On New Year’s Day, 1567, Queen Elizabeth received a lavish pedigree book from Robert Cooke, Clarenceux King of Arms (London, British Library, King’s MS 396). A large volume, it comprises three sections: the first contains the dedication to the queen, along with abstracts summarizing the descent of titles to her (fols. 1v–3v); the second (figure 5), which encompasses the bulk of the manuscript, is an illuminated genealogy from Rollo to Elizabeth herself (fols. 4v–27v); the final section is a proof of the queen’s claim to Scotland (fols. 28v–29v). This book has never been acknowledged beyond a brief mention in an exhibition catalog published over three decades ago. To a degree, the neglect is understandable because of the formal discrepancies between this manuscript and its generic precedents. In other words, it looks very little like traditional genealogies or pedigrees. And because Elizabeth’s pedigree book refuses to speak in the dialect of similar works made for her predecessors, it is illegible within the genre of which it declares itself a member.

In 1992, Norman Bryson invoked Jonathan Culler’s proclamation that “context is not given but produced.” Bryson’s statement was a call for art historians to recognize the artifice of context, a construct traditionally treated as a natural entity. Since that time, most art historians have assimilated this idea. Still, when we assemble our materials we operate within the entrenched infrastructure of a discipline founded on formalism, and often under the assumption that
our objects must "do" with one another in form, must somehow be bound by iconography, genre, the hand of the artist, and so forth.\(^7\) Against the grain of this habit, this chapter will advocate the value of treading the ligature that joins disparate material.

To this end, I would like to start again.

**On New Year's Day, 1567, Queen Elizabeth received 170 gifts from numerous people close to the court.**\(^8\) Following procedure, Elizabeth delegated the gifts for safekeeping to a number of household employees.\(^9\) However, in this year she kept three gifts with herself: the first, the lavish illuminated pedigree book, described as "By Roberte Cooke al[ia]s Chester A Booke of Armes of the Quenis Ma[ies]ties progenitors Tytte to the Crowne of Englande and Fraunce . . . with the Quene",\(^10\) the second, a chessboard in a box of ivory given by William Drury;\(^11\) and the third, a glass of sweet water and instruments for the teeth given by the Italian author, illuminator, and aspiring diplomat Petruccio Ubaldini.\(^12\) According to Jane Lawson, "although Elizabeth did not supervise the delivery of New
Year’s gifts . . . she certainly reviewed them . . . Gifts that caught the Queen’s eye remained ‘with the Queen’.

Using the queen’s pleasure as pretext, this essay demonstrates how dental instruments can tell us something about what this unusual pedigree book is attempting to achieve. My argument is that when seen from an oblique angle and under the raking shadow cast by toothpicks, this manuscript emerges as an advocate for alternatives to the figural representations that Elizabeth used to distribute her presence.

The Toothpick as an Instrument of Statecraft

What exactly were these instruments for the teeth, and why would the queen keep them with herself, particularly when other items of personal care were delegated to others? Although none of Elizabeth’s dental instruments survives, a near-contemporary set in the Wellcome Collection gives an idea of how it might have looked (figure 6). This set was produced for an unknown descendant of Nicholas Brown, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, and comprises a small chest covered with embroidery that features the owner’s arms. Fitted inside are four silver descalers for removing plaque and other deposits, which accord well with the advice of Thomas Raynalde, who in his 1565 publication, The Womans Booke, recommends that, “To kepe and preserue the teeth cleane . . . yf they be very yelowe and filthy, or blackish, let a Barber scour, rube, and pycke them cleane and whyte.”

Over the 24 years for which New Year’s Gift Rolls survive, the queen received gifts relating to dental hygiene 22 times, and Ubaldini’s was the first. These gifts run the gamut from humble toothcloths of “corse holland” to the bijou described as a “Touthe picke of golde the top beinge garneshid with a faire emeraude, a Dyamond & Ruby & other smale Dyamondes and Rubies with ij perles pendaunt.” (See Appendix A for a list of all known gifts of dental hygiene presented to the queen.) Nicholas Penny has observed how such elaborate picks suspended from chains feature in sixteenth-century Italian portraiture as signs of conscientious hygiene.

However, no known portrait displays the queen with a pendant pick.

Elizabeth’s waning beauty and her rotting teeth feature routinely in traditional biographies, while scholars since the 1990s have taken a critical approach to accounts of her encroaching decrepitude. My own concern in the queen’s dental instruments has less to do with the currency of royal representation than with the bodily contingencies that underwrote its checks. A case in point occurred in the same year that Elizabeth received the first gift of dental instruments on record,
when she met with Guzmán de Silva, ambassador to Spain. According to a dispatch to the secretary of state, written on December 29, 1567, "[t]he most serene Queen came here on the xxiii\textsuperscript{rd} of this (month) with her health, although she hadn't had it three or four days before, owing to a toothache and a fever that lasted, according to what I've been told, forty hours, which exhausted her.\textsuperscript{720} This episode is important. It indicates that it was the state of the queen's teeth which jeopardized her ability to conduct affairs of state. After a far more famous meeting from 1597, the French ambassador De Maisse offered the—now
oft-quoted—comment that, "her teeth are very yellow and unequal... and on the left side less than on the right. Many of them are missing so that one cannot understand her easily when she speaks quickly." Once again, defects of the teeth impinged on the use of her mouth.

Her mouth was, arguably, Elizabeth's most potent political apparatus and the one that she herself advertised as such.22 The queen's fluency in multiple languages is well known.23 Her prayer of thanksgiving, following recovery from smallpox in 1562, unites the "unimpaired" state of her body to her "superior[ity] in the knowledge and use of literature and languages."24 And throughout her recorded speeches and letters, Elizabeth retains her word as her bond, as, for example, in her 1563 answer to the Lords' petition that she marry: "Since there can be no duer debt than princes' word."25 How binding would that word be if the mouth that issued it were defective? The manuals on rhetoric and oratory that crowded London's bookshops during Elizabeth's reign have much to say on the impotence of inarticulate speech,26 and as Carla Mazzio points out, the Latin root of inarticulate is "artus," for joint. Knowledge of this etymology suffused Elizabethan thought on mis-spoken speech, referred to as "unjointed."27 The mouth is effectively a large joint, so we might, with Elizabethans, diagnose poor oratory as a condition with a physiological etiology. Philemon Holland, in his 1601 translation of Pliny, writes that teeth are "necessarie also they be for the framing of our speech... but when they be once falne out of the head, man is bereaved of all meanes of good utterance and explanation of his words."28 The transactions between this particular physical pathology and psychological strain could be quite intense. Carole Levin notes that "[d]reams about teeth always had distressing implications and seemed to be quite common, possibly suggesting the problems early modern people had with dental care. Losing a tooth meant the death of a friend, but bloody teeth foretold one's own death."29 Leaving aside such psychological implications—dire though they might have been—it was the success of the queen's orations which depended upon her ability to keep her teeth in her mouth. Dental instruments facilitated that end. And so the toothpick, read from a clinical perspective and viewed in the hands of the queen (not adorning her in portraits), appears less like a beauty aid and more like an instrument of statecraft.

Evasion and Emulation

How, then, can dental instruments index the meanings and value of Elizabeth's pedigree book? To answer this question, it is helpful to consider that emulation recurred as a motif in royal discourses
of succession, which presented Elizabeth with a challenge. Though Elizabeth did identify with her father, Louis Montrose notes that "such strategies of identification ... risked emphasizing precisely the condition that she wished to neutralize." This vexation might be amplified by a genealogy that presents the queen with a lineage of exclusively male forebears on whom she could not model her physical self. However, her pedigree book recommends precisely the opposite: it configures a strategy for circumventing the modes of dynastic assertion that Elizabeth was unable to deploy.

Several aspects of this manuscript facilitate such a circumvention: the book’s horizontal orientation, its narrative mode, and most significantly its refusal to paint the face of the English monarch. It opens with an image of Rollo, first Duke of Normandy (figure 7). He reclines upon a throne, a skin of chainmail outlining his muscular physique, and with a jagged scepter in one hand. A knoll beneath his throne gives rise to a tree trunk with nascent leaves, the origin of the biobotanical narrative that ensues. Two pages on, the viewer encounters his descendant, William the Conqueror (figure 5). Here the first Norman king of England stands in triumph above the marble tomb of his foe, Harold, whose rent and splintered achievements lie crushed beneath the victor’s feet. This opening is particularly significant because it telegraphs the representational strategies to follow. Though William was indeed king of England, he is presented as not entirely such: on his body is the armor of a military leader, and on his head is a ducal coronet. The crown of king, instead, surmounts his shield of arms, his kingship proxied by the royal seal to the left, while his medallion proclaims only the date of his conquest, duration of his reign, and place of his burial. For every other king presented in this manuscript, an escutcheon surmounted by a royal crown or a seal is his only means of representation, and—with the single exception of Stephen—a date of coronation is detailed. Not a single king of England in the entire manuscript, following William, is represented in face or body. Not one. I return to the importance of this point below.

Visual convention dictates that a genealogy proceed in a vertical fashion, whether stretching up as a Tree of Jesse, or climbing down as its roots. It is a logical convention that assists royal genealogies’ biogenetic plot. An example is the well-known genealogy of Henry VI from the Talbot-Shrewsbury Book (London, British Library, Royal MS 15 E vi, fol. 3r), in which a column of roundels runs down either side of the folio (figure 8): on the left, against a ground of fleurs-de-lis is the French royal line; on the right, against a ground of leopards, is the English. At the bottom of the folio, the
two lines converge in a point over which is a roundel framing the figure of Henry VI. An angel hovers on either side, each holding a crown over Henry’s head so that, ultimately, his status as the heir to two parallel lines of descent is legible, visible, and inevitable.\textsuperscript{32} Genealogies made for public display, such as the Coronation Roll of Edward IV (Philadelphia, Free Library, Lewis MS 201), likewise allow for most or even the entirety of a monarch’s descent to be viewed in a single visual span, whether laid out upon a table or (less likely) hung from a high elevation: either way, the result is a
smooth and uncontested passage from the legitimate monarchs of the past to the new monarch of the present.\textsuperscript{33} Perhaps more importantly, codices containing aristocratic and royal genealogies that are contemporary or near-contemporary with Elizabeth’s pedigree book orient their contents vertically, despite the horizontal orientation of the codex as a support. For example, a genealogy of Edward VI (London, British Library, King’s MS 395) was written and illustrated so that it must be opened on a table with the spine
perpendicular to its customary position (figure 9). Similarly, a genealogy of Robert Dudley commissioned, almost certainly, by Robert Cooke (University of Pennsylvania, MS Codex 1070) opens in the typical fashion for a book; yet the lines of descent emulate roll genealogies and run vertically down each page. Elizabeth’s pedigree book, in contrast, moves horizontally from left to right as the

Figure 9  Genealogy of Edward VI

Note: Section including Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV, Richard III, and Henry VII. England, c. 1511 with additions before 1553

Source: London, British Library, King’s MS 395, fols. 32v-33r. Photo: © The British Library Board
pages turn. Each opening is an independent unit with an episodic quality that disables the continuity demanded by genealogical display. Phenomenologically, then, the motivation of this genealogy is neither gravitational nor natural, but indeterministic: the will of history, or the willingness of the reader-viewer to turn the page.

As with other genealogies, the proliferation of text in this manuscript thickens its historical texture: it is a very chatty genealogy, detailing not only dates but also specifying who married whom, who married twice, who had no issue, who was illegitimate, who fought where, and so forth. But what is more, the book was designed for cross-reference, given original foliation as well as instructions to those folios, where appropriate or necessary for narrative sense. As a result, it is very difficult to extrapolate a continuous biological vein from Rollo to Elizabeth.

By the time the reader-viewer approaches the genealogy’s finale, the sublimation projected on William the Conqueror’s page is complete (figure 10): only a parade of shields deputizes Elizabeth and her immediate ancestors. What is remarkable about this page is the manner in which its final progress recasts the pageant that greeted Elizabeth on her entry into London eight years earlier (figure 11). Rather than describe the culmination of the cycle, it seems appropriate to juxtapose it with one record of the event, The Pasage of our most dread Soueraigne Lady Queene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion. In this account, the author describes:

Upon the lowest stage were made one seate royall, wherin wer placed two personages representyng kyng Henrie the seventh and Elyzabeth his wyfe... thone of them whiche was kyng henrie the seventh proceeding out of the house of Lancaster, was enclosed in a read rose, and thother whiche was Queene Elizabeth being heire to the house of Yorke enclosed with a whyte rose... Out of the which two roses sprang two braun[n]ches gathered into one, which wer directed upward to the second stage or degree, wherin, was placed one, representing the valiant & noble prynces king henry theeight which spring out of the former stock, crowned with a crown imperial, & by him sate one represe[n]tingye right worthy ladie quene Anne... & ii. tables surmounting their heads, wherein were writte[n] their names & titles. Fro[m] their seate also proceeded upwards one braun[n]che directed to the thirde and uppermost stage or degree, wherein lykewise was planted a seate royall, in the whiche was sette one representyng the Queenes most excellent maiestie Elizabeth nowe our moste dradde soueraigne Ladie, crowned and appareled as thother prynces were.
Figure 10  Pedigree book of Elizabeth I

Note:  Lines of descent approaching Henry VII and Elizabeth of York.  England, 1567
Source:  London, British Library, King’s MS 396, fols. 26v-27r.  Photo: © The British
Library Board

Every detail from this description conforms to the pages of the pedigree book, except one: whereas the pageant represented kings and their queens in figural form as part of a tableau vivant, here the monarchs appear only as heraldic emblems. Most surprising of all is the summary of the queen herself as a symbolic array. It is a telling—if not deliberate—return to origins for the blazon genre of poetry: where one might expect to find a body, she encounters instead the visual catalog of its surrogate, with crest, torse, mantling, escutcheon, and supporters. In her presence as a configuration of shapes and tinctures, the queen reiterates the form of her forebears and appears as an apt conclusion to the series of male monarchs who preceded her. Overall, then, the aims of this program are to suggest to the queen’s own eyes alternatives to corporeal emulation, alternatives that avert the vexations identified above. Mary Beth Rose has summarized a current that runs through scholarship on Elizabeth, which argues that “[w]ith expert use of traditionally male discourses of divine right, the king’s two bodies, and military heroism—all discourses...
that assume the superiority of abstract, symbolic systems to actual, embodied experience—[Elizabeth] grounds her authority in her metaphysical and political position as the legitimate heir in a male dynasty. My own position is that objects made for the queen provided the very models for presenting such unembodied experience. It was a strategy that the queen was already implementing through her imposing orations.

**Conclusion: Voice and Blazon**

If, throughout this essay, I have evaded the weightier matters of biography and events, it is not for lack of circumstantial material.
The year 1566 saw a reprisal of Parliament’s demands that Elizabeth commit to marriage and secure the succession, inciting her famous battery of rhetorical questions: “Was I not born in the realm? Were my parents born in any foreign country?” The chord they strike resounds when rehearsed alongside an image from this manuscript. What’s more, just one day after she received this New Year’s gift, the queen dissolved Parliament in response to the Commons’ insistence that she marry. The security of the succession was nothing short of a public obsession in these years. So would someone have pressed the issue in his New Year’s gift to the queen? I doubt that Robert Cooke would have been so incautious as to prod so tender a nerve. In other words, I do not think that this book is concerned with Elizabeth’s issue, and I am not convinced that the ready-to-hand context of the succession—the traditional preoccupation of genealogy—is relevant to it.

Instead, it is knowing that the queen favored it, along with dental instruments and a chess set, that opens on to a different path of inquiry. This essay has not focused on the chess set, but it is worth remarking that it was only in the sixteenth century that the queen became the most agile piece on the board. And so, these objects, but particularly these objects together, suggest the potential for a para-history of representational strategies during Elizabeth’s reign in which the queen’s carnal body could be put to retreat. Relevant here is Rose’s observation that “[a]fter her early speeches on marriage and the succession . . . Elizabeth virtually gives up on emphasizing the trope of virgin mother as a salient aspect of her self-presentation.” Furthermore, Elizabeth’s relationship with the figural portraits of her was uneasy, prompting in 1563 the drafting (if not necessarily the implementation) of a proclamation that prohibited the production of unauthorized portraits of the queen until a suitable pattern could be designed and disseminated. The queen’s body—as many have shown—was a liability, a fact of which she was aware.

Histories of kingship and queenship often focus on the aura of the monarch’s presence, which proceeds from his or her physical body or the likenesses that stand for it. But equally powerful was the monarch’s intangible residue. Whether ephemeral, like viva-voce oration, or symbolic, like heraldry, Elizabeth did indeed have at her disposal means of expression that were not vitiated by their issuance from a female body. And it is in furnishing some questionable contexts that more of these less visible means might be accommodated in our discussions of Early Modern queenship.
APPENDIX A

Gifts relating to dental hygiene presented to Queen Elizabeth as recorded in the New Year's Gift Rolls. For ease of reference the gifts are listed according to their catalog number in Lawson, *Elizabethan New Year's Gift Exchanges*.

67.167 “By Patritio Baldino a Glasse of swete water with certeyne other Instrumentes for Teethe &c with the Quene.”

71.86 “By the Lady Ratlif a night Rayle and a paire of Ruffes of lawne wrought with blacke silke and edged with venixe siluer and silke / a Swette bagge and sixe Touthe pickes of Quilles garnisshed with silke . . . The Sleues dd to Mrs Stafford the Sweetebagge dd to Mrs Habingdon The toothpickes to Mrs Knowles.”

75.95 “By Snowe Six little tothe pykes of gold and Six verey small tothe clothes edged with black sylke with her Ma'tie.”

76.23 “By the Duches of Somerset a litell Cofer or deske with Duiers tilles in the same couerid with Crymsen vellat in the lidde is sette a Steele glasse and in the same cofer is diuers other thinges vide Comes, Toothpickes, Sisers &c and also in it is a Snuksen of Nedleworke of venixe golde siluer and silke lyned with vnshorne vellat and fregned at bothe endes, And a swet bagge of blewe Taphata embrauderid. Deliuerid to the said Richard Todde.”

76.110 “By the Lady Paulet a cushioncloth of networke wrought with blake silke and edged with a brode passamane of blake silke, two swetebagges of Taphata, twelue toothpickes and a Little nosegaye of flowers of silke thendes trimmed with pearle. The tothepickes and nosegaye with the Quene by Richard Todde / The Cusshion cloth and bagges to the saide Mrs Skidmore.”

76.147 “By Mrs Snowe foure toothpickes of golde and Sixe touthe clothes wrought with blake silke and golde . . . The tothe clothes dd to Mrs Skidmore / the tothepickes and houerglasse dd to the said John Asteley.”

76.166 “By Mrs Laundres Twist two handkercheues and iiiij totheclothes trimmed with gold & silke . . . Deliuered to the said Mrs Skidmor.”

77.108 “By the Lady Cheeke a Toothe & Eare picke of golde beinge a Dolphin enamvled with a perle pendaunt with xvjsmale Rubyes being but sparckes & v sparkes of Dyamonds. dd to the Lady Howard.”
77.144 “By Mrs Snowe vj tothe pickes of golde, and vj smale clothes to wype Teeth wrought with blacke silke. dd the vj tothpickes to the La Hawarde and the clothes to Mrs Skydmore.”

77.159 “By Mrs Twiste laundrys Six smale Tothe clothes wrought with black silke and edgid with a smale border of black silke siluer & golde . . . dd to Mrs Skydmore.”

78.114 “By the Lady Ratclif v crippins of Lawne garnessed with golde and siluer purle two swete bagges of sylke and anightcoyf of white cutworke floresshed with Siluer and set with Spangilles / and v tothe pykes beinge quilles the Crepyns dd to Mrs Blanch threst to Mrs Skydmor.”

78.160 “By Twyst Lawndrys ii handkerchers wrought with blac spanysshworke and edged with abonelace of venice golde and iiiij totheclothes of corse hollande wrought with black sylke / and edged with bonelace of Siluer & black sylke . . . dd to Mrs Skydmor.”

79.99 “By the Lady Mary Semer wif to Mr Rogers A Touthe pike of golde made gone fation dd to the foresaid La haward.”

79.131 “By Sir Edward Horsey Captayne of Thile of wight a Touthe picke of golde the top beinge garneshid with a faire emeraude a Dyamond & Ruby & other smale Dyamondes and Rubies with ij perles pendaunt dd to the Lady hawarde.”

79.163 “By Mrs Twiste Six Towthclothes wroughte with Blake silke and edged with golde . . . the tothe clothes dd to Mrs Skydmore.”

82.152 “Smithstone allis Tailor a Coif of Lawne florishshed with blacke silke and edged with a bonelace of venice golde and vj totheclothes of holland wrought with spanishworke . . . Mrs Skidmore cate.”

82.153 “Twist a paire of Sleves of Camrike wrought with blacke silk and vj toutheClothes Mrs Skidmore cate.”

88.144 “By Mrs Smithson Two handkerchers and two toothclothes dd to the said Mrs Skydmore.”

94.115 “By Sir Thomas Cecyll A Tooth picker Case of golde Garnished with Sparkes of Dyamondes and Rubyes Three pearles pendant One Bigger then the Residue, and a Small Chayne of golde to hange itt by . . . dd to Mrs Radclyffes.”
97.82 “By the Baroness Hunsdon one Case of gold garnished with Dyomondes Rubies and three small pearles pendant with Sisers and tooth Pikes therin dd to Mrs Ratcliffe.”

97.198 “By Mr Baker one glasse of Precious water for the teath dd to the La: Skudamore.”

98.195 “By Mr George Baker one glasse of precious water for the teeth Delivered to the Lady Scudamore.”

99.192 “By Mr George Baker one Glasse of water for the Teeth dd to the La: Scudamore.
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2. The dedication reads, “Whereas moste excellent and mightie princesse my dreade soueraigne, I suppose, the readinge of petegres to be more rare unto your Maiestie, then the knowledge in other causes, and that it wolde be a thinge somwhat tedious, and payntfull to your highnes to peruse every severall ligne in this booke contented, I have thought good therefore, under your Maiesties pardonne, to sett down in writing, a brief and playne abstract of the whole contents of the same, wherein doth appere, how your maiestie is descendiad as lineall heire to to all those most noble, and famous howses of seuerall Emperours, Kingses, and princes, whose petegrees as they haue of antiquitie truly remaynede of recorde, so haue I faithfully cowched the same in such
sorte, as by right of blood and progeny they are directly descendid, to your most royall and sacred person, in whome, as remayneth not only the truth of their inheritance, but much more the possession of their royall vertues, and princely qualities, so the eternall kinge, grant your maiestie not only so many and prosperous yeres as any of those youre maiesties most noble progenitors did inioy, but also if it might stande with gods good favoour and mercy, the yeres and felicite of them all” (London, British Library, King’s MS 396, fol. iv).


14. London, Wellcome Collection, Accession Number A61493. The dental set is currently on long-term loan to the Science Museum, London. I am grateful to Rory Cook for providing me with detailed information about this object. Although a history of dentistry in Early Modern England has been published, a comparable study of dental hygiene has yet to be written. For dentistry, see A. S. Hargreaves, *White as Whales Bone: Dental Services in Early Modern England* (Leeds: Northern UP, 1998).


16. A toothpick from the second half of the sixteenth century, which is now in the British Museum gives an idea as to how so sumptuous an object may have looked (London, British Museum, WB 188).


18. Roy Strong, Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987) gathers together all of the major portraits of the Queen and contains no image showing a pendant pick. Its former fashionability in England is implied in All’s Well That Ends Well, when Parolles describes the pendant pick as an outdated accessory: “Virginty, like an old courtier, wears her cap out of fashion: richly suited, but unsuitable: just like the brooch and the tooth-pick, which wear not now” (Alls Well That Ends Well, I.1.157–60).


20. “Esta Reina Serenísima entró aquí á los 23 deste con salud, aunque no la había tenido tres [o] cuatro días antes de dolor de dientes y de una calentura que le duró, según me ha dicho, cuarenta horas, que la fatigó mucho.” Archivo general de Simancas, Secretaría de Estado, Lp. g 819, fól. 223. My translation. Many thanks to Isabel Aguirre Landa for sending to me a complimentary copy of this document at very short notice.


24. Elizabeth I: Collected Works, 141.

25. Ibid., 79.


31. There are numerous individuals who are represented in their figural likenesses throughout the manuscript, but, again, with the exception of William the Conqueror, these individuals are not English monarchs. They include: Rollo, Duke of Normandy; William, Duke of Normandy; Geoffrey, Count of Anjou; William, Duke of Aquitaine; Robert, Count of Mortain; Sancho, King of Spain; Arnold IV, Count of Angoulême; Charles the Great; Luderic, Forester of Flanders; Theodoric, Count of Holland; Hermann, Count of Hainault; Albert, Count of Namur; Geoffrey, Duke of Ardenne; William, Count of Warenne; Godfrey, "Erle of Array" [Comte d'Eul]; Eric, Count of Bigorre; Eustace, Count of Boulogne; Robert, Earl of Gloucester; Robert FitzHaimon; Macmurrough, King of Leinster; John the Marshal; Hugh de Lacy, Lord of Meath; William de Braose; Edmund, Earl of Lancaster; Thomas, Lord Wake; Bartholomew de Badesmere; Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln; Patrick Chaworth of Kidwelly; and Blondel of Luxemburg; Emperor Lewis IV.

33. It should be acknowledged that very little information on the use and display of genealogies is known. The Free Library’s genealogical roll of Edward IV, for example, is extremely long, which means it would either have been viewed on a table in at least two sections, or it would have to have been hung from a height of 16 feet in order to have been viewed in its entirety.

34. An MA thesis devoted to this manuscript, which I have not consulted, dates it to 1572 (Barbara A. McGeoch, “A Study of a Genealogical Manuscript of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester” [MA thesis, City University of New York, 1974]). The manuscript has been fully digitized and can be viewed at: http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/medren/detail.html?id=MEDREN_4218616.

35. On the rarity of horizontal genealogies, see Ann Payne, “Heraldry and Genealogies,” in *Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age: The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree*, ed. Mark Evans (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), 22. Payne refers to Elizabeth’s pedigree book among two other examples of late sixteenth-century, horizontal genealogies (New York, Morgan Library, MS M.956 and the Lumley Inventory itself, which was probably made c.1590).

36. For example, “Geoffrey duke of Arden of whom did descend the barons of Jaynville whose heire was maried to Roger lord Mortimer of Wigmore as apperith folio 2r” (London, British Library, King’s MS 396, fol. 20v)


38. The Pasage of our most dread Soueraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion (Tottell, 22 January 1558 [sic]) STC 287:02.


41. Elizabeth I: Collected Works, 95.


43. Jenny Adams, Power Play: The Literature and Politics of Chess in the Late Middle Ages (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2006), 160–61. These changes were very recent; as Adams notes, a book of 1529 printed in England still outlined chess problems using the old rules (i.e., those that did not account for the queen’s aggrandized position on the board).

