# 5

## HAUT AND BAS MINSTRELSY

### Introduction

Since music was a largely functional art during the Middle Ages, we might expect instruments to be classified according to their function, and therefore according to their social status. We shall indeed find that trumpeters and harpers, for instance, were generally more highly-regarded than other minstrels: but the variety of instrumental music available was so great that such a rigid system of classification would not have been practicable. Of prime importance was the broad division into *haut* and *bas* – that is "loud" and "soft" music, not "high" and "low" in the modern sense of high- and low-pitched. Examination of the instruments used on specific occasions shows that this division was rigidly adhered to: some occasions required *haut* minstrelsy, some *bas*, while others (such as the civic processions) had need of both; but there was never any doubt as to which was required, and which instruments were therefore unsuitable.

Although the terms *haut* and *bas* appear to have been used to distinguish different instrumental groupings only from the late fourteenth century onwards, E.A. Bowles has shown[1] that the actual distinction between loud and soft instruments obtained as early as [145a] the thirteenth century. The grouping of instruments in contemporary French literature shows a consistent division between noisy instruments (such as trumpets, horns, nakers, tabors, bagpipes, shawms and chime-bells) and quiet ones (such as portative organs, flutes, crumhorns and all the stringed instruments, both plucked and bowed). Only two instruments defy complete classification because of their versatility; both the bagpipe and the pipe-and-tabor were normally regarded as *haut* instruments, although it seems that the smaller versions of both could be used for *bas* music.

In England, as on the Continent, the distinction between loud and soft minstrelsy seems general in the late Middle Ages. The terms *haut* and *bas*, however,

[1] Bowles/*Haut*, p. 119: the whole of this introductory discussion is based on Bowle's article.

are not found in English sources; and the equivalent English terms – "loud" and "still" – are found later than their French counterparts.[1a]

In the present chapter, *haut* and *bas* minstrels will be examined in turn, and we shall then try to draw some conclusions about the use of instruments in consort. The discussion of pipers will, of necessity, deal with *bas* pipers in an attempt to separate them from the shawmists and bagpipers. Otherwise, only one section may seem out of place: I have separated the discussion of the chimes-players from those of other *haut* instrumentalists both because of the particular problem that the chimes-players present and also [145b] because they were not household musicians.

**Trumpeters**

No single body of men contributed more to the splendour of a ceremonial occasion then did the trumpeters of the nobility. They were part of that "conspicuous consumption"[1b] which was considered necessary in any noble household, and the banners bought for them were brilliant and costly.[2]

The trumpeters' actual status was high, too, and they enjoyed a greater position of trust than did the more domestic minstrels, a few specially-favoured harpers and *gestours* only excepted.[3] Payments to trumpeters for carrying letters, for instance, far outweigh those to other minstrels.[4]

Such message-taking jobs were by no means confined to those who were known as *nuncii* or *cokini*.[5] At times when many messages had to be carried, such as during war-time, clerks, chaplains, and [146] many other members of the household were used for this purpose. In one Wardrobe-book entry we even find John the trumpeter described as "cokinus", and in a later entry he appears amongst payments to "nuncii".[6]

I have already mentioned the relationship between heralds and minstrels:[7] that between heralds and trumpeters was especially close. From various sources

---

[1a] "Still-minstrel" in Henry V's reign (see above, p. 133 and n. 172): I have not found the term "loud minstrel" earlier than the 16th century (see below, ii, p. 181).

[1b] Stevens/*CCS*, p. 56.

[2] For the king's trumpets, and the banners were often of red silk (sarcenet or taffeta), embroidered with the royal arms: much gold leaf was used for this. See E101.394.16, m. 11 (37–38 Ed III); Add 17721, f. 31 (13–14 Hen VI); Devon/*Issues*, p. 207 (I Ric II); and Lafontaine/*Musick*, p. 1 (coronation of Ric III, 1483). See also n. 10, below.

[3] See below, pp. 163 and 165 f.

[4] See below, ii, Appendix A, *passim*: also above, p. 31 and n. 73.

[5] See Hill/*Messengers*, especially p. 316, for discussion of the *cokini* and *cursores*.

[6] See below, ii, pp. 22 and 24. This is probably John de Depe, who carried many letters at about this time.

[7] See above, pp. 28 ff.

we find that trumpeters attended heralds. In the *Canterbury Tales* we find that at a tournament trumpets sounded after the announcement of the rules, as a signal to the combatants to begin, and again to announce the victory: these announcements were made by heralds.[8] An early sixteenth-century treatise on the apparel to be worn by a baron in the field in his sovereign's company deals with heralds, pursuivants and trumpeters together.[9] The trumpeters' attendance on the heralds was not, then, merely a ceremonial function: it was as important to make a great display in war as it was in peace-time. Thus we [147] find trumpeters being given new banners before embarking for war.[10] Their duties were probably very much the same in actual war as in martial exercises in peace-time: a trumpet assisted at the announcement of an imminent battle in 1388; trumpets sounded the English advance at the battle of Poitiers in 1356; and the trumpeters accompanied the sergeants-at-arms when the truce with France was proclaimed round the garrisons in 1414.[11]

A chronological survey of trumpeters will show that during the late Middle Ages their numbers increased, while their function became both more occasional and more purely ceremonial. At the end of Edward I's reign the king employed two pairs of trumpeters, while other nobles employed one pair or a single player:[12] these numbers probably remained general in peace-time for most of the fourteenth-century, and it is not until 1392 that we find an increase. In this year the Earl of Derby took abroad with him a band which included two pairs of trumpeters, although his earlier expedition had included only one pair.[13] This number may still have been exceptional for an earl, however, and the king's trumpeters do not seem to have increased until Henry VI's reign. [148] Henry had inherited two pairs of trumpeters from his father, to which another three players were added by 1447.[14] By the 6th or 7th year of the following reign, Edward IV had increased his trumpeters to nine, at which stage the trumpeters had their own administration under a Marshal of the Trumpets. The Duke of Clarence now had six trumpeters, who were normally required only at the principal

---

[8] See Manly/*TCT*, iii, pp. 105 f and 108: also Douce/*Jousts*, pp. 4 f.

[9] Madden/*Remembrances*. The trumpeters of the King of Scots may have ranked as pursuivants, for a payment for their banners is entered under the heading "To the Harrottis" – i.e. heralds and pursuivants (see below, ii, p. 164). However, I doubt if Carrick Herald should be identified with William Carrick, the trumpeter, although it is interesting that a payment for Carrick (Herald) to take letters to Bruges follows close after a payment for one new saddle for the trumpeters (below, ii, p. 163).

[10] See below, ii, pp. 154 f: also above, p. 94, n. 25.

[11] Rickert/*Chaucer*, pp. 311 f (a translation of Froissart); *ibid*, p. 232 (a translation of Baker's chronicle); and Wylie/*Henry V*, I, p. 156, n. 8.

[12] See below, ii, pp. 53–58, *passim*, for instance.

[13] See below, pp. 202 f.

[14] See Rastall/*MERH*, p. 30. Payte was probably dead four years later, however.

feasts, while a baron, Lord Howard, apparently had four in 1481.[15] The king's trumpeters remained at nine until the increase to fifteen in Henry VIII's reign: at about the same time six was the standard number for an earl.[16]

In the earlier part of this survey, I have deliberately referred to trumpeters as being in pairs. Household servants often shared lodgings, and it was natural, for instance, that if a servant was not present at the time that a payment was made to him, his *socius* should collect it. The phrase "socius suus" is especially common in reference to trumpeters, however, and in their case it implies a close professional relationship: the king [149] employed trumpeters "qui non sunt" in pairs,[17] and it is usually to a pair of trumpeters that we find gifts being made for minstrelsy.[18]

In this connection we must remember that the ordinances of 1318 required two trumpeters, as well as two other minstrels, to remain in Court to make minstrelsy at the king's pleasure.[19] This does not mean, of course, that the four minstrels all played in consort, for the other two may have been *bas* minstrels. But it does indicate, I think, that two trumpeters were considered suitable for most domestic purposes.

I must emphasise that this minstrelsy by the trumpeters, far from being outdoor music, sometimes took place in the relatively confined space of the king's chamber, in religious houses just as elsewhere.[20] On the other hand, one pair of trumpeters – especially with a nakerer added – was evidently sufficient for many ceremonial purposes, and in the earlier part of the period the combination of two trumpeters and a nakerer seems standard.[21]

[150] What is the significance, in musical terms, of the general increase in the number of trumpeters? First, it indicates a growing pre-occupation with display and ceremonial: and so we find the number of trumpeters increased in war-time, and a veritable army of trumpeters and taborers at Richard III's coronation.[22]

---

[15] For Clarence's trumpets, 8 Ed IV, see *Ords & Regs*, p. 98: they are required to come "at the festes, and other tymes, if they be commaunded". Howard's trumpets were augmented by a fifth player at half pay for military purposes: see below, p. 205.

[16] For Henry VIII's trumpeters, see Rastall/*MERH*, p. 40: for the six trumpeters of an earl or duke, c. 1512, see Percy/*Northumberland*, p. 339.

[17] Doncaster and Crakestreng in 32 Ed I: Yvan and Ithel in 1 Ed II. See below, ii, Appendix A, for those dates.

[18] There are some gifts to solo trumpeters, although this is less common: see below, ii, pp. 46, 65 and 99. We should expect some solo minstrelsy from trumpeters, since certain nobles employed only one trumpeter.

[19] Tout/*Ed.II*, p. 303.

[20] See below, ii, pp. 71, 78 and 79.

[21] See below, ii, pp. 40, 52 and 66–70 (Scot, Kenynton and Francekinus).

[22] Edward III's trumpeters were not infrequently increased from four to five or six, often, it seems, for military purposes: see below, ii, pp. 91, 97, 101, 102, 111, 112, 116 and 117 (*temp*. Ric II). One of the augmented band is often a clarioner. The war-time ordinances of 18–21 Ed III show that his minstrels included five trumpeters and two clarioners: see

Second, the increase implies that the custom of employing trumpeters in pairs was dying out, and this in turn indicates a positive decline in domestic minstrelsy by trumpeters.

I do not mean by this that the minstrelsy of one or two trumpeters had completely ceased to exist by the end of the fifteenth century, for the itinerant minstrelsy still included independent or liveried trumpeters travelling singly or in pairs. But gifts for such minstrelsy are rare, and amongst the trumpeters of the larger households the practice seems to have died out.[23] Indeed, a decline in such minstrelsy is noticeable as early as the [151] reign of Edward III, when the Wardrobe Books still recorded enough *Dona* for a comparison with earlier reigns to be made. In the ordinances of 1455 it is clearly recognisable: for although Henry VI had recently increased the number of his trumpeters from four to seven, not one of the four minstrels in constant attendance was a trumpeter.[24] When we do hear of trumpet-playing of a domestic type in the early sixteenth century – that which greeted the Earl of Northumberland at his chamber door on New Year's Day – all six of his trumpeters were involved.[25] We can safely assume, I think, that this was ceremonial music of some volume rather than indoor music of the type that a pair of trumpeters might have played to Edward I or Edward II.

The foregoing discussion should not be taken to imply that the royal trumpeters were capable only of playing fanfares of little musical value. On the contrary, I am sure that they took advantage of the various improvements to their instrument and were capable, by the late fifteenth century, of playing quite intricate music.[26] As early as 1350 we find Edward III's trumpeters playing a "Danse d'Alemagne" as well as making military signals before a [152] sea-battle.[27] The dance could probably not be played on the straight ceremonial *busine*, and perhaps the S-shaped trumpet (which we do not find depicted until several years

---

*Ords* & *Regs*, p. 9. For the increases to the trumpeters of the Howard and Scottish households, see below, pp. 205 and 209.

For trumpeters at the coronation, 1483, see Rastall/*MERH*, pp. 34 f: even the *clangor tubarum et tibicinum* before the knighting of the future Edward II can hardly have compared with this (see below, p. 176).

[23] See above, ii, pp. 133 and 139. The gifts to single trumpeters of the household, ii, p. 137, and Appendix D, *passim*, may not have been made for minstrelsy.

[24] *Ords & Regs*, p. 18: Radcliff, Wykes and Cliff were all still minstrels, while More was a *wayt*.

[25] Percy/*Northumberland*, p. 342.

[26] Not necessarily polyphony, since it seems most unlikely that they could read mensural notation.

[27] Harvey/*Plantagenets*, p. 90, quoting Froissart's chronicle.

later)[28] was already in existence. Moreover, there was at this time the distinction between "trumpeter" and "clarioner", which implies two different instruments.

Household accounts enable us to make a guess at the significance of these terms. Anthony Baines considered that the evidence for the distinction was "contradictory and unhelpful",[29] and it is certainly not easy to see what instruments were meant by the two names. As the clarion most often made its appearance in royal accounts during war-time, however, the obvious answer in that the clarion was the ceremonial and military straight *busine*, while the king's regular trumpeters played the more versatile S-shaped instrument.

This distinction is found again at the very end of our period. In the later fifteenth century the S-shaped trumpet was superseded by the looped instrument, while the slide-trumpet with adjustable mouthpipe was widely used on the Continent but not, [153] apparently, in England. Baines considered that the latter instrument was probably that known as the "trompette des ménestrels": and the "trompette de guerre" would certainly have been the straight *busine*, which continued to be used as the ceremonial trumpet.[30]

"Minstrel", "trumpeter" and "minstrel-trumpeter" are all terms used for the king's trumpeters at this time. Even if they played a looped instrument rather than a slide-trumpet, the distinction between a household trumpeter and a "war-trumpeter" was now one of status as well as of function; for while a minstrel-trumpeter could no doubt play fanfares on a *busine*, a war-trumpeter would not have made minstrelsy. It is perhaps for this reason that the additional war-trumpeter in the Howard accounts received less in gifts and wages than his companions.[31]

**Nakerers and Taborers**

Nakers were a pair of bowl-shaped drums, usually suspended from the player's belt, but occasionally slung from the back of a second person. They may have been tuned to definite pitches in the Middle Ages.[32] Nakers were primarily a military instrument, used together with trumpets, but they could also be used [154] for domestic minstrelsy.[33] The king's nakerer was probably a highly-skilled

---

[28] In a miserere in Worcester Cathedral, dating from c.1397: see Gardener/*Sculpture*, plate 550.

[29] In his article "Trumpet" in Grove/*Dictionary*: I have used this article for the history and evolution of the trumpet.

[30] See Carysfort/*Beauchamp*, pageants xxix–xxxi inclusive and xxxiv, for a depiction c.1485.

[31] See below, ii, p. 156 (two items).

[32] Baines/*MI*, p. 328.

[33] See below, ii, p. 39, for instance (two items).

and respected player, as his close connection with the trumpeters would require. Nevertheless, nakers do not seem ever to have been a solo instrument.

Taborers, on the other hand, frequently appear as solo minstrels. A tabor was a small cylindrical drum slung from the belt or neck. Like nakers, it could be a military instrument, but when used for noise-making – whether on the field of battle or for raising wild-fowl[34] – it did not require any great skill, and we find that trumpeters sometimes became taborers on military expeditions.[35] A tabor could therefore be used as a substitute for nakers: indeed, during the fifteenth century, when the use of nakers seems to have died out, trumpets and tabors were used together for both civil and military ceremonies.[36]

Usually, however, a taborer played *pipe*-and-tabor, holding the pipe in his left hand and striking the tabor with a stick held in his right: the pipe was normally a flageolet, although it seems that even a small bagpipe could be played in this way.[37] [155] Pipe-and-tabor had many festive uses: it could provide music for the celebrations after a wedding, for a solo dancer, or for the ceremonies and entertainments aboard ship.[38] Like the equally-versatile bagpipe, pipe-and-tabor cannot strictly be classified as either *haut* or *bas*.[39]

**Pipers, Wayts and *Vigilatores***

"Piper" in the royal accounts and elsewhere could be used in reference to many different types of instrument. Bagpipes of various sizes were probably more common at Court than the incidence of the words "bagpiper" and "cornemuser" would suggest: sometimes we know that a royal minstrel was a bagpiper through a single entry amongst many referring to him as a "piper"[40] The larger bagpipes may have been suitable for military music (although I have no evidence of such a use), while it is possible that the smallest variety could be played with one hand, leaving the other free to strike a tabor.[41]

[156] Most pipers probably played a shawm or wayt, however. In a household context, *wayt* denoted a player of that instrument probably as late as the mid-fifteenth century: only then did it come to have the narrower meaning of a

[34] See above, pp. 110 f.

[35] See below, ii, pp. 72 and 165 (and n. 10).

[36] For Richard III's coronation, see Rastall/*MERH*, pp. 34 f: for Lord Howard's trumpets and taborets, see below, ii, pp. 153–57.

[37] For the flageolet, see Baines/*MI*, pp. 225 f: for the bagpipe, see below, p. 155.

[38] See below, ii, pp. 152, 156, 169, 176 and 183.

[39] For the classification of instruments, see Bowles/*Haut*.

[40] For instance, John Perrot in Edward III's reign and Pudsey in Henry VII's.

[41] See below, ii, p. 94. This was, of course, during war–time: but as Robert de Farebourn had been making minstrelsy to the king, and had presumably therefore played *pipe*-and-tabor, we must assume that John Perrot used the instrument in the same way.

household watchman. Before that time we find not only *vigilatores* and minstrels, but huntsmen and other household servants, described as "wayt".[42]

We find pipers also referred to as *fistulator, flutar'* (I am not sure how to extend that contraction), recorder-player or horn-piper.[43] The third and fourth of these are specific enough. The first two are synonymous, but may not always mean a flageolet type of instrument:[44] such a phrase as "fistula nomine Ricordo"[45] suggests that *fistula* was as general a term as "pipe". Indeed, we find Guy Middleton, *fistulator*, also referred to as Guy Waite.[46]

Efforts to put specific intruments to the royal pupers are not, therefore, very successful. We have a further problem, too, since despite the popularity of the shawm we appear to have no word for that instrument until "shawm" itself is found in the late [157] fifteenth century.[47] At this point, a fifteenth-century gloss of *colomaula* (i.e. *chalemie*, shawm) as "wayte-pipe"[48] seems to solve the difficulty by identifying the wayt – common enough in the Wardrobe Books – with the shawm. The identity is partly confirmed by references to wayts in contexts where we could reasonably expect shawms to be used.[49]

The solution, however, is not yet complete. The frequent mention in medeival sources of shawms and wayts together[50] implies a distinction between the two terms. Galpin's opinion[51] that the wayt was specifically a *small* shawm is supported in serveral ways. The Leckingfield Proverbs, although slightly late for out purposes (*temp*. Henry VIII), show a shawm to be low-pitched,[52] whereas the pipe of a domestic watchman would have to be high-pitched (rather than merely

---

[42] See below, ii, Appendix A, *passim*.

[43] See below, ii, pp. 33, 82, 112, 120 and 138.

[44] John of Kinghorn was also known as a *fistularis*: see Farmer/*Scotland*, p. 40. For *fistula* meaning a flageolet, see Baines/*MI*, p. 235.

[45] Wylie/*Henry IV*, Appendix A.

[46] See below, ii, p. 124. However, it is possible that at this time *wayt* already denoted the office of *vifilator* rather than the instrument.

[47] In the *Liber Niger*: see below.

[48] Galpin/*OEIM*, p. 120.

[49] Langwill/*Waits*, p. 172, quotes wayts piping at banquets:

> "When theo table was y-drawe,
> Theo Wayte gan a pipe blawe." (From a 14th-century romance, *Kyng Alysander*);
>
> "Grete lordys were at the Assent;
> Waytys blewe, to mete they wente." (From the romance *Sir Eglamour*, 1440).

[50] This was the starting-point for Frere/*Shawms*.

[51] *Ibid*.

[52] Galpin/*OEIM*, p. 117, quotes the relevant passage:

> "A Shawme makithe a swete sounde, for he tunythe basse… "

noisy) to penetrate the thick walls and doors of a castle. If the wayt was, in fact, a small shawm, then the description of Guy Middleton as *fistulator* is understandable.

[158] The *Liber Niger* states that of Edward IV's minstrels "sume use trumpettes, sume shalmuse and small pipes, and sume as strengmen…"[53] The relationship between shawms and small pipes here seems to be the same as that between shawms and wayts: and so Galpin's opinion that wayts and small pipes were the same instrument is probably the most logical conclusion.

While accepting this conclusion, we must nevertheless examine the other possible identities of the "small pipe". These are:

1 A flageolet.
2 Small bagpipes.

The first of these is unlikely, for the flageolet does not seem to have been played much at Court except with a tabor, and the players in this case were known as taborers, not pipers. Minstrels taking their description from *fistula* are rare,[54] and only Flagilet, Edward III's piper, can be assumed to have played the instrument. A bagpipe of the small variety is more likely: otherwise, the *Liber Niger*'s list is seriously simplified as regards the variety of instruments at Edward IV's Court, bagpipes being entirely omitted.

However, the *Liber Niger* does imply that the shawms and small pipes were played by the same men. This, if we accept [159] it, probably rules out the possibility of the small pipe being a bagpipe, since the techniques of playing shawms and bagpipes are very different.

The word "wayt" is apparently cognate with the names of many instruments still found at the present time in Europe, North Africa and the Near East.[55] By the late thirteenth century it had given its name to the men who played it, including the domestic watchmen.[56] In Latin documents such as the Wardrobe Books, these men were known as *vigiles* or *vigilatores*, which names they retained until the mid-fifteenth century: references to them as "gayte" or "wayte"[57] seem to be the standard vernacular description by about 1445.[58]

---

[53] *Ords & Regs*, p. 48.

[54] See above, n. 43.

[55] Many are mentioned in Frere/*Shawms*.

[56] See below, ii, p. 22, for an early example.

[57] The consonant-change from the French "gayte" to the English "wayte" has been explained with reference to the German "wachen", Anglo-Saxon "wacien" and other words from which "watch" is derived (Langwill/*Waits*, p. 170, for example). This is confusing and unnecessary: the consonant-change is a common one (c.f. garde/ward, gofer/wafer, gage/wage, guarantee/warranty, and many others).

[58] See below, n. 68.

The *vigiles* were capable of making minstrelsy by the beginning of our period. Four royal *vigiles* were among those who received gifts for minstrelsy at the marriage of the king's daughter Elizabeth in 25 Ed I,[59] while the king's four *vigiles* received a [160] similar gift at the Pentecost celebrations of 1306.[60] Their minstrelsy was perhaps as acceptable at times as that of the minstrels proper, and in 31 Ed I we find the *vigilis* of the Prince of Wales apparently entertaining his master *solo*.[61]

The *vigiles* were not usually recognised as minstrels, however, and in the royal household ordinances of 1318, as in the *Liber Niger*, no mention is made of their musical accomplishments. Indeed, the *vigiles* whom we shall find raised to the status of "king's minstrel" must have been exceptional in their profession, although not uncommon at Court.[62]

The various servants named "Wayt" in Edward III's reign are not easy to identify. However, at least two of the *vigiles* – William Harding and Gerard – became king's minstrels:[63] John Harding, *vigilis* under Edward II,[64] may be the John Wayte who was [161] a minstrel in the next reign.[65] Harding is especially interesting, in that his seal provides our only positive iconographical evidence that a *vigilis* played an instrument of the shawm variety.[66]

In the first half of the fifteenth century, Guy Middleton (who was both minstrel and *vigilator*) was followed by *vigilatores* who were not, as far as I know, minstrels.[67] In 1455, however, one of the minstrels was also the *vigilator*:[68] this was probably Robert More, who was a king's minstrel by about 27 Hen VI,[69] and

---

[59] See below, ii, p. 17.

[60] *Ibid*., p. 57.

[61] *Ibid*., p. 38.

[62] By their nature, the offices of *vigilis* and waferer were more likely than other household offices to produce suitable candidates to fill vacancies amongst the king's minstrels: see above, p. 100. It may be no coincidence, then, that in the 1318 ordinances the members of these two departments – "lez ij vaytez et wafrer" – are directed to be lodged together: see Tout/*Ed. II*, p. 311.

[63] *Vigiles*; see below, ii, pp. 86 and 99 respectively: minstrels; see below, ii, p. 110. Three "waytes" are included with Edward III's minstrels in the ordinances of 18–21 Ed III: see *Ords & Regs*, p. 9.

[64] See below, ii, p. 81.

[65] See below, ii, pp. 104 and 109. I have tentatively identified John Wayte with Badencore (Rastall/*MERH*, p. 17): Harding is perhaps just as likely.

[66] See below, ii, p. 86.

[67] Richard More and William Wodeford: see below, ii, pp. 125 f.

[68] MS Landsdownel, f. 90v, describes the king's minstrels thus: "xij Menistrealx, one le gaite".

[69] See below, ii, p. 128.

whome we find in the ordinances of 1455 described as "wayte".[70] More was not the only *vigilator* in the household, but presumably he was the senior one. A year or two later, certainly, he had two colleagues – who are not known to have been minstrels, however.[71]

We last hear of More in 5 or 6 Ed IV.[72] A few years later, [162] the *Liber Niger* makes allowance for a senior "wayte" who might or might not be a minstrel. His rank is that of yoman (i.e. valet), and he has only one groom to assist him:[73] but his wages and liveries can be either those of the household yoman or those of the minstrels, according to his ability.[74] The implication is, therefore, that he took the higher wages and livery if he could make minstrelsy.

According to the twelfth-century *Dialogus de Scaccario*, the duty of the royal *vigiles* was to guard the treasures in the Exchequer.[75] These treasures were considerable, and their custody no doubt remained a duty of the *vigiles* throughout our period. A list of prisoners held after the breaking of the Exchequer in June 31 Ed I, includes the sad entry:

> Item Gilbertus le Wayte de Westmonasterio captus et detentus in eadem (Newgate Gaol) propter suspicinonem quia stetit Custos vigilie tempore quo Thesauraria illa fracta fuit.[76]

As we have seen, the king's *vigiles* sometimes received extra liveries because they were required to keep watch during the [163] night.[77] There is every reason to suppose that this duty remained unchanged throughout our period, and that the wayte's regular duties as set down in the *Liber Niger*[78] are the same as those of Edward I's *vigiles*, for example. The *Liber Niger* directed that the yoman wayte should pipe the watch every night, making a "good noise" (*bon gayte*) and checking at every chamber door and department (*office*) for fire and other dangers. Between Michaelmas and Maundy Thursday he was to pipe four times each night, and in summer three times.

---

[70] See above, p. 88 and n. 3.

[71] See below, ii, p. 129.

[72] See below, ii, p. 130.

[73] *Ords & Regs*, p. 48.

[74] See above, p. 117 and n. 118.

[75] Johnson/*Dialogus*, pp. 12 f.

[76] Palgrave/*Kalendars*, i, p. 269. Gilbert probably always worked in Westminster Palace, and he was not a member of the king's household: at this time the king was in Scotland, with a household that included his four *vigiles* (Alexander and Geoffrey de Windsor, Skirewith and Finchesle).

[77] See above, p. 120, and below, ii, pp. 44 and 82.

[78] *Ords &Regs*, p. 48.

## *Bas* Minstrels

Until the late fifteenth century the harp was the most popular courtly instrument. After that time the lute took its place: but for most of the later Middle Ages, when a man of rank was accompanied by a solitary minstrel, that minstrel was more often than not a harper.[79] Even when a noble employed many minstrels, his harper seems usually to have been the closest to him. Thus we sometimes find a payment made to a man of standing by the hand of his harper:[80] and on one occasion we find a harper taking letters.[81]

[164] The first two Edwards employed many harpers, and evidently though well of them. Of those employed by Edward II, two were styled "Master" and a third became *Roy de North*.[82] No later monarch employed so many, however, and as far as one can tell from minstrel-lists a single harper bacame normal in the king's household, and remained so until the sixteenth century. Some dependent households also employed a harper and, like the king's, a variety of other plucked instruments. During the fourteenth century the crowd was apparently a popular instrument in the households of the king and the Prince of Wales. The households of the queen and queen mother, however, provide an interesting exception to the general pattern: the psaltery seems to have been considered the most suitable plucked instrument for a lady's entertainment, and we do not find a harper in the queen's or queen mother's household until the fifteenth century.[83]

Luters, citolers and gitterners all appear in minstrel-lists in the Wardrobe Books. The lute is found as early as 23 Ed I,[84] and a luter appears regularly amongst the royal minstrels, usually in the king's household, until Henry V's reign. Luters are found [165] again at Henry VII's Court, by which time the lute was a popular courtly instrument and considered suitable for ladies – a luter was one of the Princess Margaret's minstrels after her marriage to the King of Scots.[85]

The citole seems to have been favoured at Court during the reigns of Edward II and Edward III, although its popularity did not compare with that of the psaltery. We also find the gittern from Edward II's reign until Henry V's – apparently only one player being employed at Court at any one time. With a lack of more precise descriptions of the "still minstrels" in the mid-fifteenth century, it is im-

---

[79] Appendix A, ii, below, will supply enough examples to support the point: see also above, pp. 77–80, *passim*.

[80] See below, ii, pp. 17, 22 and 27 (three times): c.f. also *ibid*., p. 157.

[81] *Ibid*., p. 104.

[82] See above, pp. 28 and 143.

[83] In the reign of Henry VI. The list of queen's minstrels at the marriage of Princess Philippa in 8 Hen IV does include a harper, but I do not think that these minstrels were usually members of the queen's household: see above, p. 89 and n. 8.

[84] Frryde/*Prests*, p. 31: for my first calendared entry, see below, ii, p. 16.

[85] See below, ii, pp. 179 ff.

possible to tell if these instruments continued at Court. They seem to have lost favour by Henry VII's reign, however, although in less exalted spheres they retained their popularity well into the sixteenth century.

A noble's favoured harper was perhaps in many cases a *gestour* rather than simply an instrumentalist.[86] The words *gestour* and *rymour* have appeared very rarely in the records searched for the present work, however, and amongst royal minstrels only three *gestours* can be identified – each on a single reference.[87] In [166] addition to these, we also know that Edward II, as Prince of Wales, had a *rhymer*:[88] it would be reasonable to assume that he still employed a *rhymer* after he had come to the throne, although we do not know which of his minstrels it must have been.

The harp was not the only instrument used to accompany the voice, although it was probably the most common one. Chaucer provides examples of singer accompanying themselves on the rebec, gittern and psaltery,[89] and we can certainly add clarsach and lute to these if we include singers accompanied by a second minstrel.[90] As we have seen, the crowd could be used by a *rymour* (probably, but not certainly, plucked rather than bowed). It perhaps seems strange to us that a singer should accompany himself on a bowed instrument, but the use of a rebec in this way is supported by later examples.[91]

In the case of purely instrumental music, the harp, clarsach and (plucked) crowd were at a disadvantage when compared with the fretted instruments on which greater virtuosity and chromatic compass were possible. True, the Scottish accounts make it clear that at a late date the clarsach could be used purely [167] instrumentally:[92] but I am inclined to attribute the harp's popularity partly to its use as an accompaniment to the telling of *gestes*.[93] If this is a correct guess, further investigation may show that some royal harpers were *gestours*.

The players of bowed instruments appear to divide neatly into violists and fiddlers. In the first three reigns of our period two violists seem standard for the king's household, while dependent households sometimes included a single player. During the fifteenth century the viol may have suffered a temporary

---

[86] c.f. pp. 75 ff, above.

[87] John Alisaundre is described as *rymour* in *RegBP*, ii, p. 317; William Percival as *gestour* in a list of household servants (calendared below, ii, p. 117); and Alexander Mason as *geyster* in a list of grants (calendared *ibid*., p. 131).

[88] See above, p. 79.

[89] For the use of instruments in the *Canterbury Tales*, see Montgomery/*MICT* and Chappell/*PMOT*, pp. 33 f.

[90] See below, ii, pp. 144 and 174.

[91] See *ibid*., pp. 133 and 170.

[92] For instance, "… to the man that playit to the king on the clarsach…": see *ibid*., p. 172, and several other examples.

[93] On the *gestes* themselves, see above, p. 76.

eclipse, and it is notably absent from Henry VII's Court: not until the following century did it re-appear.[94]

The three *gigatores* of Edward I were not his own minstrels, although two of them remained at Court for several years. The word *gigator* (or *gigour* in French) may be an attempt by the Wardrobe scribes to Latinise the German players' own description of themselves as players of the *Geige*, and Hayes' conclusion that they were rebec-players, playing sharply-accented dance-music,[95] is probably correct.

[168] As far as one can tell, the three groom *gigatores* who were at Court in 31 Ed I[96] did not become king's minstrels in the following reign. Edward III employed a pair of fiddlers, and we find a single player in the households of Henry IV and his two successors. Our information is insufficient for the reigns of the Yorkist kings;[97] in the time of Henry VII, however, we find that the queen had a fiddler and that one of Prince Henry's minstrels was a rebec-player.[98]

**Chimes-Players**

The chimes player is almost completely absent from the records of noble households and of towns. The list of minstrels at the Pentecost feast of 1306 includes a "menestral ove les cloches", and that is only reference to a chimes-player that I have found.[98a] Even allowing for the fact that many royal minstrels do not have instruments assigned to them in the Wardrobe Books searched for the present work, it seems unlikely that no reference would be made to the instrument if a chimes-player had been employed at Court. We [169] must therefore conclude that chimes were not a household instrument.

This lack of documentary evidence is the more notable if we consider the contemporary iconography, for the depictions of chime-bells are far from uncommon. The thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries saw a burst of energy in the production of illuminated psalters in England, and it is in these psalters that chimes are found. The depictions are consistent, both in the appearance of the bells[99] and in the method of playing them.

---

[94] c.f. Stevens/*M&P*, p. 277.

[95] Hayes/*KM*, p. 31. The issue is confused by an entry (not known to Hayes) in which a *gigator* is described as "violist": see below, ii, p. 88. This may be a scribal error caused by unfamiliarity with the word.

[96] See below, ii, p. 31.

[97] Edward IV's *Liber Niger* refers to string-minstrels, as do the accounts of Henry VII's reign: see *Ord & Regs*, p. 48, and below, ii, pp. 133–41, *passim*. This description, of course, includes plucked instruments.

[98] See below, ii, p. 135, and Baillie/*Notes*, under "Savernake".

[98a] See below, ii, p. 55

[99] For a discussion of their casting and tuning, see Waesberghe/*Cymbala*.

The instrument consists of a number of bells suspended from a beam or rod and struck with two metal-headed hammers. The player may be seated beneath them or – less commonly – he may stand. It is a little unfortunate that bells are usually depicted within the limited space of an illuminated initial, for although the beam is normally shown, we rarely find out what supported it. In one illustration the beam is supported on pillars, and seems to be a fixture: in another case, the very unsteady-looking side-pieces must be a portable frame.[100] We also find the frame suspended from above.[101]

The number of bells depicted varies, but it seems clear that eight were usual. Where there are fewer than this, the available [170] space is usually limited:[102] in one such case the illuminator appears to have solved his problem by arranging the bells in a rather impractical double row, by means of which he has just managed to fit in all eight.[103] An illustration from a late twelfth-century psalter in the Hunterian Library[104] is remarkable for having fifteen bells: its two players, with two hammers each, are on a raised platform which they have reached by means of ladders, and the solmisation names of the notes are written on the beam from which the bells are suspended.[105]

---

[100] Harley 2804 (12th-century German Bible), ff. 3v, 4, reproduced in Millar/*RIM* 4, Plate XI; Bibliothèque de Dijon, Bible of St Stephen Harding (11th century), reproduced in *NOHM* 3, Plate V.

[101] See above, Plate IV.

[102] See the *Exultate Deo* initials of the York Psalter (c.1250), reproduced in Millar/*York*, where there are six; of the Peterborough Psalter (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 53), reproduced in James/*Peterborough*, where there are five; and of a 13th-century psalter (Royal MS 3.E.VII), where there are four. See also the five in a corner-roundel of the Beatus page of the Evesham Psalter (Add 44874, c.1250—60), reproduced in Turner/*EGIM*, coloured plate II. For an exception, see *NOHM* 2, frontispiece (St John's College, Cambridge, MS B.18, 12th century), where there are only seven bells, although there is no shortage of space.

[103] See above, Plate IV.

[104] Huntarian Library, Glasgow, MS 229 (press-mark U.32, Sect. 6), f. lv: c.1270, reproduced in *NOHM* 3, Plate VII.

[105] However, these do not correspond with the bells: the bells are named in sequence from both ends, and as the names are placed between the bells, there are more bells than names. The sequence of names is as follows (the position of each bell is signified by a stroke):

/ut/re/mi/fa/sol/la/fa/sol/la/sol/fa/mi/re/ut/.

It would be hazardous to guess on this evidence alone if the picture illustrates an arrangement that could be used in practice. Working from the left of the row, we have nine bells in sequence, viz., ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la, fa, sol, la (each name referring to the bell on the left). If we take the lowest note to be a C (for which the precedent is the illustration in Harley 2804, where the bells are marked from left to right C D E F G A | b) we are in the natural and soft hexachords: the notes played by the left-hand player are therefore c, d, e, f, g, a, bb, c′, d′. Working from the right, we have the notes of one hexachord only, viz., ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la (each name now referring to the bell on the

[171] Illuminations do not define the setting in which chimes were played. However, they are consistent in the *emotional* context in which chimes appear, and there can be little doubt, I think, that the pictures of bells would conjure up in the medieval mind a particular type of music in a specific setting. With few exceptions, the illuminations which depict bells are in psalters; and the majority of these depictions are in the initials to Psalm 80, *Exultate Deo*.[106] Chimes are also found, along with other instruments of varying types, in the Beatus pages.

The shout of praise with which the *Exultate Deo* opens shows us the emotional setting in which chimes were used. But I must emphasise that it is the *emotional*, not the actually setting: we [172] cannot use these initials as evidence that the psalm itself was accompanied by bells.

What, then, was the actual setting? The singing of the *Te Deum* was almost certainly one, and the news of Simeon's forthcoming meeting with the Christ in the Towneley *Purificacio Marie* another:[107] the emotional setting of both is similar to that of the *Exultate Deo*. Moreover, it is in the *Te Deum* that we find the *haut* music of shawms and trumpets.[108]

The *Te Deum* is known to have received special treatment as early as the tenth century, when the *Regularis Concordia* of St Ethelwold states that the bells should sound as soon as the *Te Deum* is started at the end of a liturgical drama.[109] Smoldon believes that bells were also used – on rare occasions – for the other pieces with which liturgical dramas could end.[110] One of these pieces was the sequence *Victimae Paschali*, which is known to have been accompanied by the organ.[111] This is interesting in the light of Harrison's admission that instruments could be used in the most joyful part of the Mass, the sequence, an "outburst of praise, when not only the voices [173] and the organ but also the bells joined in the festive sound".[112]

---

right). This "la" is the same as that for the highest note of the left-hand sequence, but of course it refers to a different bell.

From here we pass to sheer conjecture. The lack of a B# is remedied if the bells of the right-hand player ar etuned to the hard hexachord, i.e., e. a, b#, c', d' and e'. This would give the instrument a total range of a 10th, with only four notes common to both players: each player would have a large enough range to play most plainsong tunes, so that both men playing together could perform a plainsong tune in 4ths or 5ths.

[106] See above, n. 102: also above, Plates II and IV. In the modern numbering, this is Psalm 81.

[107] See above, pp. 42 f and 49.

[108] See above, pp. 70 f.

[109] See Craig/*ERD*, p. 116, from Chambers/*MS*, ii, pp. 14 f.

[110] Smoldon/*MMLCD*, p. 494: see above, p. 42.

[111] Smoldon/*Sepulchre*, p. 9.

[112] Harrison/*MMB*, p. 206.

The pattern is clear. For certain joyful hymns and sequences, the voices were accompanied by the organ, and the bells were rung:[113] on special occasions, other instruments could join in the *Te Deum*. The main point at issue now is the type of bell used in this context.

Churches had bells of various types. Most of these, such as the tolling-bells and altar-bells, had well-defined uses and they do not concern us here: clock chimes were part of a mechanical installation, and they, too, need not be discussed. This leaves the main peal, which differs from chime-bells in certain important respects. A peal requires several people to play it, and the result is not strictly musical: moreover, a peal is not intended to be heard inside a church – even when the bell-tower is part of the church building the sound is muffled, and we must remember that many medieval belfries were a separate building.

Harrison apparently assumes that it was a peal that was rung during the singing of the *Te Deum* and sequence, and there is evidence to support this in cases where the rejoicing is of a more general nature than a purely liturgical *jubilus*. [174] Thus when, at the restoration of Adam of Dalton as Bishop of Winchester in 1334, the Prior ordered the bells to be rung and the community to sing *Te Deum* with organ accompaniment,[114] there is good reason to suppose that a peal was rung such as could be heard for miles around: and the clock which sounded at the reception of John de Hertford at St Albans[115] was similarly heard *outside* the Abbey.

However, this view is difficult to hold in the majority of instances. At the end of a liturgical drama, or in the singing of a sequence during the Mass, the events taking place in the church were normally of no concern to the populace outside it. In these circumstances, why should a peal be rung? One possible answer is that, even if the peal could hardly be heard inside the church, it might have a strong symbolic significance. In fact, there is no evidence of such a significance: for instance, the larger types of bell are rare in medieval iconography.

Waesberghe's opinion – that chime-bells were used in those chants which were accompanied by the organ, and especially in the sequences[116] – solves this problem. The evidence is admittedly [175] circumstantial,[117] as we have seen. But

Comment [ESD1]:

---

[113] The precise way in which particular pieces were performed nevertheless remains debatable. For instance, Harrison/*MMB*, p. 207, remarks on the lack of evidence for the use of the organ in sequences (*Ad prosam ad evangelium*), while admitting the ringing of bells.

[114] Harrison/*MMB*, p. 206 and n. 3.

[115] See above, p. 71.

[116] Waesberghe/*Cymbala*, pp. 18 f.

[117] Waesberghe's evidence is similar to mine, but includes Continental sources. However, my own opinion, which largely agrees with Waesberghe's, was formed before I had heard of his work on the subject: for the purposes of this thesis, therefore, the conclusions that I have drawn on the uses of *cymbala* are based , like the rest of the thesis, on English sources only.

chime-bells had been known in church from the sixth century onwards,[118] and their frequent depiction and strong symbolism both imply that they were a well-known instrument in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Waesberghe, too, noted a general connection between organs and *cymbala* in both texts and illuminations.[119]

My conclusions on this subject can be summarised as follows:

1 On major feasts the *Te Deum* could be accompanied by the organ.
2 At the end of a liturgical drama the *Te Deum* could be accompanied by (chime-) bells.
3 For certain occasional celebrations the organ accompaniment to the *Te Deum* could be augmented by bells and/or shawms and trumpets (depending on the exact nature of the occasion). These bells might be chimes, or a peal, or both (depending, again, on the nature of the celebration).
4 There is evidence for the use of the organ and (chime-) [176] bells to accompany the sequence.

However loaded with reservations these conclusions may be, they enable us to hazard a guess at the work which earned a "menestral ove les cloches" the respectable sum of 13.4d at the Pentecost celebrations of 1306. It seems that the vigil kept by the Prince of Wales on the eve of the feast was concluded with a sung service. We are told that the noise of trumpets and shawms (apparently in the Palace of Westminster, not in the Abbey itself) was so great that the "shout of praise" at the entry of the choir could not be heard.[120] Possibly the *jubilatio* sung by the choir on their entry into the choir of the Abbey was the *Te Deum*: that hymn would certainly have been sung at some point in the service. In any case, this is exactly the setting in which we might expect the organ and bells to be used.

**Instruments in Consort**

It would be convenient for us if the Wardrobe Books were to state that certain minstrels had performed together. [177] Unfortunately, they never do. Gifts were often made to two or more minstrels together: but this does not, of course, mean that they performed concurrently rather than consecutively, only that the gift was made as one sum to be divided between them afterwards. Sometimes the gift is made for "minstrelsy", sometimes for "minstrelsies", but this does not indicate whether minstrels performed together or separately. Some Wardrobe scribes used the singular form, some the plural: thus, we find a violist, two trumpeters

---

[118] See *NOHM*, 3, p. 491 and n. 5.

[119] Waesberghe/*Cymbala*, p. 19.

[120] "… Sed princeps Walliae, praecepto regis patris sui, cum praecelsis tyronibus, fecit vigilias in ecclesia Westmon*asterii*. Ibi aut*em* tantus clangor tubaru*m* & tibicinu*m*, et exaltatio vocum prae gaudio extiterat clamantiu*m*, quod conuentus de choro ad choru*m*, non audiretur iubilatio." Matthew/*Flores*, p. 458.

and a nakerer receiving a gift for making "menestralciam suam", although the violist cannot have played in consort with the other three.[121]

With very few exceptions, therefore (none of which is in the Wardrobe accounts), entries in the account-books searched for this thesis give no definite instrumental combinations which we know to have performed on a specific occasion. The picture is not a complete blank, however, and to various clues given in the household accounts we can add evidence from other sources. It is also interesting for us, who live in an age of consorted music, to know how much *solo* music was made in a medieval noble household; and the accounts show that harpers, violists, fiddlers, bagpipers, *vigiles*, taborers, trumpeters and others could all produce [178] acceptable entertainment on their own.[122]

We have already seen, however, that in the early fourteenth century two trumpeters, especially if they were joined by a nakerer, probably formed a consort suitable for both domestic and military minstrelsy.[123] As the numbers of household trumpeters increased, so did the size of these trumpet-consorts.[124]

Otherwise, *haut* groups consisted mainly of shawms, and by the late fifteenth century a band of four players – usually three shawms and a trumpet[125] – was the standard loud band for dances and other occasions. On the Continent, iconographical representations of this grouping date from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries,[126] and the grouping was a well-established custom when Tinctoris wrote of it:[127]

> … for the lowest contratenor parts … one joins to [179] the shawmists (*tibicines*) trumpeters (*tubicines*) who play very harmoniously upon that kind of trumpet (*tuba*) which is called *trompone* in Italy and *sacque-boute* in France.

At the wedding of Philip of Austria a year later, in 1488, a motet was performed on three shawms and a *trompette-saicqueboute*.[128]

---

[121] Calendared below, ii, p. 39.

[122] See below, ii, especially the *Dona* sections of Appendix A, and Appendices B, C and D, *passim*.

[123] See above, p. 149.

[124] The six trumpeters of the Earl of Northumberland seem to have played together, for instance: see above, p. 151.

[125] I shall not always attempt to distinguish between trumpets and sackbuts in tracing the earlier history of this grouping: all types could be used, but their names as used by the various writers do not correspond with the modern definitions of the instruments.

[126] Anthony Baines cites a Burgundian ivory of the late fourteenth century and a Florentine chest-painting, "The Wedding of Adunari", c.1420: see his article "Trombone" in Grove/*Dictionary*.

[127] Quoted *ibid*., from *De Inventione et Usu Musicis* (? Naples, 1487).

[128] Marche/*Mémoires*, iii, p. 152.

In England, a loud consort of shawms is found as early as the thirteenth century,[129] although we do not have another certain example of such a consort until Henry VII's reign.[130] A study of household minstrels, however, indicates that such a consort – with trumpet added – probably flourished in England as on the Continent. Pipers are numerous in Edward III's reign, and the ordinances of 18–21 Ed III include a high proportion of pipers in addition to the three wayts.[131]

On the available evidence, it seems impossible to prove that these minstrels included a four-man band. Such a band is found in John of Gaunt's household at the end of the same reign, however, consisting of three pipers and a clarioner. These four minstrels all received an increased grant together, as if they formed a single unit amongst the Duke's minstrels.[132]

[180] The Lancaster minstrels taken to Prussia by the Earl of Derby nearly twenty years later could have included this and other *haut* consorts, and were presumably capable of supplying between them most types of minstrelsy that the Earl might need. There was no *bas* instrumentalist, however, unless one of the pipers was a cornemuser or a flageolet-player. On the first expedition, in 1390–91, Henry took two trumpeters, three pipers and a nakerer: apart from solo minstrelsy, these could have supplied consorts of two trumpeters and a nakerer, or of three pipers and a trumpeter. Possibly all the minstrels played together – although we should not assume so – when they serenaded the Earl in his chamber on New Year's morning, 1391.[133] On the second expedition, in 1392–93, Henry took four trumpeters and three pipers: the smaller trumpet-consort of two trumpets and nakers was presumably superseded, therefore, by four trumpets playing together.[134] The shawm-and-trumpet band could have remained the same.

The fifteenth-century existence of the shawm-and-trumpet band prior to the reign of Henry VII can only be deduced from certain salient facts. The first of these is the use of the word "shawms" from the late fifteenth century onwards to denote a band of liveried minstrels. The word could be applied to the [181] minstrels of a noble,[135] of the king[136] and of towns.[137] Town waits had certainly been

---

[129] John de Hertford's reception at St Albans: see above, p. 71.

[130] The royal *vigiles* of Ed I's reign may have performed such a consort, but we cannot be sure: see above, p. 159 f.

[131] See above, p. 133.

[132] Probably in 1374. See Armitage-Smith/*JGReg*, ii, p. 219: translation in Rickert/*Chaucer*, pp. 232 f.

[133] For the wage-lists of these minstrels, see Smith/*Derby*, pp. 132 f and 137: for the serenade, see *ibid*., p. 109.

[134] This conforms to the general pattern noted above, pp. 147 f. For these minstrels, see Smith/*Derby*, pp. 269 ff.

[135] Those of the Duke of Gloucester in 1482 may have followed a lead from the king, whose minstrels had included shawm-players in the time of the *Liber Niger*: see above, p. 158, and below, ii, p. 158. See also below, ii, p. 141, for the waits of the Earl of Northumberland, 1499.

pipers as early as 1457, in which year Allan Pyper had been elected the "Pipers or Wayts" at Doncaster.[138] A payment in the Smiths' Company accounts for 1477 is to the Coventry waits for "pypyng";[139] this is significant in view of the fact that one of the four Coventry waits was a trumpeter,[140] and we may eventually discover that the other three played shawms.

There is good reason to believe that the "shawms" that we find from the late fifteenth century onwards were no innovation. What *was* new was the constitution of the king's "shawms" at Henry [182] VII's Court, which consisted not of three shawms and one sackbut, but probably of two of each.[141] The slide-mechanism of the sackbut must have given it a distinct advantage in the matter of agility and ease of playing over any type of trumpet. While a slide-trumpet or even a looped trumpet could no doubt manage to play a slow-moving lower part,[142] a sackbut was suitable for faster-moving parts as well. Hence it is with the introduction of the sackbut at Court that we find an increased proportion of brass instruments amongst the shawms.

At Court, Henry VII's shawms were known as the sackbuts or the sackbuts and shawms. But in other contexts we find them referred to as his "shawms" as late as 1512:[143] evidently a well-established phrase continued to be used for many years after it had ceased to be entirely appropriate.

The older grouping of three shawms and a trumpet probably remained the usual *haut* consort until well into the sixteenth century, perhaps with the trumpets normally replaced by a sackbut. In the early years of the century, references to "loud minstrels" [183] and to "four minstrels" seem to have had a standard significance: both phrases were probably applied to this four-man band, although I cannot at present prove it. The four Italian minstrels at the Scottish

---

[136] The queen's accounts record a gift of 140.0d to "the Kinges mynstrelles with the shalmewes" at New Year, 1503: see Nicolas/*York*, p. 90. The Northumberland ordinances of 1512 record a regular gift of 10.0d to three of the king's shawms who used to come yearly: see Percy/*Northumberland*, p. 339.

[137] Henry VII's accounts for 1492 record a gift of 6.8d to "the shamews of Madeston": *PPE.H.VII*, under date 31 July of that year.

[138] Bridge/*TWT*, p. 64.

[139] Calendared below, ii, p. 190.

[140] The Coventry waits are named in 1423 as Mathew Ellerton, Thomas Sendell, William Howton and John Trumpere. In 1439 the trumpeter was made the senior wait, and three years later the waits had their liveries only on condition that they had a trumpet (presumable the instrument, not the man). See Harris/*Coventry*, pp. 59, 189 and 200.

[141] Their numbers flucuate between three and five, but four seems usual: see below, ii, pp. 133–41, *passim*, and Lafontaine/*Musick*, pp. 2 ff (the names of the sackbuts are listed in Rastall/*MERH*, pp. 36 and 40).

[142] For tenor and contratenor parts specifically marked to be played by a trumpet, see *NOHM* 3, p. 425.

[143] See above, n. 136.

Court may have been one such group,[144] and the regulations of the minstrel-fraternity at Canterbury imply that a group of "four minstrels" was the usual one for playing at weddings, May-games, and so on.[145]

*Bas* instruments were generally used for solo minstrelsy, judging from the many gifts to single *bas* minstrels recorded in the Wardrobe Books.[146] In the fourteenth century, however, the king employed players of bowed instruments in pairs, possibly because the viol and small fiddle were not as suitable for solo work as other *bas* instruments were. A gift to the king's two *vidulatores* at Easter, 29 Ed I,[147] may be for minstrelsy when the [184] king was making his offering: no gifts were made to other minstrels that day, and we have examples of violists making minstrelsy on such occasions.[148] Later accounts suggest that fiddles, too, were played in pairs. The two fiddlers who sang to the King of Scots in 1497 presumably played as well,[149] and the Scottish accounts hint at several other occasions on which fiddlers may have played together.[150]

In the iconography of the period, a not infrequent combination is of one plucked and one bowed instrument.[151] This could easily be explained in terms of the artist's intentions with regard to the symbolic and decorative effects of his illustration. But here again, the household accounts show a pattern which hints at the common occurrence of such consorts in actual minstrelsy. In the reigns of Edward II and Edward III we find the combination of violist and psaltery-player in the queen's household,[152] while a harper and a violist of Edward II were probably lodged together.[153] Information for the later part of our period is [185]

---

[144] They were probably the "four loud minstrels" (see below, ii, p. 181), and they were rewarded – together with the trumpets – for minstrelsy "at the taking of the schip of the stokkis" (*ibid*., p. 187). They were often joined by the Moorish taborer, which explains a reference to the *five* loud minstrels (*ibid*., p. 180).

[145] See above, p. 19.

[146] Anthony Baines has pointed out that in the cases of the bagpipe and the pipe-and-tabor, the drone and the drum-beat were major factors in a solo musician's ability to hold the attention of his listeners: see Baines/*MI*, pp. 227 f, The same can be said of the larger fiddles, hurdy-gurdy and portative organ: see Dart/*Interpretation*, p. 154.

[147] See below, ii, pp. 22 and 23.

[148] See above, p. 64.

[149] See below, ii, p. 170.

[150] See *ibid*., p. 178, for instance (10 April).

[151] The *bas* consort of the Braunche brass, for example: see above, p. xxxi.

[152] See especially ii, p. 87, below (reproduced as Plate III, above).

[153] See below, ii, p. 83. This does not necessarily mean that they performed together, of course, but the point is worth pursuing.

unfortunately lacking: the sixteenth-century ordinances of the Northumberland household do allow for the combination of lute and rebec, however.[154]

The range of instruments used to accompany the voice has already been noticed.[155] Outside the limits of this vocal minstrelsy, however, mention of instrumental accompaniment is scarce. It seems that the singing of clerks was not normally mixed with the playing of minstrels, whether the occasion was an enthronement-feast, the crying of "Wassail" on Twelfth Night, or a New Year serenade.[156] This was not a question only of status, for we have seen that minstrels could join with clerks in order to sing *Te Deum*.[157] But when a piece of part-music – a "Caroll", "ballad" or other polyphonic "good songe" – was "made" by one of the "best doctors in the land"[158] for a specific occasion, rehersal-time was probably too short for the minstrels to learn it if they were not musically literate.[159] Not until Tudor times do we have [186] evidence of a repertoire of well-known songs at Court, and it is only in Henry VIII's reign that we find minstrels accompanying the part-singing of members of the Chapel Royal.[160]

---

[154] See below, p. 211.

[155] See above, p. 166.

[156] For singing at enthronement-feasts, see above, p. 92, n. 21; for the crying of "Wassail", 1494, see *Ords & Regs*, p. 121, quoted in Stevens/*M&P*, p. 242; for the New Year serenade to the King of Scots, see below, ii, p. 167.

[157] See above, pp. 70 f.

[158] See *Ords & Regs*, p. 123.

[159] A full discussion of musical literacy is outside the scope of this thesis. I do not think, however, that minstrels could read *mensural* notation until the sixteenth century, although the best of them were perhaps familiar with the unmeasured notation of plainsong and *basse-danse* tunes: c.f. Stevens/*M&P*, p. 313, and below, p. 242.

[160] See Stevens/*M&P*, p. 249, for the "Golden Arbour" pageant.