard and Redgrave, vol. 2, under 'RASTELL, John', p. 265 no. 20700.3 to p. 266 no. 20744; vol. 3, p. 142 indicates him printing from 1509 to 1535. See also *The British Library General Catalogue ...*, vol. 270, under 'RASTELL, John', at pp. 437-9; an analysis of their subjects is given by Hyatt King, 'The significance of John Rastell ...' (see n. 3), p. 202.
5. For Rastell's play: *A new Interlude and a mery of the Nature of the IIII Elements*, printed by him, undated, but assigned to 1519 and known in a unique copy, see Hyatt King, 'Rastell Revisited' (see n. 3), pp. 213-18 and the sources indicated there. For the stage built in 1524 and Rastell's involvement with the theatre see Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), pp. 16-17, and 'Pleadings in Rastell v. Walton: a Theatrical Lawsuit, temp. Henry VIII', ed. [H.R. Plomer], reprinted in A.W. Pollard, *An English Garner: Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse*, Westminster 1903, pp. 305-21. For Rastell's participation in pageants see S. Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry and early Tudor Policy*, Oxford, rev. ed., 1996, pp. 165-66, 188-89, 196-97, Reed, pp. 5, 14, 19, 104-17, also for that of 1522 see J. Robertson, 'L'entrée de Charles Quint à Londres en 1522', in *Fêtes et Cérémonies ...* (see n. 3), pp. 176-77, and for that at the opening of the theatre at Greenwich see Anglo, 'Le Camp du Drap d'Or...', in *ibid.*, p. 134. For Rastell's artistic work see Reed, pp. 13-14, 17-20, Hyatt King, 'The Significance of John Rastell...' (see n. 3), p. 201; for his work at Guisnes see Joycelyne G. Russell, *The Field of Cloth of Gold*, London 1969, pp. 32-47, and for it likely that he assisted with the Round House, Calais, see Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 166; for his decoration of the theatre at Greenwich see Anglo, 'Le Camp du Drap d'Or ...', p. 134 (correcting p. 130 and Rastell's supposed decoration of the Banqueting Hall, Greenwich); see also Anglo, *Spectacle*, pp. 217-18, 221-22.
6. For the decoration of a room with a series of portraits of scholars and famous men, and the tradition, see C.H. Clough, 'Art as Power in the Decoration of the Study of an Italian Renaissance Prince: The Case of Federico da Montefeltro', in *Artibus et Historiae*, vol. 31, Vienna 1995, pp. 19-50.
7. For such a collection of prints cf. J. Bindley, *The Bindley Granger. A Catalogue of the very valuable collection of British Portraits from the reign of Egbert to the present day ... which will be sold at auction by Mr Sotheby* (Auction: part 1, 25 January 1819 and 10 following days; part 2, 8 May and seven following days; part 3, 15 July and 2 following days), London 1819.
8. The copies, with those known to me to be significantly incomplete indicated as (I), are: Glasgow, University Library; London, British Library, shelfnumbers C.15.c.6 and G.6030 (I, lacks Gi of second portion); Manchester, John Rylands University of Manchester Library, copy of John Forde, shelfnumber 9848 (repaired, with missing parts of some leaves completed in ink, Gii colophon mounted); Oxford, Bodleian Library (I); San Marino, California, Huntington Library (I, both copies), Warminster, Longleat; Washington, D.C., Folger Shakespeare Library; Washington, D.C., Library of Congress (I, lacks Ei, Evi of first portion).
9. Pollard and Redgrave, *A Short-title Catalogue* (see n. 2), vol. 2, p. 266 no. 20724, which indicates it as in the Library of Congress copy, though not as a separate sheet; that it was an additional separate sheet in 1917 is indicated by its then owner, H.C. Levis, *Notes on the Early British Engraved Royal Portraits issued in various series from 1521 [sic for 1529] to the end of the eighteenth century*, London, 100 copies, privately printed, 1917, p. 13, and reproduced p. 14 as plate 7.

10. West's own note concerning the copy is in the front of it, British Library, shelfnumber C.15.c.6. There is a copy of Dibdin's edition in the British Library, shelfnumber 599.i.18, and one of 10 copies on special paper, shelfnumber G.6031. Each of the facsimile sheets of 1926 reproduces two leaves of the original — a verso and the facing recto — the 69 leaves being mounted on 35 boards, issued in the Association's 'Collection of Photographic Facsimiles' no. 51, of which there is a copy in the Library of Congress, see *The National Library Catalog* (see n. 2), vol. 481, p. 669 card 0065062.
11. The information is in the copy itself.
12. For the trial titlepage see the text below note 8.
13. London 1874, p. 332, under 'RASTELL, John'; an edition with the same title, rev. F.M.R., London 1878, p. 348, for Rastell, is as the first edition.
14. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), Appendix IV, 'The Pastyme of People', pp. 211-16 at p. 211.
15. Cf. Levis, *Notes on the Early British Engraved Royal Portraits...* (see n. 9), p. 23.
16. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), plate facing p. 212, where the woodcut of William I is paralleled with the stained-glass which represents him in the window.
17. B. Poole, *Coventry: Its History and Antiquities*, London 1870, pp. 114-29, for St Mary's Hall; for the north window see p. 114. The nine portraits (perhaps echoing the 'Nine Worthies') in order are: William I, Richard I, Henry V, Henry VI, Emperor Constantine, King Arthur, Henry III, Henry VI, and one unnamed.
18. Rastell's woodcut portraits conform to what was known of the fashion for beards and for being clean shaven, cf. R. Reynolds, *Beards: An 'Omnium Gatherum'*, London 1950; Richard I specially grew a beard (p. 161), beards were worn by Henry III (pp. 160-61), Edward II (p. 161), Edward III (p. 163); by the late fourteenth century the beard was in decline, those of Richard II and Henry IV being token, while Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV, Richard III and Henry VII, were all clean shaven (pp. 163-66, 179); with the beards of Henry VIII and Francis I the fashion for them began again (pp. 216, 214). For facial features supposedly reflecting inner character see Clough, 'Italian Renaissance Portraiture and Printed Portrait-books' (see n. 1) pp. 184-5, 195-6; F. Haskell, *History and its Images*, New Haven 1993, pp. 60-67; cf. also Jane F. Gardner, *Leadership and the Cult of Personality*, London 1974. For the French portrait-book of 1527 see the text below n. 34. For Rastell's printing of statutes see the text below n. 3.
- Legal hereditary succession as 'guardian of the crown' was a fundamental concept of undying royal authority in the later middle ages. Dynastic portraits were visual symbols of that concept; cf. E.H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, Princeton, N.J., 1957, pp. 419-37 covering tomb-effigies, though not dynastic portraits, and see also P. Strohm, 'The Trouble with Richard: The Reburial of Richard II and Lancastrian Symbolic Strategy', *Speculum*, vol. 71 (1996), pp. 87-111, particularly p. 110 and n. 90 for other references.
- The description of the Great Hall, Richmond Palace, from London, College of Arms, MS Ist M. 13 (part iii), f. 62v, printed in *The Recept of the Ladie Kateryne*, ed. G. Kipling, Early English Text Society, 296, Oxford 1990, p. 72; for it being written in 1503 see the text at that page 'unto this now the xviiijth yere of his [Henry VII's] reigne', and cf. 'Introduction', pp. xxxi, xlii-iii. S. Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship*, London 1992, p. 116 writes that the pictures appear to have been sculpted figures, for 'the parliamentary surveys (sic) tells us that the hall was "adorned with eleven statues, in the sides thereof"'. The Parliamentary Survey of 1649, the source, is quoted in H.M. Colvin and J. Summerson, 'The King's Houses, 1485-1660', in *The History of the King's Works*, gen. ed. H.M. Colvin, vol. 4, part ii, London 1982, p. 227; there was a fire in the Great Hall in 1506, which necessitated rebuilding (p. 224). I am unconvinced that the numerous 'pictures' of 1503 are to be conflated with the eleven statues of 1649.
19. For the stone statues of Westminster Hall see *The History of the King's Works* (see n. 18), I (1963), p. 528, plate 23, L. Stone, *Sculpture in Britain in the Middle Ages*, Harmondsworth 1955, p. 194, plate 153B, N. Pevsner, *London, I: The Cities of London and Westminster*, The Buildings of England, rev. 3rd ed. B. Cherry, Harmondsworth 1973, p. 531; for the stone statues of Canterbury Cathedral's screen see Stone, p. 204, plate 153A.

For the 1542 inventory (where, for instance, the existing portrait of Elizabeth Woodville in the

Royal Collection is listed) see F. Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets*, Woodbridge 1986, p. 8. For the group of three painted in the same studio see *The Queen's Pictures*, Exhibition Catalogue, The Queen's Gallery, Buckingham Palace, London 1977, p. 5 item 2, and for the date c. 1518-23 see Hepburn, p. 9; also for Richard III's portrait see the text below n. 27. For Edward IV's portrait in the 1542 inventory, which tree-ring dating suggests as c. 1534-40, see Hepburn, p. 9.

The origins of the English Royal Collection of dynastic portraits are considered by Hepburn, pp. 2-7; the portraits of Richard II and his contribution to court patronage are also indicated in D. Gordon, *Making and Meaning: The Wilton Diptych*, Exhibition Catalogue, National Gallery, London 1993, plates at pp. 23, 24, 30, 40 and C.M. Barron, 'Richard II: Image and Reality', in the catalogue, pp. 18-19. For Henry VIII's interest in portraits of himself see particularly R. Strong, *Holbein and Henry VIII*, London 1967. Over the century from 1542 the collection grew considerably, as by the end of Charles I's reign there were 73 pictures, mainly portraits of deceased royalty, in the Privy Gallery of the Palace of Whitehall, see F. Haskell, 'Charles I's Collection of Pictures', in *The Late King's Goods*, ed. A. MacGregory, London 1989, p. 204.

For Francis I's enthusiasm from the very start of his reign to form a collection, which included portraits of the French ruling dynasties, see J. Cox-Rearick, *La collection de François I^{er}*, Exhibition Catalogue, Louvre, Paris 1972, p. 7. As in England, panel portraits of the French kings, where possible, were taken from tomb-effigies (cf. n. 21 below); French portrait-books of French monarchs (as appears to parallel the case with Rastell's woodcuts) drew either directly on tomb-effigies for the earlier kings' portraits, or on miniatures in manuscripts (for which see A.D. Hedeman, *The Royal Image. Illustrations of the 'Grandes Chroniques de France', 1276-1422*, Berkeley 1991), and on panel portraits in the French Royal Collection for the later kings; for problems in providing portraits of the earlier French kings for French portrait-books see Haskell, *History and its Images* (see n. 18), pp. 53-56, and see also n. 34 below.

20. Illustrations of great seals are in Alfred B. Wyan and Allan Wyan, *The Great Seals of England from the earliest period to the present day ...*, London 1887, plates IX-XVI for the monarchs from Edward III to Richard III inclusive. Tomb-effigies are an important but complicated consideration. Those of Henry II (clean shaven) and of Richard I (bearded) appear realistic, but it is uncertain if they were carved from the corpse as it lay in state. The extent to which the effigies of John (Worcester Cathedral), Henry III (Westminster Abbey) and Edward II (Gloucester Cathedral) authentically reproduced facial characteristics is uncertain. The effigy of Edward III (Westminster Abbey) is generally thought likely to be a true-likeness. The woodcut portraits in Rastell's book in terms particularly of facial hair have some resemblance to the tomb-effigies of John, of Henry III and of Edward III, while those of Henry II, of Richard I and of Edward II are dissimilar. This indicates that the tomb-effigies for at least some of these monarchs were not the direct source. For the nature of tomb-effigies of the English and of the French kings of this period see Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (see n. 19), pp. 2-3; for reproductions of the English tomb-effigies see R. Ormond, *The Face of Monarchy: British Royalty Portrayed*, Oxford 1977, plates 11-9, 22-6.
21. For a comparison of the facial hair of the tomb-effigies with that of the woodcut portraits in Rastell's book see note 20. For Henry IV see R. Strong, *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits: National Portrait Gallery*, 2 vols., London 1969, vol. 1, pp. 141-43, vol. 2, plates 275-76; as Strong indicates, it appears evident that the dress of Henry IV's portrait was taken from that of Charles VI of France in the series of engraved portraits of French monarchs, first published by Bouchet in 1527 (see n. 34 below); the woodcut of the 1553 printing is reproduced by Strong, vol. 2, plate 276. The face seems to me to derive from Henry IV's tomb-effigy in Canterbury Cathedral (though Strong, vol. 1, p. 142, claims that it bears no relations whatsoever to it); for the face of the effigy see Ormond, *The Face of Monarchy* (see n. 20), plate 29.
22. For the portrait of Henry V in the Royal Collection see Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (see n. 19), pp. 27-40 and plate 22. For an engraved portrait of John, Duke of Bedford, with a hooked nose, by G. Vertue, see S. Stebbing, *A Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England, and Monarchs of Great Britain etc. From the Conquest, Anno 1066 to the Year 1707*, London 1707, facing p. 313, where the source is indicated as 'From a Curious Limning in a (MS) rich Prayerbook presented by himself to K. Hen. 6 now in the Possession of the Earl of Oxford'.

23. For the panel in the Royal Collection see Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (see n. 19), pp. 60-67 and plate 47, and for other portraits see particularly p. 60 n. 22 and plates 48, 53; P. Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, Exhibition Catalogue, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2nd ed. rev., 1977, pp. 82-83 P8 and plate 40 (Royal Collection) and for others see pp. 89 P30, 93-4 P45 and plate 42. The copper-plate engraving is in Livy, *Epitoma decadum quattuordecim ... historici in centum et quadraginta libros distinctum* ..., 2 vols., Rome, C. Swenheyn and A. Pannartz, 1472, in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, shelfnumber 2^oL. impr. c.n. mss. 39. The book belonged to Dr Hartmann Schedel, whose handwriting is on the engraving. This latter has been assigned to the Master 'BR' and dated to the 1470s; obviously it is prior to Schedel's death in 1514, see F. Anzelewsky, 'An Unidentified Portrait of King Edward IV', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 109 (1967), pp. 702-5 and plate 63, where it is suggested that the engraving was from a lost portrait in oils (known from its copy in the Royal Collection) by a Netherlandish painter, 1470-71, painted when Edward IV was in exile in the Low Countries; see also Hepburn, pp. 60-2 and plate 49 and Tudor-Craig, pp. 82-3 P8 and plate 41.
24. For an example of the crown painted above Edward V's head shortly after his death — that in St George's Chapel, Windsor — see the text below n. 25.
25. For the portraits in the Royal Collection by 1542 see the text below note 18; for Edward V's portrait see Tudor-Craig, *Richard III* (see n. 23), p. 89 P32: where it is stated the portrait of Edward V '... Perhaps derived from a full-face portrait of Edward VI, Dr Strong's Type D. 1546-47, prime example in the Royal Collection', and citing Strong, *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits* (see n. 21), vol. 1, p. 92, vol. 2, plate 171 (not 71, as in Tudor-Craig). Tudor-Craig adds: 'No portrait of Edward V is recorded in the Royal Inventories, and Vertue, with admirable scholarship, took his portrait of him from the [MS] "Dictes des Philosophes" at Lambeth (no. 66)', cf. the Vertue engraving in Stebbing, *A Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England* (see n. 22), facing p. 425.
26. A.J. Pollard, *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower*, Stroud 1991, at pp. 114-15 provides plates (inadequate in both size and quality) of all these representations of Edward V. For the Lambeth Palace MS see n. 25 above.
27. Anon. [R. Fabian (d.1513)]. [*The Chronicles*], [London], R. Poynton, 1516, copy in the British Library, shelfnumber G6014, and see Pollard and Redgrave, *A Short-title Catalogue* (see n. 2), vol. 3, p. 476 no. 10659. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), pp. 211-16 for Rastell's editing of the work, and p. 211 for Brute and Albion; cf. G.S. Gordon, *The Discipline of Letters*, Oxford 1946, pp. 35-58, entitled: 'The Trojans in Britain'.
28. For Rastell's will see Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), p. 26; for him as a commissioner see J.A. Guy, *The Public Career of Sir Thomas More*, Brighton 1980, p. 14.
29. Tudor-Craig, *Richard III* (see n. 23), pp. 90-91 P40; Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (see n. 19), pp. 86-87 and plate 60.
30. St Thomas More, *The Complete Works*, The Yale Edition, New Haven, 1963-in progress, vol. 2 (1963), *The History of King Richard III*, ed. R.S. Sylvester, editor's 'Introduction', for the date 1513 see pp. lxiii, lxxx, and for subsequent work on it, p. xx; for its circulation in manuscript, see p. ciii; for William Rastell's translation, see pp. xviii no. v, xxix, xlviii and l-liv. For Richard III's appearance and deformity, see p. 7; for this work as 'history' rather than satire, see the text below note 41. For the portraits: Tudor-Craig, *Richard III* (see n. 23), p. 93 P44, plate 26 and p.92 P44, plate 25, respectively; Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (see n. 19), pp. 79-81, plate 54, pp. 78-87, plate 55, respectively; cf. Strong, *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits* (see n. 21), vol. 1, p. 262, vol. 2, plates 515-7; see also n. 38 below.
31. For subsequent oil portraits see Tudor-Craig, *Richard III* (see n. 23), p. 81 P1, P2, P3; p. 82 P6; p. 84 P10, P11, P12; p. 86 P18; p. 88 P24; p.89 P33; p. 94 P46, P47, and see plates 27-39; see also Strong, *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits* (see n. 21), vol. 1, pp. 262-4, vol. 2, plate 516. For a copper-plate engraving see n. 32 below; for a full-length line drawing portrait of Richard III in pen and wash (probably to be dated between September 1483 and April 1484) in the English version of the Rous Roll, see J. Rous, *The Rous Roll*, introduction by C. Ross, Gloucester 1980, unpaginated, no. 63, and for its date see p. vi; for the Latin version, where the portrait has been eliminated by Rous, see p. xvii.

32. T. T[imms or Twyne], *A Booke, Containing the True Portraiture of the Countenances and attires of the Kings of England, from William Conqueror, unto our Soueraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth now reigning: together with a Briefe report of some of the principall acts of the same Kings ...*, London, John de Beauchesne, 1597, very rare, a copy is in the British Library, shelfnumber C33.b.19, f.Eiij for the engraving of Richard III. For an oil portrait of the same period depicting Richard III as elderly see Tudor-Craig, *Richard III* (see n. 23), p. 89 P33; the portrait is owned by the Marquis of Bath, Longleat: 'in this portrait [which is not illustrated] Richard II looks one of the oldest [in the series of royal portraits]. His is the only deeply lined face ...'.
33. For Rastell's birth, judged to be in 1475, see Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), p. 1.
34. No author is indicated, but the work is assigned to its printer; there is an extensive text with 57 woodcut portraits of the French monarchs from Pharamond to Louis XII inclusive. The dominant text, and the fact that the ruling dynasty is not covered by it or represented by the woodcut portraits, are features common to this publication of Bouchet and to Rastell's *The Pastyme of People*. There is a copy in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, shelfnumber Rés.Lⁿ.2. It was reprinted with changes to the frames of the portraits (probably necessitated by wear) and some portraits were differently assigned (perhaps in error): in 1529, Rés.Lmⁿ.1482; in 1531, Rés.Lⁿ.2.A. (lacks ai-aii) and British Library, 596.b.11 (imperfect); in 1535, Rés.Lⁿ.2.F.; in 1536, Rés.Lⁿ.2.B; in 1537, Rés.Lⁿ.2.D and British Library, 9917.aaa.11; in 1541, Lⁿ.2.E (sic) (imperfect); in 1545, Lⁿ.3, and British Library, 136.b.8 (imperfect). The portraits were recut with Francis I added and the text reduced to information in the captions (thus producing a typical portrait-book): *Epitome gestorum LVIII regum Franciae ab Pharamondo ad hunc usque Christianissimum Franciscum Valesium*, Lyons, B. Arnoullet, 1546, Rés.8°L37.71, and British Library, 596.6.17(1) (imperfect); reprinted the same year with the captions in both Latin and French, Rés.Lⁿ.71A. The Latin version was reprinted as *Regum Francorum imagines*, Lyons, 1554, British Library, 1319.1.1, and the French version as *Cronique abrégé ...*, Paris, 1555, Paris, Arsenal, hist.5078. Thereafter editions proliferated, notably being printed by Guillaume Le Noir, Paris, commencing in 1566, and by François Desprez, Paris, no date, [probably 1567, British Library as 1564?]. The woodcut or metal engravings of the portraits from John the Good to the last monarch furnished in the series of these above, and subsequent printings, derived from supposedly true-to-life images, and for the availability of the portraits that served as the source see Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (see n. 19), pp. 4-5. For the portrait of Charles VI of France, see: 1527, Bouchet, f. cxxxvi; 1546, Arnoullet, f. Hiv; [1567?], Desprez, f. 53^v.
35. The wealthier merchants of Coventry were of the Wool Staple of Calais, and it is not unlikely Rastell learnt French in Coventry as a boy, cf. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), p. 6. For Rastell residing in France and visiting there, see Reed, pp. 7-8 (1512-14), 13 (1520), Hyatt King, 'The significance of John Rastell...' (see n. 3), p. 201 (1523-25), Reed, p. 21 (1529-30); sometime in 1515-16 Rastell visited France, probably Rouen, for type, see Hyatt King, p. 201. For his books in legal French and his use of French type see also Reed, p. 8; woodblocks that appear French in origin are indicated in the text below note 14; for his use of music type from France or the Low Countries see Hyatt King, p. 213. For the French printer Guérin in Rastell's service see *ibid.*, p. 203.
36. See n. 34 above.
37. For the corrections see the text below n. 26.
38. For the portrait of Edward IV in the Royal Collection see the text below note 22, and see also n. 23; for that of Richard III see the text below n. 28 and also nn. 29 and 31. Tudor-Craig, *Richard III* (see n. 23), p. 93 P44, referring to the latter portrait, wrote: 'The x-ray taken of this picture for the preparation of the catalogue revealed an alteration in the outline of the king's right shoulder; as originally drawn, it was lower than at present. The earlier silhouette is visible to the eye. The difference is enough to give that hint of deformity which is carried through in all versions of this type. The underlying layers of paint also show that the eye was first drawn in a less slit-like fashion. If panel dating allows, it is arguable that the picture in its original condition was of the time of Richard III. Alterations consistent with Tudor propaganda could have been made at any time from 1486 onwards. Since the picture was not painted before 1485, it is hard to see why these features were not incorporated from the beginning'. I do not

follow this. My conclusion, on the basis of the attributed date of the panel, c. 1518-23, is that the portrait was taken from a previous one without the deformity, but that the patron required adjustments to include it. Since the panel so altered was for the Royal Collection one can suppose the modifications were a consequence of Tudor propaganda. Strong, *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits* (see n. 21), vol. 1, p. 263, referring to the portrait of Richard III in the National Portrait Gallery (no. 148), relates it to that in the Royal Collection, mentioning also (p. 264): 'An early portrait of a man bearing a broken sword in the possession of the Society of Antiquities may be hostile early Tudor representation of him (in x-ray it reveals a hump-back) to be published in Dr P. Tudor-Craig's catalogue of the Antiquaries pictures'. This is confirmed by Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, pp. 90-91 P40. Accordingly there is the significant testimony of two earlier independent portraits of Richard III, where there was no deformity, but which on being copied were altered to conform to Tudor propaganda regarding the deformity. The tradition of this deformity was current by about 1513 on the testimony of More's *History*, see the text below n. 29 and also n. 42 below.

39. E.W. Ives, 'The Fall of Wolsey', in *Cardinal Wolsey. Church, State and Art*, ed. S.J. Gunn and P.G. Lindley, Cambridge 1991, pp. 292-97.
40. W. Roper, *The Lyfe of Sir Thomas More*, ed. E.V. Hitchcock, Early English Text Society, 197, London 1936, p. 21; for More's execution, 6 July 1535, see *ibid.*, pp. 102-3.
41. For More's career, his presumed motives in taking royal service, and his objective in writing *Utopia*, see Guy, *The Public Career of Sir Thomas More* (see n. 28), pp. 6-11; cf. also K. Kautsky, *Thomas More and his Utopia*, London 1927, pp. 129-40.
42. For the date of composition of More's *History*, its sources, the author's intentions in writing and his fear that the work might be misunderstood, see Sylvester, 'Introduction' to More, *The History of King Richard III* (see n. 30), pp. lxiii, lxxviii-lxxx, c-civ; Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (see n. 19), pp. 83-87, also places More's *History* into its historical context, but in contrast to Sylvester suggests the work was intended either as a moral treatise, or perhaps was a parody of Polydore Vergil's humanistic history that covered Richard III's reign.
43. J.D. Mackie, *The Earlier Tudors*, Oxford 1952, p. 258. C.H. Clough, 'Niccolò Machiavelli's Political Assumptions and Objectives', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. 53 (1970), pp. 30-74.
44. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), pp. 21, 26.
45. The portrait chosen to illustrate this point is that attributed to Joos van Cleve (otherwise Joos van der Beke, c. 1485-c. 1541), probably of 1536, Hampton Court, Royal Collection no. 563, see M.J. Friedländer, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 14 vols., Leiden, rev.ed., 1967-1976, vol. 9, part i (1972), with notes by H. Panwels and M. Gierts, pp. 33, 35, 66 and plate 91. For Rastell's debate with Frith see Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), pp. 21-22; for Cromwell's concern to protect legal and representative institutions from royal interference see A.G. Dickens, *Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation*, London 1959, particularly pp. 74-89.
46. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (see n. 3), pp. 24-26 for Rastell in 1534 seeking to interest Cromwell in the publication of his 'Book of the Charge', and also seeking privileges from him to publish religious treatises; for the letter (without a source) see p. 24; for his death in prison see p. 26.