

'FARTE PRYKE IN CULE': THE PICTURES

Meg Twycross with Malcolm Jones & Alan Fletcher

Episode Three of a saga that has run and run. For new readers: in *METH* 6:1 (1984) Peter Meredith published an article on the interestingly named game played by A and B in *Fulgen's and Lucres* as the culminating bout in their competition to win the favours of the maid Joan.¹ With an inspired leap of serendipity, he suggested that it was the same game as the one called 'cock-fighting' in Kipling's *Stalky and Co*, where the combatants were trussed into a bundle, with their hands tied together, and a 'stump' (a cricket stump, it transpires)² thrust behind their bent knees. 'The additional element in the *Fulgens* contest is the spear, which presumably sticks out in front in the manner of a jousting weapon (and a "pryke"), "held" by the "cule", with the "fart" as an added bit of vulgarity ...'³ I offered to try this out in my current production of *Fulgens and Lucres*, and reported on the experiment in an insert to the same article. What we came up with, on a purely pragmatic fashion, was this:



FIG. 1: The first experiment

The drawback was the length of the 'spear'. Following the 'tourney' motif, we had decided to use a broomstick on which the contestants sat in a hobby-horse fashion, so that it was 'held by the "cule"'. The difficulty with

this, though it looked suitably phallic, was that you could not follow the sequence of events suggested by Medwall's dialogue: 'bynd me fyrst' (the hands), 'geve me my spere' (the broomstick), and 'put me a staffe thorow here' (through the elbows and behind the knees) — 'Than am I all redy'.⁴ Once the 'spear' was in place, you could not get the staff behind the knees without dislocating the actor's wrists. Besides this, the front end of the broomstick projected above the cross-staff so high up that the actor could not grasp it with both tied hands. (Our version, for other theatrical reasons, tied it with a loop to two other loops round the hands, but it would have been impossible any other way.) In the article, I suggested a couple of alternatives, but neither of them was particularly satisfactory.

Two years later, however, Alan Fletcher came up with a detailed account of the game as observed in Ireland, in County Down, at Christmas 1602, by Josiah, Sir Thomas Bodley's younger brother.⁵ It was identical with our reconstruction apart from one thing: the 'spear' was not a broomstick, and the player did not sit on it. Instead, *inter indices et pollices utriusque manus bacillum quoddam, longitudinis fere unius pedis, ab anteriori parte acutum, tenebant* ('Between forefingers and thumbs of each hand they held a certain small stick of about a foot in length and sharpened at the front end'). According to Bodley, they tried to topple each other by using their feet: the stick was purely to prod the defeated opponent in the backside. Bodley actually says that the prone contestant *podicem prebet, perjungendum cum dicto bacillo* which Fletcher translates as 'he offers his backside to be prodded with the small stick previously mentioned'. However, unless the meaning of the word *podex* ('anus') had changed radically by the sixteenth century,⁶ the outcome of the game was rather more sexually explicit than Fletcher's polite translation conveys. It would explain why A's elaborate description of the 'wound' he has received seems more graphic than necessary for the obvious joke.⁷ The sixteenth-century audience, including, as Bodley is eager to point out, the women, found it hilarious: watching one of their fellow servants the object of simulated buggery with a foot-long sharpened stick made them laugh till the tears streamed down their cheeks. The idea brings tears to my eyes, too, but for a different reason.

This would make the focus of the game and role of the 'spear' rather different from what we had assumed. It also explains the slight mystification we had felt about the 'hobby-horse' effect: in practice, you could not really use the spear to knock your opponent over, even if you were more cautious about damaging him than we were, and had to be for

the purposes of the play. Shoulder-charging or tripping (like the sixteenth-century players, and like *Stalky*)⁸ is much more effective. And the name of the game seems to come from the ritual humiliation exacted from the loser at the end rather than anything in the jousting process.

So far so good. This was my emended reconstruction of the position, drawn to illustrate Alan Fletcher's article.



FIG. 2: Emended version

It is still easier to tie the player's hands *after* rather than before putting the staff behind his knees and over his elbows, though the latter is just about possible.

It seemed unlikely at the time that we would ever see pictures of the game in progress. But then in 1992 Alan Fletcher was shown, by Michael Crozier-Shaw, one of his undergraduates, a photograph of the version according to *Stalky* being played on the deck of the *Norman Castle* en route for the Cape in 1894, an illustration in Angus Wilson's *The Strange Ride of Rudyard Kipling*.⁹ It was entitled 'Norwegian Cock-fighting'. I acquired a print of the photograph from the Birmingham Reference Library in 1993 (PLATE 8). The focus is not as sharp as one would like, but the combatants, dressed in summer whites and deck shoes (?), are trussed up in exactly the same way as in our experiment, with a fairly hefty pole behind the knees. Their hands are tied either with handkerchiefs (as in *Stalky*) or bandages. They do not seem to be holding 'spears', and indeed in *Stalky* the victor seems to have belaboured his fallen opponent with his feet.¹⁰ In the photograph, the winner is actually sitting on the ground. Both men

This image has been removed for copyright reasons. You can see the original if you buy a paper copy of *Medieval English Theatre* 23: see <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/meth/intro.html> for instructions on how to order.

PLATE 8: 'Norwegian Cockfighting' on the SS *Norman Castle*
© Stone Collection, Birmingham Reference Library

are inside a circle chalked on the deck: perhaps the game had come to involve edging one's opponent out of the ring, as in Sumo wrestling.

Then at last came the contemporary visual evidence. Malcolm Jones sent me the copy of a draft chapter in which he pointed out that there were two English misericords which show 'cock-fighting' precisely as described in Bodley's account.¹¹ They were carved at exactly the right period and, it may be said, area for Medwall and possibly for *Fulgens and Lucres*. One is from St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, and one from Henry VII's Chapel in Westminster Abbey.

The Windsor version (PLATE 9) is the earlier by about thirty years, probably from the early 1480s (see below). It is the supporter to a misericord on the South side of the choir stalls, number 8 on the East block of the lower row.¹² It shows two boys or young men, both trussed up in the familiar fashion. The short staves behind their knees appear to have been broken off, but the rough ends are visible. Their hands are bound in front of their knees, and each grasps, with some apparent difficulty, a short thick stick between his outstretched fingers. (The sixteenth-century players held their 'spears' 'between forefingers and thumbs of each hand'.) The game seems to have reached the stage where the player on the left is about to be knocked over. The player on the right has pushed his stick under the soles of the other's boots, and his opponent is balanced precariously on his backside with his feet in the air. His stick, however, is shoved between the other's knees in a potentially dangerous fashion. Because this scene is a supporter, not the misericord proper, it is surmounted by the end of a curved bracket with foliage and some rather plump pendulous fruit. This is described by W.H. St John Hope as 'a cluster of figs or pears'.¹³ Either would be an appropriately rude metaphor for the name of the game: the fig probably has the edge.¹⁴

The Westminster misericord (South side, lower range, third bay, number 3),¹⁵ from the 1510s, has suffered a certain amount of damage but the two figures are not seriously affected (PLATES 10 and 11). They are much more chubby and child-like than the Windsor pair. Their feet are bare, and one can presume that their legs are bare too. Both are trussed up in the usual way. The sticks under their knees are clearly visible, if only just long enough to rest in the crook of the elbows. It is difficult to see the 'spears' but their bound hands are held in front of them with the fingers pointing forward, and there may be the remains of a stick in the left-hand figure's grasp. Exactly what stage in the contest they are at is hard to tell.

This image has been removed for copyright reasons. You can see the original if you buy a paper copy of *Medieval English Theatre* 23: see <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/meth/intro.html> for instructions on how to order.

PLATE 9: Misericord Supporter, Windsor, St George's Chapel
© Reproduced by permission of English Heritage. NMR

This image has been removed for copyright reasons. You can see the original if you buy a paper copy of *Medieval English Theatre 23*: see <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/meth/intro.html> for instructions on how to order.

PLATE 10: Westminster, King Henry VII's Chapel
© Reproduced by permission of English Heritage. NMR

This image has been removed for copyright reasons. You can see the original if you buy a paper copy of *Medieval English Theatre 23*: see <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/meth/intro.html> for instructions on how to order.

PLATE 11: Westminster misericord: detail.
© Reproduced by permission of English Heritage. NMR

There is quite a lot of clear space between them, but the left-hand boy is upright, though apparently sitting down, and the right-hand boy has his (somewhat chipped) feet in the air and appears to be going over backwards.

We should be able to date the Windsor misericords fairly precisely. The re-building of St George's Chapel was inaugurated by Edward IV on 9 February 1472/3 with the appointment of Richard Beauchamp, Bishop of Salisbury, as Master and Surveyor of the King's Works there; but the campaign effectively began in 1475 with the appointment of John Sawyer and William Berkeley 'to take carpenters called "kervers" and other carpenters for the King's new works within the castle of Windsor'.¹⁶ It was Edward's intention to be buried in the Chapel 'by us begoune of newe to bee buylded'.¹⁷ The resulting works are among the best documented of the period, and the work on the stalls and other woodcarvings is 'the only known English example of which any detailed accounts have been preserved'.¹⁸ They are extensively reproduced by William H. St John Hope in his comprehensive *Architectural History of Windsor Castle*.

The accounts rendered by the Bishop of Salisbury for 11 January 1480/1 to 18 October 1481 and after his death by his deputy Thomas Canceller from 18 October 1481 to 11 January 1481/2 show that most of the woodwork for the stalls both in the Choir and in John Shorne's Chapel was completed in that year. Among them are *Pro factura et le kervvyng ... xlij Enterclosez, Counters et Babrias fact[ium] infra Stalles in Choro ibidem* ('For the making and the carving ... of 42 Entercloses, Counters, and Baberies made beneath the stalls in the same Choir').¹⁹ Hope suggested that the *enterclosez* were 'the panels above the stalls', the *counters* were 'the stalls themselves', and the *baberries* are 'babooneries', grotesques, the images on the misericords.²⁰ However, he also points out that 42 is precisely the original number of the top range of stalls on both sides.²¹ Our misericord is on the bottom range, 'substalls for the priest vicars, lay clerks, and choristers',²² and may not have been one of the 1481 babooneries. Accounts for the following year (1482/3) contain more carving for the choir, but do not mention *baberries* as such.²³ The documentation unfortunately dries up after 11 January 1483/4, and Hope suggests that 'later accounts would probably contain entries referring to the counters and *baberries* of the lower row of stalls'.²⁴ It seems unlikely that they would have been finished much later than 1484. Work on the choir seems to have been almost complete when Edward IV died on 9 April 1483, and ceased altogether after Richard III's death in August 1485.²⁵

It would be good to be able to put a name to the artist, but though William Berkeley is cited as *principalis kerver*, he did not necessarily make the misericords by himself: he was fairly clearly consultant overseer of the woodwork, with a team of carvers and joiners working for him.²⁶ Not all the woodwork was made on site. We know that many of the canopies were created in London workshops and transported to Windsor. In 1476/7 Berkeley was paid for travel and subsistence *existentis apud London super factura tabernaculorum supervidenda* ('staying in London to supervise the making of the canopies'),²⁷ and in 1481/2 Thomas Canceller was paid expenses *existentis apud London quolibet quaternio anni ad recipiendos denarios eisdem operibus solvendos. et ad supervidend. lex Kervers ibidem operantes ...* ('staying in London for about a quarter of a year to receive the moneys to be paid out for the same works, and to supervise the carvers working on the same ...').²⁸ Some of this carving may have been for the misericords, but there is no way of telling. If they were made by a London workshop, then there might be a possible link with the Westminster misericords, even though the style is fashionably different.²⁹

However, Charles Tracy believes that '[a]ll the seating seems to have been made in the lodge at Windsor'.³⁰ He also says that the Windsor woodwork 'can be shown stylistically to be largely a native product'.³¹ Besides Berkeley, there were other woodworkers with English surnames. For example, the (London-based?) carvers of the canopies named in the 1476/7 set of accounts are Robert Elis and John Files.³² In 1482/3, the year after the upper misericords were installed, William Ipswich, *kerver*, was paid for making a *tabula* ('picture' or 'board?'), he himself being in prison at Windsor at the time of payment.³³ (There are clearly tales to be told about the life of a carver in the King's Works.) On the other hand, two workmen with Flemish names, Dirike Vangrove (Van der Graaf?) and Egidius Vancastell (Casteel) were paid for making images of St George and the Dragon, the more prestigious carvings on the Rood beam.³⁴ The craftsmen involved in the overall production of the woodwork seem thus to have been a characteristic mixture of English and Flemings, producing a typical blend of styles in conformity with Edward IV's known cultural tastes.³⁵ This could be important if we were looking for sources of the imagery (again, see below).

It is less easy to pinpoint the date of the Westminster misericords. According to Holinshed, 'the first stone of [Henry VII's] ladie chapell', in which he, too, designed to be buried, was laid on at 2.45 p.m. on 24 January 1502/3, by Abbot Islip, Sir Reginald Bray (also heavily involved

with and indeed buried in Windsor), and others.³⁶ Unfortunately the building accounts have completely disappeared.³⁷ In his Will, dated 31 March 1509, Henry VII earmarks money for outstanding works, which include that 'the said Chapell be desked', desk at the time including choir stalls and other woodwork.³⁸ Received wisdom is that it was completed by 1512,³⁹ incidentally the date of the publication of *Fulgens and Lucres*.

Despite the lapse of only thirty years, the overall style of the Westminster misericords looks different from that of the Windsor ones. They have a distinct 'Renaissance' air,⁴⁰ though still in the English tradition. Tracy accounts for the 'Flemish resonances' in the design of the stall carving by suggesting that they were made either by 'Flemish craftsmen working under the close supervision of an English architect' or 'Flemish craftsmen who had lived in England long enough to have fully absorbed the native practice of choir-stall designing. The decorative carving can be closely compared to Flemish work'.⁴¹ Colvin suggests that the joiners who started on the Savoy Hospital 'just about the time that Henry VII's Chapel was completed' might have come from working on the stalls there. Some of them have 'unmistakably Flemish names'.⁴²

They might however come from ultimately the same source. The use of woodcuts and engravings as pattern books began almost as soon as the invention of printing.⁴³ Up to this point the earliest misericords in Britain to use Continental prints were thought to have been those at Ripon (1489–1494).⁴⁴ However, Malcolm Jones has recently demonstrated that the Windsor carvers also made use of Continental prints as patterns.⁴⁵ These include works by Master E.S. (*floruit* c. 1450–1470), the Master of the Banderoles (*floruit* 1450 onwards), and the Master of the Bern Passion (*floruit* 1460s). He identifies no less than nine surviving source images, plus one which bears a close resemblance to 'the plainly scatological antics of the ass-eared fools who inhabit the margins of a 1498 Basel edition of Brandt's *Narrenschiff*', and which is probably based on an earlier lost print. This predates Ripon by six or seven years. By the time the Westminster misericords were in the making, it was an established practice. The carvers there copied well-known engravings by Dürer and Israel van Meckenem.⁴⁶

The supporters to our Westminster misericord are clearly adaptations of the very familiar marginal criblé engravings from the Books of Hours printed in Paris for a range of markets by Philippe Pigouchet for Simon Vostre from the late 1490s on.⁴⁷ These are repeated over and over again, so it is difficult to say exactly which edition was the source for the carvers. My illustrations (PLATES 12–13) are from a single leaf in my possession

whose provenance I have not yet identified accurately: but the cuts turn up, for example, in the editions of 1498 (Sarum) and 1501 (Rome).⁴⁸ The Westminster carvers did not follow their patterns slavishly. The solid but sinewy children of the French engravings have been given an Italianate Renaissance flavour and become chubby putti, with windblown tunics, their feet braced inside the circular surround of the brackets, and in the case of the windmill putto, a blank heraldic shield. Presumably the misericord design proper has been similarly transformed.

This image has been removed for copyright reasons. You can see the original if you buy a paper copy of *Medieval English Theatre 23*: see <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/meth/intro.html> for instructions on how to order.



PLATES 12 and 13: Westminster misericord supporters and Pigouchet cuts.⁴⁹
Westminster images © Reproduced by permission of English Heritage. NMR
Pigouchet cuts © Meg Twycross

The odds on a common source have lengthened with a most unexpected parallel from Spain, on the choir stalls at León.⁵⁰ It is conspicuously the same game, though the writer of the article in which it is illustrated, Isabel Mateo Gómez, misidentifies it as a comment on clerical homosexuality: 'two friars either measure or touch each other's penises'.⁵¹ It is fairly clear, however, that the two figures are not friars, despite their pudding-basin haircuts: they have no tonsures and are wearing what look like ordinary short or calf-length tunics. As for the indecent exposure, they would have had to be phenomenally and rather uncomfortably well endowed, though perhaps her mistake does also suggest why the game got part of its name.

This image has been removed for copyright reasons. You can see the original if you buy a paper copy of *Medieval English Theatre* 23: see <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/meth/intro.html> for instructions on how to order.

PLATE 14: Stall carving, Catedral de León.
© Elaine C. Block

The choir stalls of León were carved by two Flemish artists: Juan de Malinas (Jan van Mechelen) between 1464 and his death in 1475, and Maestre Copin who took over until the stalls were finished in the early 1480s.⁵² These carvings thus predate or are exactly contemporary with the Windsor stalls, and mean that we would be looking for a model produced in the 1460s or 1470s, probably in the Southern Low Countries or the Rhine Valley.

It would be a coup to find this source, either printed or painted, but it is one I have so far failed to pull off. I thought at first that it might be found ‘in the margin of some Book of Hours, possibly those devoted to “boys’ games”’.⁵³ In the first three decades of the sixteenth century, some Books of Hours associated with Simon Bening supplemented their calendar images of the Labours of the Months with subsidiary images of children’s, or possibly more precisely, young people’s games.⁵⁴ The ancestor of the motif appears to be the *Heures de la Duchesse de Bourgogne* (Adelaide de Savoie), Musée Condé, Chantilly, MS lat 1362 (1460–70?).⁵⁵ In the Bening illuminations, jousting on barrels in the snow, stilt-walking, summer queens, jousting with whirligigs,⁵⁶ swimming and water-tournaments, ninepins, bowling hoops, snowballs, follow each other with the inexorable and mysterious logic of the playground. These in turn seem to have been suggested by the printed Pigouchet/Kerver calendars, which from 1500 also supplemented the traditional agrarian Labours with games and folk-customs, though not always purely by children. But none of them show this particular game. Even Bruegel’s *Children’s Games* (1560), an extended version of the Bening motif,⁵⁷ which chronicles eighty or so games from the Low Countries, does not feature this one. And in any case, even the earliest printed calendars are too late for any of the misericords save Westminster.

Without an attributable model, it is impossible to say how close each carving is to its original, assuming this to have existed. The León and Windsor misericords are not in fact very close to each other either in detail or overall design. The positions of the two figures are different relative to each other. Their garments are different, save that both pairs are wearing shoes, unlike the Westminster players. Their hairstyles are completely different. Indeed, the Windsor players, instead of being clones of their opponent, like the León and Westminster ones, are so strongly characterised that they almost suggest portraits: the falling boy is plump-faced with shoulder-length curling hair, his opponent close-cropped and with oddly gaunt features.⁵⁸ In León, the game seems to be just beginning;

in Windsor, the figure on the left seems to have been toppled; in Westminster the figure on the right (though this could be accounted for by a reverse print). Of course we have to take into account different local styles, and the different spaces into which the carvers had to fit their work: an arm-rest panel in the stall in León, a supporter in Windsor, the misericord proper in Westminster.

The nature of the game possibly appealed to the particular bents of the carvers at the two English venues, though they both show its beginning not the end. The Windsor carvers seem unusually obsessed with arses and evacuation.⁵⁹ In one an extremely large monk shits a devil; in another, a devil shits a human being; in a third, as Malcolm Jones has pointed out, 'two men are shown kneeling one behind the other: a scarf attached to the forward man passes round the neck of the following man, and has the effect of pulling his nose into the anal cleft of the man in front, whose hose at half-mast have exposed his buttocks'.⁶⁰ Even if the game as represented on the misericord has not reached its scatological climax, one can perhaps see a train of association.

The Westminster carvers are also quite fond of bare bottoms, especially ones with a nice Renaissance curve. They seem rather to associate them with flagellation: in one, one boy holds down another, who is being birched by a third; in an image based on van Meckenem, a woman is birching a man who is being made to wind wool on a frame.⁶¹ The maid Joan comes to mind: ritual humiliation heaped on humiliation. But our misericord, again, only implies this aspect of the game.

Interestingly, though English misericords do feature games like wrestling (the favourite), cock-fighting (the genuine kind), hobbyhorses, ball-bouncing, jousting, archery, backgammon, and dice,⁶² these are the only two of their kind. Are we to assume that it was a well-established game, but unrecorded until the carvers had a copiable engraving to work from? Or was it perhaps a relatively new game, the very latest in playground sadism? That might explain why Medwall makes such a production number of it. Was it even an import from the Low Countries?

Are there any possible connections between *Fulgens* and the misericords? Only ones of contiguity, though they are suggestive. Medwall was a scholar at Eton from 1475–1480 (aged 13 to 18), just before the Windsor misericord was carved. After a period at Cambridge, he was back in the region again: his earliest notarial document was attested at Windsor on 18 August 1489. I am not suggesting that he was responsible for suggesting the subject matter of the carving: but perhaps it was a

schoolboy game at Eton? And perhaps it continued to be so? M.R. James, who correctly identified the game à la Starkey as ‘cockfighting’ in his 1933 pamphlet on the woodwork of St George’s Chapel,⁶³ was Provost of Eton at the time, and had been a schoolboy there from 1876. There were also, of course, choirboys at Windsor, and choirboys at Westminster, and Westminster School was in existence, though before its official secular re-foundation by Henry VIII.⁶⁴ Medwall was in the latter vicinity, as a notary in the household of Archbishop and Lord Chancellor Morton, based in Southwark, in the 1490s: but he disappears from view before the Westminster misericords were carved. We do not know for certain where or before whom *Fulgens and Lucres* was originally performed, or whether the Flemish element had any special resonances. And where does the Spanish connection come in?⁶⁵ All we can say is that the actors in the play and the carvers of the misericords clearly expected their particular audiences to recognise the game: and that they shared much the same sense of humour.

*Lancaster University
University of Sheffield
University College, Dublin*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article was written up by Meg Twycross, but would not have been possible without the discoveries made by Malcolm Jones (who has also commented on and contributed lavishly to its writing), and Alan Fletcher. Christa Grössinger has been extremely generous with her help on the subject of misericords, especially rude ones. We would also like to thank Elaine C. Block for supplying us with the image of the León misericord.

PLATE 8 is reproduced by kind permission of Birmingham Reference Library; PLATES 9, 10, 11, 12a, and 13a of English Heritage: National Monuments Record; PLATES 12b, 13b, and 15 of Meg Twycross; PLATE 14 of Elaine C. Block.

NOTES

1. “Farte Pryke in Cule” and Cock-Fighting’ METh 6:1 (1984) 30–39.
2. Rudyard Kipling *Stalky & Co.* (Macmillan, London, 1899: reprint 1982) 152.
3. Meredith “Farte Pryke in Cule” 33.

4. *Fulgens and Lucres* Part One lines 1185–8: from *The Plays of Henry Medwall* edited Alan H. Nelson (D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, 1980) 60.
5. Alan J. Fletcher “Fart Prycke in Cule”: A Late-Elizabethan Analogue’ METh 8.2 (1986) 132–9.
6. Or the meaning of the word *cul*, which according to MED means precisely the same. *Iungo* can also have sexual connotations: see the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*.
7. *Fulgens and Lucres* Part One lines 1261–71.
8. Kipling *Stalky & Co.* 141, 143. It seems to be a refinement of the torture if the victim is in stocking feet: “I move it’s shoes-off for them an’ shoes-on for us,” said Sefton joyously’. Presumably the shoes-off feet get stamped on.
9. Angus Wilson *The strange ride of Rudyard Kipling: his life and works* (Secker and Warburg, London, 1977) plate 52.
10. See note 8 above.
11. To appear in his forthcoming book *The Secret Middle Ages: A Fresh Look at Late Medieval Art* (Sutton, Stroud, 2002).
12. M.R. James *St George's Chapel, Windsor: The Woodwork of the Choir* (St. George's Chapel, Windsor, 1933) 41: based on William Henry St John Hope *Windsor Castle: An Architectural History* 2 parts and plans (Country Life, London, 1913) 2 403.
13. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 403.
14. It is probably unnecessary to labour the point. However, Gordon Williams *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature* 3 vols (Athlone Press, London / Atlantic Highlands NJ, 1994) has an exhaustive range of references for both, *svv fig* (1 480–1) and *pear* (2 1004–5). The innuendo in figs seems to be primarily female, but the word (Latin *ficus*) was also the medical term for piles: hence it can feature in what Williams characterises as a ‘sodomitical quip’. The *fico* gesture seems however to be phallic (for an early sixteenth-century Galician illustration on the stalls of San Salvador de Celanova, see Andres A. Rosende Valdes ‘The Galician Choir Stalls: Iconography of Parallelisms and the Survival of the “Margins”’ *The Profane Arts of the Middle Ages* 6.2 (1997) 193–219, fig. 1 page 212. In modern Galicia the gesture is a prophylactic good-luck sign). A nicely bisexual fruit, very suitable to our purpose. All Williams’ allusions are of course late for this misericord: it is, oddly, quite difficult to find undoubtedly obscenities of this kind in medieval literature, though *The Merchant’s Tale* and the poem ‘I have a new garden’ are sufficient testimony for the connotations of pears.
15. G.L. Remnant *A Catalogue of Misericords in Great Britain* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969) 98.

16. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 375. See also Tim Tatton-Brown 'The Constructional Sequence and Topography of the Chapel and College Buildings at St George's' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages* edited Colin Richmond and Eileen Scarff (Historical Monographs relating to St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, 17: Windsor, 2001) 3–38, especially 14–25.
17. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 376: will of Edward IV dated 20 June 1475.
18. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 249.
19. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 402. Hope's text on page 380 could accidentally suggest that these were for John Shorne's Chapel, but the accounts make a clear distinction between work in the *capella* and in the *choro*.
20. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 431.
21. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 431.
22. Tatton-Brown 'Constructional Sequence and Topography' 14.
23. There are however *xvij Stolys*. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 403.
24. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 433.
25. Tatton-Brown 'Constructional Sequence and Topography' 14–15.
26. For Berkeley, see John Harvey with Arthur Oswald *English Medieval Architects: A Biographical Dictionary down to 1550* (Alan Sutton, Gloucester, 1984) 20.
27. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 399.
28. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 402. When the carving was done, on or off site, it was placed in a 'dead store' until fitted into place: the documents record both.
29. Many of the craftsmen working on the two sites seem to have come from the same workshops or even been related to each other. This is hardly surprising in two major royal commissions in the Thames Valley — in fact the only major royal commissions of the end of the Middle Ages — when one followed on the other relatively closely. See Colvin *History of the King's Works* 3 214, and for an emended and much amplified account, Christopher Wilson 'The Designer of Henry VII's Chapel, Westminster Abbey' in *The Reign of Henry VII* edited Thompson 133–156. There is however nothing particularly similar in the list of subjects of the Windsor and Westminster misericords: see Remnant *Catalogue of Misericords* 5–10 (Windsor), 96–8 (Westminster).
30. 'All the seating seems to have been made in the lodge at Windsor but most of the canopies were apparently sub-contracted to Ellis and Filles in London': *English Gothic Choirstalls 1400–1540* (Boydell, Woodbridge, 1990) 47. Tracy explains this by 'As the canopy work was purely architectural, it was, presumably, not considered necessary to ensure a close decorative continuity with the seating': *English Gothic Choir-Stalls* 48. Though a Windsor origin for the misericords is plausible, it is not provable.

31. Tracy *English Gothic Choirstalls* 47. He adds, 'The use of native-type misericord supporters, and moulded ledgings, confirms the furniture's (English) origins' (54).
32. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 399. For Ellis and Filles, of whom nothing else seems to be known, see Harvey *English Medieval Architects* 92 and 108. Two members of an Ellis dynasty worked for Henry VIII as masons in the 1520s–40s.
33. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 403.
34. Hope *Windsor Castle* 2 399.
35. Tracy *English Gothic Choirstalls* 54–7 discusses the mixture of styles in detail, though he is primarily interested in the architectural detail of the woodwork. He suggests 'there was probably pressure from the commissioning patron, Edward IV, for the monument to reflect, as far as possible, the contemporary taste of the Low Countries' (57).
36. Quoted from Holinshed *Chronicles* edited Henry Ellis, 6 vols (Johnson, London, 1807/8) 3 530, by H.M.V. Colvin *The History of the King's Works* 6 vols (HMSO, London, 1963–83) 3 211. John Stow uses this in his *Annales*, quoted in A *House of Kings: The History of Westminster Abbey* edited by Edward Carpenter (Readers Union/John Baker, London, 1967) 95.
 For the building of Henry VII's Chapel, see Colvin *History of the King's Works* 3 211–18; also Jocelyn Perkins *Westminster Abbey: Its Worship and Ornaments* 3 vols (Oxford University Press, London, 1938, 1940, 1952) 2; W. R. Lethaby *Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen: a study of mediaeval building* (Duckworth, London, 1906) 222–7, and *Westminster Abbey Re-examined* (Duckworth, London, 1925). On the misericords, see Helen J. Dow *The Sculptural Decoration of The Henry VII Chapel, Westminster Abbey* (Pentland Press, Edinburgh/Cambridge/Durham, 1992) 3. She lists them in detail on 14–16.
37. 'Henry VIII's Chapel ... is one of the most inadequately documented buildings in the whole History of the King's Works': Colvin *History of the King's Works* 3 210.
38. *The Will of King Henry VII* edited T. Astle (Astle, London, 1775) 6; and OED sv *desk*.
39. See Colvin *History of the King's Works* 3 213, quoting Lethaby *Westminster Abbey Re-examined* 180. The reasoning is that it would have been finished by 1512, 'the year in which Skelton's eulogy of Henry VII was suspended on the bronze enclosure of his chantry'. Tracy accepts this dating: *English Gothic Choirstalls* 48.
40. Christa Grössinger *The World Upside-Down: English Misericords* (Harvey Miller, London, 1997) 34, and see PLATES 43, 102, 103, and 115.

41. Tracy English Gothic Choirstalls 58. His main interest is in the stalls and canopies rather than the misericords.
42. History of the King's Works 3 218: 'John Duche, John Vanclyffe, Henry Vanshanhale, Garrard Wesell and Meneard de Freseland'. Helen J. Dow, however, attributes the more Renaissance look of the misericords to the fact that one of the carvers may have been John Hudde, who worked on the new North tower and porch at Bourges between 1511 and 1515 (*Sculptural Decoration* 83–5). She sees distinct similarities between their style and some of the work on the St Guillaume portal at Bourges, which includes 'nude children at play'; and 'figures engaged in quarrelling or even actual combat'. Most studies of the Cathedral of St. Étienne at Bourges concentrate on its rôle as a great Gothic building; however, see Amédée Boinet *La Cathédrale de Bourges* (Laurens, Paris, 1952) 11–14 on the building campaign of the early sixteenth century, and 'Les Sculptures de la Cathédrale de Bourges (façade occidentale)' *Revue de l'art chrétien* Supplement 1 (Paris, 1912).

Since Hudde did not return to England until 1515, three years after the generally accepted date of the completion of the Chapel, this involves Dow in re-dating the stalls and their misericords to about 1519 (*Sculptural Decoration* 101). However, John Harvey (*English Medieval Architects* 151) puts Hudde at Westminster after 1502 but, by implication, before his journey to Bourges in 1511, in which case it seems unlikely that he could have had a stylistic effect on the misericords. The argument for Hudde having been one of the carvers at Westminster, however, rests on probability only: he was known to have been engaged on the King's Works at the Tower of London, and in Westminster Hall in 1500–1502. There are no documents actually placing him in the Henry VII Chapel.

43. Grössinger *World Upside-Down* 65–71.
44. It not only used the blockbook *Biblia Pauperum*, but an engraving by the German Master bvg (Grossinger *World Upside-Down* 21). J.S. Purvis was the pioneer in this field: 'The Use of Continental Woodcuts and Prints by the Ripon School of Woodcarvers' *Archaeologia* 85 (1935) 107–28.
45. Malcolm Jones 'German and Flemish prints as design-sources for the misericords in St George's Chapel, Windsor (1477x84)' in *Windsor: Medieval Archaeology, Art and Architecture of the Thames Valley* edited Laurence Keen and Eileen Scarff (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 25: W.S. Maney for British Archaeological Association, Leeds, 2002) 155–165.
46. Grössinger *World Upside-Down* 67–8 and plates 101, 102, and 103, J.S. Purvis 'Continental Woodcuts' 124–6.
47. See Félix Soleil *Les heures gothiques et la littérature pieuse au XVe et XVIe siècles* (Augé, Rouen, 1882) for printed Hours and their margins. The same cuts were also used by Thielman Kerver. Items from this particular set of engravings were

used as patterns by misericord carvers in Bristol, c. 1520 (Grössinger *World Upside-Down* 69–70 and plates 104, 105, and 106) and Throwley, Kent (Grössinger 70 and plate 107). It is possible that Pigouchet's marginal mermaid, whose arms are held up at right-angles, was the source for the Westminster mermaid misericord (North side, upper range, second bay, no 3), as it was of Bristol N11.

There are two children on hobby-horses in this cut: the second has a whirligig over his shoulder. The hobby-horse motif seems to have been widespread: see Elaine C. Block 'Iconography of Choir Stalls in Barcelona' *The Profane Arts* 6: 2 (Autumn 1997) 240–57. On 244–5 she lists other hobbyhorse riders, possibly derived from the same engravings, in Spain, France, and the Low Countries. Their nudity seems more attributable to the pattern source than to the sexual reference (*hobby-horse* meaning 'whore') she suggests, however. Her FIG. 5, a misericord at Cuidad Rodrigo, looks like a version, without whirligig, of the second boy, and a confronted pair jousting with whirligigs on one in the Musée nationale du Moyen Age at Paris (her FIG. 6) an adaptation of the same cut, or possibly copied from the children's game for the month of June in the illuminated Hours – see note 51.



PLATE 15: Pigouchet criblé cut, © Meg Twycross

48. But not together on a page: e.g. *Horae presentes ad vsum Sarum impresse fuerunt Parisiis per Philippum pigouchet Anno salutis M.ccc.xcviii ... pro Simon Vostre: librario sig. a viii^v (hobby horse), b vii^r (whirligig); Ces presentes heures a lusiage de Romme furentacheues le .xv. iour de Nouembre. Lan mil cinq cens et vng pour Simon Vostre Libraire ...* (Coat of arms of Philippe Pigouchet, Paris, 1501) sig. g viii^r (whirligig).
49. The attitude suggests that the model is this one and not the other child in the same group, who is mounted on a hobby horse with a whirligig over his shoulder: see illustration to note 47 above.
50. Sent to me almost simultaneously by Malcolm Jones and Christa Grössinger.

51. Isabel Mateo Gómez ‘Gothic Choir Stalls’ in *The Profane Arts* 6: 2 (Autumn 1997) 156–174, FIG 5 on page 161.
52. Maria Dolores Teijeira Pablos *La Influencia del modelo gótico flamenco en León: La Sillería de coro catedralicia* (Universidad de León, León, 1993) 17–31. She suggests that Juan de Malinas 26–9 might be identified with Jan Keldermans of Mechelen, who does not however appear to have worked in his home city (28). Maestre Copin’s (29–31) daughter was called Geltruda de Ver (58) and one of his assistants was Mateo de Ver, perhaps, Teijeira suggests, a relation (30).
53. Meredith “Fart Pryke in cule” 38.
54. For example, BL Additional 24098, the ‘Golf Book’ (Ghent/Bruges, c.1500: Bening, Horenbout); the Spinola Hours, Getty Museum, Malibu MS Ludwig IX 18 (Ghent/Mecheln c. 1515: Bening); the Breviarium Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp (Ghent/Bruges before 1521: Bening, Horenbout); the Grimani Breviary, Venice, Biblioteca Marciana MS lat XI 67 (c. 1515: Master of James IV of Scotland) has a few games.
55. Y. Bouissounouse *Jeux et travaux d'après un livre d'heures du XVe siècle* (Droz, Paris, 1925).
56. See for example the calendar of the month of June in the Spinola Hours, fol. 4^r, and of the Breviarium Mayer van den Bergh, fol 4^r (see *Breviarium Mayer van den Bergh: Alle miniaturen* edited Hans Nieuwdorp and Brigitte Dekeyzer (Ludion, Ghent, 1997) fol. 4^r — boys riding on sticks; BL Additional MS 24098 (Golf Book), fol. 4^r (see *Miniatures and Borders from a Flemish Horae British Museum Add. MS 24098, Early Sixteenth Century: Reproduced in Honour of Sir George Warner* (British Museum, London, 1911) PLATE xxviii. The Pigouchet Hours often show children with whirligigs besides the pilgrims as the subsidiary Labour of the Month of April, but they are not jousting. See also Herman A. van Duinen *De koorbanken van de Grote- of Onze Lieve Vrouwekerk te Dordrecht* (Primavera, Leiden, 1997) 77–82, 136, and the print by Hans Weiditz (1521) of children jousting on hobby horses (146, PLATES 263, 264). As the sixteenth century progressed, fantasies showing children and putti involved in sportive activities increased in number.
57. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum. Bruegel was much influenced iconographically by Bening’s work: see Charles de Tolnay ‘Studien zu den Gemälden Pieter Bruegels der Ältere’ *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 8 (1934) 108–35, at 125; Friedrich Winkler ‘Das Gebetbuch des Kardinals Albrecht von Brandenburg’ offprint from *Aachener Kunstblätter des Museumsvereins* 34–35 (1962–3) 7–107, at 13; Sandra Hindman ‘Pieter Bruegel’s Children’s Games, Folly, and Chance’ *Art Bulletin* 63 (1981) 447–75, at 455–8; also Wolfgang Stechow *Pieter Bruegel the Elder* (Thames and Hudson, London, 1970) 96–104, also 82.

58. It is fanciful and the dates are wrong, but the right-hand figure bears a remarkable resemblance to the wooden death-mask effigy of Henry VII, while the left-hand figure is very like a young Edward IV.
59. Grössinger *World Upside-Down* plate 111 (74); James *Woodwork of the Choir* 13th page of illustrations between pages 34–5. See James 36–46 for list and siting of misericords: South side, lower row, West block 2A (arse-licker: 39); North side, lower rank, West block 7A (demon shitting man: 44); lower rank, East block 1A (friar shitting devil: 45). Grössinger points out how often farting and defecating evoke the devil (81–2), or, sometimes, drive him away (111), and suggests, though tentatively, that this might connote 'successful resistance to sin' (111).
60. Jones 'German and Flemish prints' 162–3.
61. South Side, upper range, 2nd bay, 3: 'Three children, the one in the middle stripped and kneeling, being held down by the one on the left, while one on the right has a birch': Dow *Sculptural Decoration* 15. South side, upper range, 3rd bay, 6: 'man with a distaff being beaten by a woman with a birch': Dow *Sculptural Decoration* 16. For image of the latter, see Grössinger *World Upside-Down* plate 102 (67).
62. See G.L. Remnant A *Catalogue of Misericords in Great Britain* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1967) 211.
63. James *Woodwork of the Choir* 41:

Two boys with hands tied and knees drawn up through them hold short sticks and try to hit each other. A form of "cockfighting".

St John Hope (*Windsor Castle* 2 403), on whom James based his account, merely describes it as:

Two boys in short tunics with hands tied, and with knees drawn up through them, each with a short staff in his hands and trying to hit the other.

Neither mentions the not-very-visible short staff passed behind the knees.

By James' (and Kipling's) time, of course, the game seems to have become commonplace in boarding schools and other male enclaves.

64. Westminster School was originally an offshoot of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster. For a brief history of Westminster School, see *The Cambridge History of English Literature* edited by A.W. Ward and A.R. Waller, 15 vols (Cambridge University Press, 1907–1921) 7 (1911).
65. It does not necessarily suggest that the game would have been appreciated by an audience of Flemish and Spanish ambassadors.