FOREIGN INFLUENCES ON AND INNOVATION IN ENGLISH TOMB SCULPTURE IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

by

Nicola Jane Shilliam B.A. (Warwick)

Ph.D. dissertation

Warwick University

History of Art

September 1986

SUMMARY

This study is an investigation of stylistic and iconographic innovation in English tomb sculpture from the accession of King Henry VIII through the first half of the sixteenth century, a period during which Tudor society and Tudor art were in transition as a result of greater interaction with continental Europe. The form of the tomb was moulded by contemporary cultural, temporal and spiritual innovations, as well as by the force of artistic personalities and the directives of patrons. Conversely, tomb sculpture is an inherently conservative art, and old traditions and practices were resistant to innovation. The early chapters examine different means of change as illustrated by a particular group of tombs. The most direct innovations were introduced by the royal tombs by Pietro Torrigiano in Westminster Abbey. The function of Italian merchants in England as intermediaries between Italian artists and English patrons is considered. Italian artists also introduced terracotta to England. A group of terracotta tombs in East Anglia, previously attributed by tradition to Italian artists, is re-examined. A less direct initiation of iconographic and stylistic innovation occurred through English artists' use of foreign patterns. The synthesis of such two-dimensional imagery by English sculptors is examined in certain tombs in Hampshire and Sussex. The influence of the Florentine royal tombs on English tomb sculpture in the latter half of the period is illustrated by alabaster tombs from an English workshop and by three other important tombs. The abandoned Italian project for the tomb of Henry VIII is studied in the context of the religious, political and economic changes that contributed to the breakdown of a supportive environment for Italian artists in England. Finally, the relevance of religious Injunctions and iconoclasm to the evolution of English tomb sculpture by the middle of the century is considered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements..... ii

List of Abbreviations in Text..... iv

List of Illustrations..... vi

Introduction..... 1

Chapter I: Pietro Torrigiano and the Royal Tombs..... 16

Chapter II: Intermediaries..... 60

Chapter III: Terracotta..... 80

Chapter IV: Tombs in Sussex and Hampshire..... 138

Chapter V: Tomb Sculpture in the Latter Half of the Reign of Henry VIII..... 184

Conclusion..... 243

Bibliography..... 249

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to several individuals and institutions for the help and advice they offered during my years of research for the preparation of this dissertation. In particular, I should like to express my gratitude to Julian Gardner, who continued to support my endeavours, even from a great distance. At Warwick I benefited from conversations with Richard Morris and Paul Hills and Robin Clifton, who first encouraged the particular interests that led to this work. Loveday Gee and Alan Watson gave much generous help with my photographic expeditions. I should like to acknowledge my gratitude to Professors J.B. Trapp, Michael Baxandall, Sydney Anglo, Keith Thomas, and the late Sir Anthony Blunt, for their influence on my work. In London the staffs of the Warburg Institute and the Institute of Historical Research were particularly helpful. At Yale I was inspired and helped by Gloria Kury, Walter Cahn, George Hersey and Andrea Norris. The staff at the Yale Center for British Art, especially Anne-Marie Logan, and the former director, Edmund P. Pillsbury, were extremely supportive. For assistance with travel in Italy, France and Spain I thank Barbara and Charles Robertson, the Courtauld Institute Summer School and the Ruskin Society for enabling me to undertake fieldwork and photography in England. My support and travels in the U.S.A. were made possible by the generous support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Other individuals who gave help with this project were Pauline Plummer, Robin Clifton, Janet Mitchell,

Michael Maslin, Shaun Twiss, Reginald Cave, Mr. and Mrs. Avens, Mr. and Mrs. Sharp and the vicars of many English country churches. Last, but with tremendous gratitude, I thank my parents, Ida, Susanne, Christopher, Nicholas, Diane, Richard Smithey and especially Oliver Avens for unfailingly generous help.

List of Abbreviations in the Text

Allgemeines Lexikon	U. Thieme and F. Becker, eds., Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenen Künstler von der antike bis zur gegenwart, Leipzig, 1907-1949. 47 vols.
D.N.B.	L. Stephen and S. Lee, eds., Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1882- .
T.E.A.S.	Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society.
E.N.P.	E. Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, New York, 1971.
I.R.S.	J. Pope-Hennessy, An Introduction to Italian Sculpture, London and New York, 1971, vol. 2.
N. Pevsner, B.E.	N. Pevsner, ed., The Buildings of England, Harmondsworth, 1951-74. 41 vols.
P.M.L.A.	Proceedings of the Modern Language Association.
R.C.H.M.	Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of England, H.M. Stationery Office, 1910- .
S.A.C.	Sussex Archaeological Collections.
T.R.P.	P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin, eds., Tudor Royal Proclamations, New Haven and London, 1969.
G. Vasari, Le vite	G. Milanesi, ed., Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed

	architettori italiani, 9 vols., Florence, 1909 ed.
V.C.H.	W. Page, et al., eds., Victoria Counties History of England, London, 1906- .
L&P	J.S. Brewer, et al., eds., Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547, 21 vols., in 35 parts, London, H.M.S.O., 1862-1910.

Key to Abbreviations in Illustrations

(C) Courtauld Institute negative.
(W) Warwick University negative.
(NMR) National Monuments Record.
(S) Shilliam negative.
(E) University of East Anglia negative.

1. Tomb of Robert Sherborne, Bishop of Chichester. Chichester Cathedral, Sussex. (S)

2. Tomb of Charles VIII of France. Guido Mazzoni. (Gaignières drawing, no. 1344 B.N. Est. Rés. Pe Ia fol. 48)

3. Tomb of Condestable Alvaro de Luna and Wife. Sebastian de Almonacid. Capilla de Santiago, Toledo Cathedral. (Sanz Vega negative)

4. Tomb of Louis XII and Anne of Brittany. A. Giusti and assistants. St. Denis, Paris. (A. Blunt, Art and Architecture in France, 1500-1700, Harmondsworth, 1953, pl. 14)

5. Tomb of Lady Margaret Beaufort. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (RHCM)

6. Tomb of Prince Don Juan. Domenico Fancelli. Santo Tomas, Avila. (H. Keutner, Sculpture from Renaissance to Rococco, London, 1969, fig. 94)

7. Tomb of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella. Domenico Fancelli. Capilla Real, Granada Cathedral. (L. Dominguez negative)

8. Tomb of Francis II, Duke of Brittany and Marguerite de Foix. Michele Colombe. Nantes Cathedral. (H. Keutner, op. cit., fig. 67)

9. Tomb of the Children of Charles VIII. Michel Colombe and Girolamo da Fiesole. Tours Cathedral. (Pierre Pradel, Michel Colombe, Paris 1953, pl. XXVII)

10. Tomb of Pope Sixtus IV. Antonio Pollaiuolo. Grotte Vatican, Rome. (J. Pope-Hennessy, I.R.S., fig. 72)

11. Tomb of Mary of Burgundy. Renier van Thienen, Jan Borman, and others. Bruges cathedral, Belgium. (J.A. van Houte, De geschiedenis van Brugge, 1982, fig. 124)

12. Tomb of Lady Margaret Beaufort, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

13. Tomb of Mary of Burgundy, detail. Jan Borman (cast by

Renier van Thienen). Bruges Cathedral, Belgium. (T. Muller, Sculpture in the Netherlands, Germany, France and Spain, 1400-1500, Baltimore, 1966, fig. 161A)

14. Tomb of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

15. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

16. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey London. (C)

17. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

18. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

19. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

20. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

21. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

22. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

23. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

24. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

25. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

26. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

27. Tomb of Medea Colleoni. Antonio Amadeo. Colleoni Chapel, Bergamo. (J. Pope-Hennessy, I.R.S., fig. 122)

28. Tomb of Bishop Guillaume de Guegen. Saint-Pierre, Nantes (Gaignières drawing, Paris, B.N., Est. Rés. Pe I h, fol. 163)

29. Tomb of the Dukes of Orléans. Michele d'Aria, Girolamo Viscardi and others. Saint Denis, Paris. (E. Panofsky, Tomb Sculpture, London, 1964, fig. 173)

30. Panel of the Door of the Apostles, Donatello. Old Sacristy, San Lorenzo, Florence. (G. Castelfranco, Donatello, New York, 1965, pl. 118)

31. St. John. Donatello. Old Sacristy, San Lorenzo, Florence. (G. Castelfranco, op. cit., pl. 92)

32. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

33. Virgin and Child. Andrea Sansovino. Cathedral, Genoa. (H. Keutner, op. cit., fig. 33)

34. Virgin and Child. Pietro Torrigiano (attrib.). Santissima Annunziata degli Zoccolanti, Fossombrone. (M.G.C. Duprè dal Poggetto, Commentari, vol. 22, 1971, fig. 6)

35. Virgin and Child. Pietro Torrigiano. Museo de Bellas Artes, Seville. (Museum negative)

36. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

37. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

38. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey. London. (C)

39. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

40. Life of St. George. Richard Pynson. (J. Hodnett, The English Woodcut, London, 1923, fig. 154)

41. Beheading of the Baptist. Verrocchio. Silver altar of the Baptistry, Museo dell'Opera del Duomo, Florence. (H. W. Janson, Verrocchio, Greenwich, Conn., 1953. fig. 91)

42. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

43. St. Edward the Confessor. Westminster Abbey, London. (F. Bond, Westminster Abbey, Oxford, 1909, fig. 154)

44. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

45. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

46. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano.

Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

47. Tomb of Henry VII, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

48. Tomb of Henry VII, detail Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (C)

49. Altar from S. Girolamo, Fiesole. Andrea Ferrucci. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. (G. Haydn Huntley, Andrea Sansovino, Cambridge, Mass., 1935, fig. 10)

50. St. John the Evangelist. Westminster Abbey, London. (F. Bond, op. cit., pl. 152)

51. The Corbinelli Altar, detail. Andrea Sansovino. Santo Spirito, Florence. (G. Haydn Huntley, op. cit., fig. 11)

52. Bust of Sir Thomas Lovell. Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey. (C)

53. Bust of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. Pietro Torrigiano. Metropolitan Museum, New York. (C)

54. Tomb of Dr. John Yonge. Pietro Torrigiano. Rolls Chapel, Public Record Office, London. (C)

55. Tomb of Dr. John Yonge, detail. Pietro Torrigiano. Rolls Chapel, Public Record Office, London, (C)

56. Bust of the Redeemer. Pietro Torrigiano. Wallace Collection, London. (C)

57. Tomb of Filippo Strozzi. Benedetto da Maiano. Santa Maria Novella, Florence. (M. Longhurst, Notes on Italian Monuments of the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century, London, 1964, fig. Q 10)

58. Altar of Henry VII, Pietro Torrigiano. Westminster Abbey, London. (F. Sandford, A Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England, London, 1707 ed., p. 168)

59. Corbinelli Altar. Andrea Sansovino. Santo Spirito, Florence. (J. Haydn Huntley, op. cit., fig. 7)

60. Altar of Santa Fina. Benedetto da Maiano. Collegiata, San Gimignano. (M. Longhurst, op. cit., fig. Q 9)

61. Nativity. Pietro Torrigiano (attrib.). Duomo, Volterra. (M.G.C. Duprè dal Poggetto, op. cit., fig. 9)

62. Monument to Dean Colet. (Engraving from W. Dugdale, A History of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, 1656)

63. Bust of Dr. John Colet. (J. Knight, Life of Colet, London, 1724, facing p. 465)

64. Terracotta Roundel of an Emperor. Giovanni da Maiano. Hampton Court. (C)

65. Reconstructed Drawing of Tomb Chest of Cardinal Wolsey. (A. Higgins, Archaeological Journal, vol. LI, 1894, pl. IV, facing p. 160)

66. Drawing of Sarcophagus of Lord Nelson, formerly of Cardinal Wolsey. St. Paul's Cathedral, London. (A. Higgins, op. cit., pl. VI, facing p. 162)

67a. Tomb of Sir Henry Marney. Layer Marney, Essex. (W)

67b. Tomb of Sir Henry Marney, detail. Layer Marney, Essex. (W)

68. Tomb of Sir William Marney. Layer Marney, Essex. (NMR)

69. Tomb of Sir Henry Marney, detail. Layer Marney, Essex. (NMR)

70. Tomb of Sir John Marney. Layer Marney, Essex. (W)

71a. Layer Marney Towers, detail. Essex. (W)

71b. Layer Marney Towers, detail. Essex. (W)

72. Bedingfeld Chantry (1). Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

73. Bedingfeld Chantry (2). Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

74. Bedingfeld Chantry (2), detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

75. Bedingfeld Chantry (2), detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

76. Bedingfeld Chantry (1), detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

77. Bedingfeld Chantry (1), detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

78. Bedingfeld Chantry, detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

79. Bedingfeld Chantry, detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

80. Bedingfeld Chantry, detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

81. Bedingfeld Chantry, detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

82. Bedingfeld Chantry, detail. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

83. Appleyard Tomb, Bracon Ash, Norfolk. (E)

84. Appleyard Tomb, detail. Bracon Ash, Norfolk. (E)

85. Appleyard Tomb, detail. Bracon Ash, Norfolk. (E)

86. Appleyard Tomb, detail. Bracon Ash, Norfolk. (E)

87. Appleyard Tomb, detail. Bracon Ash, Norfolk. (E)

88. Appleyard Tomb, detail. Bracon Ash, Norfolk. (E)

89. Tomb of Robert Jannys. St. George, Colegate, Norwich. (NMR)

90. Tomb of Robert Jannys, detail. St. George, Colegate, Norwich. (NMR)

91. Tomb of Robert Jannys, detail. St. George, Colegate, Norwich. (NMR)

92. Tomb of Sir Edward Eckingham. Barsham, Suffolk. (A.P. Baggs. The Archaeological Journal, vol. CXV, 1965, p. XXXB)

93. Tomb of Elisha Ferrars. Wymondham, Norfolk. (W)

94. Tomb of Elisha Ferrars, detail. Wymondham, Norfolk. (W)

95. Tomb of Elisha Ferrars, detail. Wymondham, Norfolk. (W)

96. Tomb of Elisha Ferrars, detail. Wymondham, Norfolk. (W)

97. Diagram of Terracotta Motifs.

98. Arminghall Old Hall. Norwich, Norfolk. (Norwich Corporation)

99. Terracotta Panel. Crown Point House, Trowse, Norfolk. (Rev. J. Kestell-Floyer, Archaeological Journal, vol. LXXX, 1923, fig. 1)

100. Terracotta Panel. Norwich Cathedral. (A. Borg, et al, Medieval Sculpture from Norwich Cathedral, Norwich, n.d., fig. 52)

101. Terracotta Panel. Norwich Cathedral. (A. Borg, op. cit., fig. 54)

102. Terracotta Panel. Norwich Cathedral. (A. Borg, op. cit., fig. 56)

103. Château of Gaillon. Normandy. (A. Blunt, op. cit., pl. 3)

104. Choir Stalls from Gaillon. Nicholas of Castille. St. Denis, Paris. (Archives Photographiques)

105. Choir Screen. St. Ouen, Fécamp, Normandy. (A. Blunt, op. cit., pl. 5)

106. Tomb Canopy Soffit. Layer Marney, Essex. (W)

107. Tomb Canopy Soffit. Oxborough, Norfolk. (W)

108. Tomb of the Cardinals of Amboise. Roulland le Roux and others. Rouen Cathedral. (Y. Bottineau-Fuchs, Gazette des beaux-arts, vol. C, 1982, fig. 1).

109. Tomb of Cardinals of Amboise, detail. (Y. Bottineau-Fuchs, (op. cit., fig. 5)

110. Tomb of Cardinals of Amboise, detail. (Y. Bottineau-Fuchs, op. cit., fig. 8)

111. Tomb of Cardinals of Amboise, detail. (Y. Bottineau-Fuchs, op. cit., fig.7)

112. Church of Saint-Pierre. Caen. (W.H. Ward, The Architecture of the Renaissance in France, London, 2nd ed., 1926, vol. 1, fig. 113)

113. Hôtel Bourgthéroulde, detail. Rouen, (W)

114. Sutton Place. Surrey. (CI)

115. Sutton Place, detail. Surrey. (C)

116. Sutton Place. Surrey. (F. Harrison, Annals of an Old Manor House, Sutton Place, Guilford, London, 1893, pl. H)

117. Hôtel Lallemand. Bourges. (CI)

118. Great Cressingham Manor. Norfolk. (E)

119. Great Cressingham Manor. Norfolk. (E)

120. Great Snoring Rectory. Norfolk. (E)

121. Great Snoring Rectory. Norfolk. (E)

122. Great Snoring Rectory. Norfolk. (E)

123. East Barsham Hall. Norfolk. (E)

124. East Barsham Hall. Norfolk. (E)

125. East Barsham Hall. Norfolk. (E)

126. East Barsham Hall. Norfolk. (E)

127. East Barsham Hall. Norfolk. (E)

128. Shrubland Old Hall, detail. Suffolk. (N. Pevsner, ed., B.E...Suffolk, 1961, fig. 50B)

129. King's College Chapel Screen. Cambridge. (Country Life)

130. King's College Chapel Screen, detail. Cambridge. (W)

131. King's College Chapel Screen, detail. Cambridge. (W)

132. King's College Chapel Screen, detail. Cambridge. (W)

133. King's College Chapel Screen, detail. Cambridge. (W)

134. Ceiling of Bishop West's Chapel. Ely Cathedral, Cambridge. (CI)

135. Pulpit. Catton Church, Norfolk. (N. Pevsner, ed., B.E...North-East Norfolk and Norwich, Harmondsworth, 1962, fig. 32B)

136. Tomb of Rénauld de Brunfay. Charnier des Innocents, Paris, (Gaignières drawing, Paris, B.N., Est. Rés. Pe. I 1, fol. 11)

137. Tomb of John Goring. Burton, Sussex. (W)

138. Tomb of Thomas West (8th Lord), detail. Broadwater, Sussex. (C)

139. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord). Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

140. Tomb of Sir John Dawtrey. Petworth, Sussex. (W)

141. Tomb of Sir John Dawtrey, detail. Petworth, Sussex. (W)

142. Tomb of John Gunter. Racton, Sussex. (W)

143. Tomb of John Gunter, detail. Racton, Sussex. (W)

144. Tomb of John Gunter, detail. Racton, Sussex. (W)

145. Ernley Tomb. West Wittering, Sussex. (W)

146. Ernley Tomb, detail. West Wittering, Sussex. (W)

147. Tomb of William Ernley, detail. West Wittering, Sussex. (W)

148a. Tomb of William Ernley, detail. West Wittering, Sussex. (W)

148b. The Ernley Monuments, H. Grimm drawing. (MS BM Burrell 5674 fo. 70)

149. Sackville Tomb. Westhampnett, Sussex. (W)

150. Sackville Tomb. detail. Westhampnett, Sussex. (W)

151a. Tomb of John and Agatha Lews. Selsey, Sussex. (S)

151b. Tomb of John and Agatha Lews. T. King engraving. (E. Heron-Allen, Selsey Bill, London, 1911)

152. Tomb of Richard Norton. East Tisted, Hampshire. (W)

153. Tomb at Yapton. Sussex. (C)

154. Tomb of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Broadwater, Sussex. (C)

155. Tomb of Thomas West (9th Lord). Broadwater, Sussex. (C)

156. Tomb of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Broadwater, Sussex. (C)

157. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

158. Book of Hours of Rouen, detail. Printed by J. Burges, P. Huvin, J. Cousins. (Paris, B.N., Rés. de Impr., Vélins 2862)

159. Book of Hours, detail. Printed by P. Pigouchet for S. Vostre, 16 September 1498. (Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 2912)

160. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

161. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

162. Book of Hours, detail. Printed by P. Pigouchet for S. Vostre, 17 September 1496. (Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr.,

Vélins 1547)

163. Exhortation to the Sicke, detail. Printed by Oswen of Ipswich. (R. Plomer, English Printers Ornaments, London, 1924, fig. 81)

164. Liber de triplici motu, title page. Printed by Poncet le Preux. (P. Renouard, Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVIe siècle, Paris, 1964, vol. 1, pl. A25)

165. Missale ad usum sarum, detail. Printed by Richard Pynson. (J. Hodnett, The English Woodcut, 1480-1535, London, 1923, fig. 116)

166. Book of Hours, detail. Printed by P. Pigouchet for S. Vostre, 17 September 1496. (Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 1547)

167. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

168. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

169. Book of Hours, detail. Printed by T. Kerver, 1505. (Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 1509)

170. Book of Hours, detail. Printed by P. Pigouchet for S. Vostre, 27 September 1501. (Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 1555)

171. Missal of Verdun, detail. Printed by J. Du Pré, 28 November 1481. (Paris, B.N., Impr. Rés. B 942)

172. Book of Hours, detail. Printed by P. Pigouchet for S. Vostre, 16 September 1498. (B.N. Impr. Rés. 2912)

173. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

174. Book of Hours, detail. Printed by P. Pigouchet for S. Vostre, 16 September 1498. (Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins, 2912)

175. Book of Hours, detail. Printed for S. Vostre, c.1502. (Paris, B.N. Rés. des Impr., Vélins 1559)

176. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

177. Ship of Fools, detail. Printed by Josse Bade and T. Kerver, 1501. (Paris, B.N., Impr. Rés. m. Yc. 308)

178. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail.

Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

179. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West (9th Lord), detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

180. Skeleton and Princess. (Hans Holbein's Dance of Death and Bible Woodcuts, New York, 1947, fig. 51)

181. Chantry Chapel of Thomas West, detail. Boxgrove, Sussex. (W)

182. Assertio Septum Sacramentorum. detail. (R.B. McKerrow and F.S. Ferguson, Printers' and Publishers' Devices in England and Scotland, 1485-1640, London, 1932, fig. 8).

183. Dyetary of Ghostly Helthe, 15 November 1521, no. 2277. Printed by J. Skot. (J. Hodnett, op. cit., fig. 200).

184. Year Books of Edward III, titlepage. (J. Hodnett, op. cit., fig. 161)

185. Tomb of William Ernley, detail. West Wittering, Sussex. (W)

186. Missale ad usum sarum, detail. (P. Rénouard, op. cit., pl. A6).

187. Presbytery Screen. Winchester Cathedral. (F.H. Crossley, op. cit., p. 126)

188. Winchester Cathedral, detail. (CI)

189. Tomb of Bishop Poyntes. Winchester Cathedral. (CI)

190. Tomb of Bishop Toclyve. Winchester Cathedral. (CI)

191a. Chantry Chapel of Countess of Salisbury, detail. Christchurch Priory, Hampshire. (CI)

191b. Chantry Chapel of Countess of Salisbury, detail. Christchurch Priory, Hampshire. (C.J. Crossley)

192. King Caedwalla granting the See of Selsey to St. Wilfrid. Chichester Cathedral, Sussex. (John R. Freeman & Co.)

193. Henry VIII confirming the royal Protection of Chichester Cathedral. Chichester Cathedral, Sussex. (John R. Freeman & Co.)

194. Lady Chapel Ceiling. Chichester Cathedral, Sussex. (John R. Freeman & Co.)

195. Boxgrove Priory, detail. (Photo: David Usill)

196. St. Jacques, detail. Liège. (M. Laurent, L'architecture et la sculpture en Belgique, Brussels, 1928, pl. XII.

197. Ceiling of the Bishop's Palace. Chichester, Sussex. (John R. Freeman & Co.)

198. Unknown Heroine and Semiramis. Amberley Castle, Sussex. (John R. Freeman & Co.)

199. Tomb of William Rudhall. Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire. (NMR)

200. Tomb of Sir Richard Cornewall. Eye, Herefordshire. (S)

201. Tomb of Sir Richard Cornewall, detail. Eye, Herefordshire. (S)

202. Tomb of Sir Thomas Manners. Bottesford, Leicestershire. (S)

203. Tomb of Sir Thomas Manners, detail. Bottesford, Leicestershire. (S)

204. Tomb of Sir Nicholas Purefoy. Fenny Drayton, Leicestershire. (S)

205. Tomb of Sir Nicholas Purefoy, detail. Fenny Drayton, Leicestershire. (S)

206. Tomb of Sir John Blount. Kinlet, Shropshire. (S)

207. Tomb of Sir John Blount, detail. Kinlet, Shropshire. (S)

208. Tomb of Sir John Blount, detail. Kinlet, Shropshire. (S)

209. Tomb of Sir Walter Devereux, detail. Stowe-by-Chartley, Staffordshire. (N. Pevsner, ed., B.E...Staffordshire, Harmondsworth, 1974, fig. 23)

210. Tomb of Sir John Vernon. Clifton Campville, Staffordshire. (S)

211. Tomb of Sir John Vernon, detail. Clifton Campville, Staffordshire. (S)

212. Tomb of Sir John Vernon, detail. Clifton Campville, Staffordshire. (S)

213. Tomb of Sir John Vernon, detail. Clifton Campville, Staffordshire. (S)

214. Tomb of Sir Thomas Bromley. Wroxeter, Shropshire. (S)

215. Tomb of Sir Thomas Neville. Tickhill, Yorkshire. (NMR)

216. Tomb of Sir Anthony Browne, Battle, Sussex. (NMR)

217. Tomb of Sir Anthony Browne, detail. Battle, Sussex. (NMR)

218. Cowdray House, detail. Sussex. (W)

219. Tomb of Prior Thomas Vyvyan. Bodmin, Cornwall. (NMR)

220. Tomb of Prior Thomas Vyvyan. Bodmin,Cornwall. (F.H. Crossley, op. cit., p. 121)

INTRODUCTION

In the fifty years between the accession of Henry VIII and the accession of Elizabeth I, English society endured an enormous range of political, economic, religious and social changes. Through dynastic alliances, territorial wars, the break with Rome and the subsequent development of the Church of England, the Tudor monarchs brought England into significant involvement with wider European political and religious developments. The desire to be regarded as an equal with the other princes of Europe also caused Henry VIII to solicit the services of European artists with knowledge of the new Renaissance styles, just as the rulers of France, Spain and the Netherlands were doing. During this same half century English tomb sculpture underwent subtle but significant modifications. Certain groups of tombs that illustrate these innovations, and the factors that contributed to their origins and development, form the body of this study.

Already a decade before the first arrival of Hans Holbein at the English court, a Florentine sculptor had created two examples of Italianate sepulchral monuments for the Tudors in the midst of the medieval royal mausoleum at Westminster Abbey: the tomb of

the Lady Margaret Beaufort, the mother of Henry VII, and that of King Henry VII and Queen Elizabeth of York. These royal tombs by Pietro Torrigiano have been been the subject of much previous research. The tombs that are studied in the later chapters offer (with a few exceptions) neither the highest quality of sculpture nor the documentary evidence to compare with the royal tombs. Art historians and antiquarians have frequently remarked on the odd and often unharmonious combination of Gothic and Renaissance styles and motifs in these lesser tombs from the hands of anonymous sculptors, yet litle research has been devoted to the origins of these monuments. Elizabethan tomb sculpture provides the researcher with more documentation, the discovery of artistic personalities, and a sense of greater satisfaction that a larger artistic trend can be delineated. If these earlier Tudor works can never be confidently assigned to named artists, they can at least be studied for what they do reveal about the different ways in which new developments in contemporary continental sculpture and sepulchral iconography were received and assimilated (or ignored) by English artists. This study is an attempt to assess the stylistic and iconographic evolution of the English tomb during a period in which Tudor art and architecture were in transition as a result of the reception of Renaissance styles, originating in Italy, in the first half of the sixteenth century.

The tomb in the sixteenth century was the material testament of man to his understanding of his place in society and in Christian history. Its form was, to a great extent, moulded by

contemporary cultural, temporal and spiritual innovations, as well as the force of artistic personalities and the directives of patrons. Given the fundamental changes that occurred in England in the first half of the sixteenth century, in addition to an analysis of traditional art historical occurrences of significance, such as the sojourn of Pietro Torrigiano and the other Italian sculptors in England, the religious, political and economic developments of the time deserve special consideration. Reformation legislation, royal proclamations on religion, Tudor trade treaties, foreign diplomacy and wars: all bear investigation for their possible influences on iconographic innovation and on changing patterns of foreign artistic activity in England. One underlying aim of this study, therefore, is to highlight the ways in which these socio-economic factors may have contributed to changes in the style and form of the English tomb in this period.

The English Tomb at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century

To study innovation in English tomb sculpture in this fifty year period it is first necessary to establish some definition of what is understood to represent the conventional English Tudor tomb in the first half of the sixteenth century. There is, of course, tremendous variation in the form of English tombs at the beginning of the sixteenth century. However, the Tudor tomb usually consisted of a stone tomb chest, either free-standing or set against a wall, often in a niche. A more elaborate tomb could

also incorporate a canopy (for example, the tomb of Sir John Peche, Lullingstone, Kent, c.1522). The tomb chest included heraldic shields to identify the deceased, set in panels with Gothic architectural decoration, and often featured clothed angels, ecclesiastical figures, or secular 'weepers' as supporters for the heraldic display. There was generally a carved effigy of the deceased, in dress appropriate to the social rank. Incised stones and monumental effigies were also popular in this period.

A fine example of the conventional early Tudor type is provided by the tomb of Bishop Robert Sherborne in Chichester Cathedral (fig. 1). The tomb and effigy are alabaster, a stone that became increasingly popular during the sixteenth century. The tomb is located under a flattened Tudor arch in the wall of the third bay of the south aisle of the presbytery. That the tomb of the Bishop was confined to a wall niche is to be expected by this date: free-standing tombs in crowded major churches were rare unless they commemorated patrons of exceptionally high status: an obvious exception is the tomb of the King, Henry VII. The Bishop's tomb chest is decorated with five cusped panels containing shields with coats-of-arms. The hands of the effigy are joined in prayer, and the effigy is open-eyed, as was customary for the portrayal of the deceased in England. The effigy is appropriately garbed in bishop's robes, including a gilded mitre, a crozier and full vestments. An heraldic lion and two bedesmen sit at the foot of the effigy and two censing angels

are placed at the head, which is supported on a ceremonial cushion. Around the ledge of the slab on which the effigy rests runs the inscription 'Non intres in iudicium cum servo tuo domine. Rober't Sherburn.' The effigy and tomb chest are enriched with colour and gilding. In the tomb recess are more heraldic arms and a bishop's mitre, flanked by two clothed angels; demi-angels appear above these two. Gothic panelling decorates the soffit of the canopy. In each reveal is a canopied niche with crocketted gables. Two more small shields of the pelican and the lion fill the spandrels of the arch. The canopy above is terminated by semi-octagonal shafts above a crested carved frieze.

A good deal is known about the tomb, since Sherborne left a will, dated 2 August 1536, that reveals that the tomb was made during his lifetime:

> my wyll and mynde is that my body be buried...in the Cathedral church of Chichester in a pour remembraunce that I have made in the south side of the same church.

This proves that the patron chose the form of the tomb. The alabaster probably came from near Bishop Sherborne's birthplace, Rolleston, near Burton-on-Trent. The patron was a well-educated, widely travelled, high ecclesiastic, who was an intimate of the royal court.[1] He was also a patron of much new architectural work, including the cloisters of Christ's Church, Oxford, and the Bishop's Palaces at Chichester, Amberley and Aldingborne. From

---

[1] See W.R.W. Stephens, Memorials of the South Saxon See and Cathedral Church of Chichester, Chichester, 1876, pp. 183-208.

his patronage of the painter Lambert Barnard, it is clear that the bishop was interested in new Renaissance art.[2] Yet it would be impossible to detect this interest in Renaissance art from the evidence of the bishop's tomb, which is devoid of any trace of Renaissance influence. Indeed, stylistically the tomb could easily date from a decade earlier. This tomb serves as an example of the large number of English tombs from the first half of the sixteenth century that remained completely untouched by Renaissance influences. That the patron of this tomb might have been expected to show some interest in the new styles - as he did in his patronage of painting elsewhere - yet chose to have his tomb conform to the earlier late medieval type, is also indicative of the problems encountered when searching for likely patrons of English tombs exhibiting innovation in this period.

Patrons

The Monarchy.

It is natural to look to the royal tombs for a guide to the pattern of patronage and the development of taste in Renaissance England. Since the death of Henry V, royal tomb sculpture did not set an example, until the Italianate tomb of Henry VII was erected in Westminster Abbey. One of the most significant means of establishing changes in taste was through the personal influence the monarch could exert on the English court through

---

[2] See chapter IV of this study.

his own patronage of artists and styles. Although royal patronage was often based on mere personal aesthetic preference, the question of the monarchy's means of display of royal prestige was conditioned by larger and more serious considerations of national diplomacy and policy.

The English preoccupation with the monarchical heritage has ensured the study of the royal tombs. Disappointingly, only the first and last Tudors are commemorated by complete monuments. A gap of nearly a century separates these two tombs, both in Westminster Abbey. If each Tudor had left a sepulchral monument, a much clearer pattern of the changing influences on English tomb sculpture would have emerged. A comparison with the sepulchral projects of the Valois dynasty in France serves to emphasize the lack of English royal models.

The Nobility and the Gentry.

To gain any sense of changes in English tomb sculpture in general, and not just of the royal tomb, we must turn to the tomb projects of the most important of the Tudors' subjects. Again, even this is not a straightforward task. The political and dynastic fears of Henry VIII led to the extermination of some of the foremost nobles in England, who might have been expected to lead the way in artistic patronage.[3] The English nobility of pre-Elizabethan England do not compare well with their French

[3] The Duke of Suffolk was executed in 1513; Duke of Buckingham executed 1521; Marquess of Exeter 1535; Countess of Salisbury 1541.

counterparts in the first half of the sixteenth century, either numerically, or in terms of their economic power, or even, generally, in terms of their cultural awareness. There is still a strong sense that England was a provincial backwater in sixteenth century Europe. There were no English projects on the lavish scale of the sepulchral programmes of the Bourbons at Souvigny, or of the Orléans in Paris. Fine marble and expensive foreign sculptors were not within the economic resources of the majority of Henry VIII's courtiers. Instead, cheaper materials were adapted to simulate more costly ones, and native masons were called on to update and interpret new styles, to the best of their abilities.

The Clergy.

In France in the first half of the sixteenth century the tombs of high prelates, like the Cardinals of Amboise, for example, provided early indications of a development in taste amongst a substantial number of high ecclesiastics for the new Renaissance styles. Although several English bishops commissioned architectural and other artistic projects in the new styles, there is a disappointing lack of Renaissance influence in tombs of high ecclesiastics of the period in England. Only Cardinal Wolsey attempted to rival the King in his patronage of foreign sculptors for his sepulchral monument, with disastrous results. Apart from Cardinal Wolsey, there is a conspicuous conservatism evident in the surviving tombs of the English clergy. This may

have been a result of the controversy over religious doctrine and the precarious position of the clergy brought about by the English Reformation. The theological issues called into question in this period may have served to inhibit innovation in ecclesiatical tomb sculpture in particular. For all members of society the controversy over religious imagery and the means of salvation must have caused doubt over the form and decoration of tombs.

The Means of Change

It is necessary both to define and describe different means of the transference of new ideas and practices, and to see the results of these new developments on existing tombs.

English tomb sculpture, especially royal tomb sculpture, had been affected in the past by continental stylistic developments and innovations. Foreign influences on English funerary art were manifested in different ways. The most direct means was the introduction of a foreign artist, commissioned by an English patron, to create a tomb in an English environment. This occurred in the fourteenth century for the tomb of Philippa of Hainault by Hawkin of Liège in Westminster Abbey.

The Anglo-French heritage of the Kings of England after the Norman Conquest had especially facilitated the artistic inter-changes of English and Franco-Flemish craftsmen and artists. The changing form of the English royal tomb in the later

medieval period was particularly affected by the shift in Anglo-French relations, both diplomatic and economic, brought about by the Hundred Years War. A concentration on this methodology to explain artistic change would be too deterministic. However, consideration of the chief diplomatic, economic and religious developments in Anglo-European relations in this period of immense change, is valid.

Economic policies had concrete effects on the traffic in craftsmen and materials across the English Channel. Royal proclamations could either welcome and encourage a generation of foreign artists, as did the 1509 proclamation of Henry VIII, or they could almost instantly curb and control the entry and activities of foreign workers, and effectively put an end to artistic freedom. By these proclamations the King could favour or spurn particular alien groups. This was bound to affect the development of taste and patronage. At times of economic insecurity the government acted in a predictably reactionary manner towards foreign workers, including artists. Some of these points will be discussed at greater length in the section on intermediaries between foreign artists and English patrons.

Although patrons may have continued to commission their tombs without any conscious regard for outside factors other than personal taste and circumstances, it cannot be denied that England, already somewhat isolated from the rest of Europe and from new developments in European art, could be opened up to new

influences by the diplomatic policies of her monarchs, and the contacts these choices allowed. The more isolationist government policy was, the more limited were the choices available to the individual.

In chapter I the tombs created by the Florentine sculptor Pietro Torrigiano in Westminster Abbey are discussed with reference to the evolution of the form of the English royal tomb at Westminster Abbey and the extent to which Torrigiano's tombs deviated from or drew on these English prototypes. Torrigiano's experience of contemporary sculpture and, specifically, sepulchral design in Europe (Italy, France and the Netherlands) is related to his work on the English tombs.

In chapter II the role played by Italian merchants in connection with the contracts between Pietro Torrigiano and the Tudors is investigated. The function of Italian merchants in England as intermediaries between Italian artists and their English patrons is considered. Reasons for the eventual breakdown of a supportive environment for Italian artists in England are suggested.

Chapter III examines the introduction to England of terracotta, a material unfamiliar to English artists before the sixteenth century for tomb sculpture. A group of terracotta tombs in East Anglia, attributed by tradition to the Italian artists at work in England in the 1520s and 1530s, is studied in relation to this Italian work, and to sculptural and architectural styles in northern France and the Low Countries.

In chapter IV, another means of bringing about iconographic and stylistic changes in tomb sculpture - the introduction of classical Renaissance motifs and imagery through the use of illustrations, originally French and Flemish woodcuts and engravings, in early printed books as patterns for sculptural reliefs - is investigated in specific tombs in Sussex and Hampshire. These two-dimensional images were themselves a synthesis of indigenous and classical Italian Renaissance styles. Most of the artists and craftsmen who used them were not cognizant of the original sources of Renaissance motifs, and the results of their use of these models were often hybrid variations of classical Renaissance forms. Both these tombs and the East Anglian group are analysed as the products of artists and craftsmen unfamiliar with pure Renaissance style.

Chapter V surveys the influence of the royal tombs by Torrigiano on English tomb sculpture in the latter half of the reign of Henry VIII and the early years of Edward VI. Particular attention is paid to the evolution of a group of alabaster tombs from an English workshop that depended most directly on the innovations found in the Italianate royal tombs. Other tombs directly inspired by the Italian work in England, though not related to the workshop responsible for the first group of tombs, are also considered. The abortive project for the tomb of Henry VIII is discussed in this chapter as well. Its significance in an evaluation of sixteenth century English tomb sculpture is twofold. First, and most obviously, its fortunes parallel the

rise and fall of Italianate influences through the reign of Henry VIII. The religious, political and economic changes that dampened the King's own enthusiasm for the project, and that were to lead to its eventual abandonment, to a lesser degree affected all those who commissioned tombs. Secondly, the royal project, had it been completed, might have provided a base for the further evolution of Italianate tomb sculpture in England in the second half of the century. Instead, Elizabethan tomb sculpture evolved in a different direction. Finally, this chapter explores the relevance of religious Injunctions and iconoclasm to tomb sculpture in England by the middle of the century.

Documentary Limitations

The primary sources for this study are obviously the tombs themselves. For the works connected with Pietro Torrigiano all possible sources of documentation have already been exhausted by previous scholars.[4] However, most of the other tombs, situated in tiny parish churches whose records do not exist for this early period, are virtually undocumented. The chief consistent source

[4] See Alan Darr, 'The English Works of Pietro Torrigiano', Ph.D dissertation, New York University, 1979, p. 393. The author admits that he had been warned by the chief authorities on the English works 'that it was unlikely that I would find anywhere any additional references to Torrigiano's English activities, but I proceeded nevertheless to examine at Westminster Abbey [the Abbey Accounts for] the relevant years (1502-25)...As predicted, I found no additional unpublished Torrigiano documents either there at the Public Record Office or at the British Museum and Library....No new documents have been located that relate to the consecration of Henry VII's chapel or to the later destruction of portions of the Chapel and Abbey during the Reformation.'

of documentation - the wills of many of those commemorated by the tombs - do survive. These were eagerly consulted, but, with a few noted exceptions, the wills provided little extra information about the contracts for the tombs, or the artists responsible. They did, however, provide some new information to identify the donors, to assist in dating the works, and to determine whether the tombs are in their original locations.

There are other obvious barriers to the study of tomb sculpture in this period. Apart from the expected deterioration and loss of works of art of this age by the normal ravages of time, iconoclasm, in two waves, first during the Reformation, and then during the Civil War and the Protectorate, has robbed us of vital visual evidence. Unlike France, England had no Gaignières on the eve of the Revolution. Although there are isolated examples of sixteenth century observers, like John Leland, describing specific tombs other than the royal tombs, there is, unfortunately, no systematic contemporary survey from which to judge later descriptive or illustrated sources. Some visual records of certain tombs that were later altered or destroyed were preserved by the studies of dedicated antiquarians like John Weever, John Stow, and William Dugdale. From these early secondary sources the studies of later topographical and architectural historians depend, and these, too, have provided the chief, frequently inaccurate or fragmentary sources for piecing together some historical documentation for the monuments themselves. Eighteenth and nineteenth century illustrations

provided valuable visual sources for the tombs in southeast England, but the lack of comparable sources for other regions has made it impossible, unfortunately, to treat each group of tombs in exactly the same manner. In spite of these considerable and frustrating inconsistencies in available sources I have endeavoured to bring together several separate studies that deserve to be considered in conjunction with each other in order to contribute to the study of developments in English tomb sculpture in this period.

I. PIETRO TORRIGIANO AND THE ROYAL TOMBS

By the time King Henry VII began to consider plans for his tomb, the continuity of English royal tomb design had been totally marred by the political and dynastic disruptions of the preceding century. Henry VII had only the monumental sepulchral project of Henry V to refer to in his choice of memorial.[1] The reign of Henry V epitomized the lost stability and glory the new dynasty hoped to regain. The first Tudor must have been influenced by the example of the splendid chantry chapel of Henry V in his concern to re-establish royal prestige through the creation of his own chapel. The splendid collection of tombs in the royal mausoleum at Westminster Abbey, begun in the reign of Edward III and ending with the works of Henry V, symbolized the continuity and strength of the English monarchical tradition. The traditional role of royal patronage as the arbiter of standards of taste and quality for the English nobility to emulate had been severely disrupted during the Wars of the Roses.

[1] For the tomb of Henry V see W.H. St. John Hope, 'The Funeral, Monument and Chantry Chapel of Henry V', Archaeologia, 2nd series, vol. LXV, February 1914, pp. 361-80. See M.H. Keen, England in the Later Middle Ages, London, 1973, and J.R. Lander, Conflict and Stability in Fifteenth Century England, London, 1969, on Henry V and the Wars of the Roses.

Since Henry V, the remains of the predecessors of Henry VII had not received distinguished memorials. Henry VI had commenced ambitious architectural projects at Windsor and Eton but, in spite of his desire to be buried in Westminster Abbey, his body remained without a monument to honour it, though his remains were revered by many as those of an uncanonized saint and martyr, at Chertsey.[2] The Yorkist Edward IV turned his attention to Windsor instead of the crowded Abbey mausoleum at Westminster, preferring to begin a new dynastic enterprise at Windsor rather than to undertake the major demolition and rebuilding the founding of a new family mausoleum in Westminster Abbey would have required. The design of the tomb of Edward, enclosed by austere and stately metal gates, was conceived in monumental terms, but remained unfinished.[3] After the untimely and ignominious death of Richard

---

[2] Will of Henry VI reprinted in J. Nichols, ed., The Wills of all the Kings and Queens of England, London, 1780, pp. 291-317. The King did not indicate his choice of burial place in his will. He merely provided funds for the continuation of pious building projects at Eton and Cambridge, and instructed his executors to pay his debtors before they used his surplus assets to 'doe and satisfie mine exequies, memorialls and all things behoveable about my sepulture in honourable wise...'. An account of the King's burial at Chertsey and the supposed miracles associated with the body, related by contemporary chroniclers, is found in R. Gough, The Sepulchral Monuments of Great Britain, London, 1786-96, vol. II, pp. 231-32. The corpse finally came to rest at Windsor, to the south of the high altar, where Henry VII had a monument erected. According to J. Speed, The History of Great Britain, London, 1613, p. 397, the remains of Henry VI were taken to Windsor to 'a new tomb at the entrance into the chancell of the chapell and at the south door of the quire it was princely bestowed; but since the tomb is removed, where the corpse is now laide is not vulgarly known...'. A design for Henry VI's tomb exists, BM Cotton MS Augustus II, i.

[3] See W.H. St. John Hope, Windsor Castle, London, 1913, vol. II, p. 376, for the will of King Edward IV, which stated that the tomb at Windsor should include a stone laid low on the ground

III, his corpse was interred in a simple tomb provided by the Tudor victor of Bosworth Field, at a later date, in obscurity at Leicester.[4]

The Projects for the Tomb of Henry VII

It was natural for Henry VII and his successors to reflect on the conventional form of the royal tomb as it had evolved during the centuries from Edward III to Henry V. The most striking features of these tombs were their gilded copper effigies and the free-standing tomb chest, and in these essential features the tomb of Henry VII conforms to the established type. Though conservative by nature, Henry VII did specify in his will two distinct innovations in the form of his tomb: he requested that a

---

over his body, and 'upon the same a stone to be laied and wrought with the figure of Dethe with scochyns of oure Armes and writings convenient aboute the bordures of the same remembring the day and yere of our decease and that in the same place or nere to it an Autre bee made metely for the tomb as herafter we shall devise and declare. Item, we wol that overe the same sepulture ther be made a vawte of convenient height as the place wil suffre it, and that upon the same vawte ther be made and sett there and upon the same Tumbe an Image for our figure, which figure we wil be of silver and gilte or at the lest coppre and gilt, and about the same Tumbe scripture be made convenient remembring the day and yere of our deceasse...'. The tomb of Edward IV remained unfinished. A description of his funeral and the remains of his monument is found in F. Sandford, A Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England, London 1707, pp. 413-14.

[4] J. Leland, The Itinerary of John Leland, ed. L. Toulmin Smith, London, 1907-11, vol. I, p. 16, writes that he saw the tomb of Richard III in the church of the Greyfriars, on the south side of St. Martin's in Leicester: 'His body being found among the slain, and naked and covered with dirt and blood was thrown across a carrier's horse, tied on with cords, behind Blanche Sanglier pursuivant at arms, and carried to Leicester, where it

kneeling figure of himself should be part of the tomb, and that depictions of his chosen saints, rather than the traditional family mourners, should adorn the tomb. This may have been prompted by the King's desire to represent the office of the Tudor King as divinely ordained and supported by the saints, rather than by mere earthly relatives, who were reminders of the personal and mortal nature of the King as a man.[5] There are indications that Henry VII suffered uncharacteristic pangs of conscience before his death, and powerful fears for his eternal salvation, to be secured with the aid of these intercessors.[6] Henry VII also chose to associate himself with the Lancastrian King Henry VI, and intended his chapel to house the shrine of Henry VI, whose canonization he attempted to secure.

---

was for two whole days exposed to public view in the Old Town Hall at the end of Blue Boar Lane, and there meanly buried in the church of the Greyfriars...'. According to W. Kennett, A Complete History of England, London 1709-19, vol. I, IV, p. 356, 'King Henry VII, out of regard to his own queen, who was of the house of York, some time after caused a monument to be erected for him, with his figure in alabaster, which remained till the dissolution, when it was destroyed, with the conventual church; and his grave with the site thereof is now no longer to be distinguished. Tradition says his stone coffin was converted into a watering trough at the Whitehorse Inn in Gallowtree gate, where Mr. Carte says the head part of it remained until about the end of the reign of George I when it was broken to pieces, and some parts placed as steps to the cellar.'

[5] The will of Henry VII is reprinted by T. Astle, The Will of Henry VII, London, 1775, p. 4: 'And in the sides and booth ends of our said Towmbe, in the said Touche under the said bordure, we wol tabernacles be graven, and the same to be filled with Ymages, specially of our said avouries, of Coper and gilte.'

[6] F. Bacon, The Life and Reign of King Henry VII, ed. F.J. Levy,

The European ambitions of Henry VIII and his interest in Renaissance art brought about the break with recent English tradition and the appointment of a foreign artist for the tomb of Henry VII. The final version of the tomb was not, however, the first foreign design for the tomb.

Guido Mazzoni and the Tomb of Henry VII

Estimates by English craftsmen survive for a monument that would have been a great innovation for an English royal tomb, though the plan was 'afterwards misliked' by Henry VIII, possibly for financial reasons.[7] The plan must have been proposed between the time Henry VII made his will, and before 26 October 1512, when, according to the 1518 contract for the tomb of Henry VIII,

---

Indianapolis, c.1972, pp. 237-38; G.R. Elton, 'Henry VII: Rapacity and Remorse', Historical Journal, vol. I, 1958, p. 39, writes: '...a dispassionate reading of both Henry's will and Fisher's funeral sermon makes plain that we have here a man's fear of purgatory and hell on account of the things which both as a ruler and a human being he had to do, rather than his considered reflections on particular aspects of his policy'. J. Cooper, 'Henry VII's last Years Reconsidered', Past and Present, vol. XXVI, 1959, pp. 110-12.

[7] The contract for the tomb of Henry VII does not survive, in spite of B. Hochstetler Meyer's claim that 'The contract and bond relating to the tomb of Henry VII are given by Britton, pp. 23-25', in her article, 'The first Tomb of Henry VII of England', The Art Bulletin, vol. LVII, 1976, p. 360, n. 8. The contract in Britton's work is for the altar of 1516. Only in the bond for the later tomb of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon is the 1512 contract referred to. The 1518 contract is reprinted as 'Transcript of a Draft of an Indenture for the Covenants for the erecting of Archaeologia, a Tomb to the Memory of King Henry VIII and Queen Katherine his wife; found amongst the Papers of Cardinal Wolsey, in the Chapter House at Westminster', Archaeologia, vol. XVI, pt. I, 1809, pp. 84-88. The plan discarded by Henry VIII for the tomb of his father

Torrigiano entered into a contract for the tomb of Henry VII.[8] Bearing in mind that Torrigiano was already contracted on 23 November 1511 to execute the Beaufort tomb, this probably means that the discarded project occurred before the engagement of Torrigiano by the court, narrowing the period down to between 1509 to late 1511. During this time, the artist responsible for the aborted project, 'Master Pageny' (Guido Mazzoni), the Modenese artist employed by the King of France, was in France.[9] On the projected tomb the King would have been portrayed twice, once kneeling, accompanied by four lords, on top of a gilded black and white marble arcaded tomb, repeating the format of the destroyed tomb (fig. 2), also by Mazzoni, of Charles VIII of France at St. Denis, Paris.[10] The kneeling figure may have been suggested by the King's request, in his will, to have a

---

remains in the form of financial estimates, the originals being preserved in the Public Record Office, State Papers Domestic, Henry VIII, (SP1/1/44 and 45) and a copy exists in the British Museum, Harley MS 297 fol. 28-30, headed, 'A plot for the tomb of Henry VII afterwards misliked by Henry VIII'.

[8] Contract for the tomb of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon, op. cit., pp. 84-88.

[9] On the tomb of Charles VIII at St. Denis see T.C. Verdon, 'The Art of Guido Mazzoni', Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1975, pp. 123-34. Also A. de Montaiglon, 'Sur le tombeau de Charles VIII par Guido Mazzoni', Archives de l'art française, I, 1851-52, pp. 129-32.

[10] A description of this tomb, destroyed during the Revolution, is found in M. Félibien, L'Histoire de l'abbaye royale de St. Denis, Paris, 1706, pp. 546-56, with an engraving of the monument by Gaignières, Bibl. Nat., Pe 1a, fol. 48. Cat. Bouchot, no. 2020. An earlier woodcut by Jean Rabel is found in P. Corrozet, Les antiquitez, croniques et singularitez de Paris, ville capitale du royaume de France, Paris, 1588. See also the tomb of Don Alvaro de Luna (fig. 3), Chapel of St. James, Toledo Cathedral. Four lords kneel at the corners of

life-sized kneeling votive figure of himself placed on the shrine of the Confessor, offering his crown, won on the battlefield, for the symbolic blessing of legitimacy and hereditary right, personified by Edward the Confessor.[11] A second votive figure was to be installed at Canterbury, for the second great English martyr connected with the English royal house, St. Thomas a Becket. The second depiction of the King, as a recumbent effigy below, with the Queen, would have satisfied English tradition. Around the sides were to be ranged twelve small images and an epitaph, also requested in the will of Henry VII. This tomb would have antedated the tomb of Louis XII and Anne of Brittany (fig. 4), the work of the Giusti family, where the royal couple were also depicted twice, first as transis, enclosed by an arcade filled with figures of the Apostles, and above, kneeling, au vif, and crowned.[12] Apart from the enormous cost of the Mazzoni project (most likely over-estimated by jealous English artists)

---

the tomb chest.

[11] This thesis is also suggested by B. Hochstetler Meyer, op. cit., p. 361. The tombs of the Despencers at Tewkesbury already incorporated the motif of the kneeling donor figure.

[12] The most recent work on this tomb is B. Hochstetler Meyer, 'The Tomb of Louis XII and Anne of Brittany in St. Denis', Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1973. In the article by the same author, p. 362, n. 24, the earlier prototypes of double representations of the deceased are enumerated. See A. Blunt, Art and Architecture in France 1500-1700, Harmondsworth, 1953, plate 14, for the tomb of Louis XII. A later example of this type is the tomb of Pope Innocent VIII in St. Peter's, Rome. Never before, however, was the conjunction of the kneeling figure with the recumbent effigy found on a royal tomb. The French King, Louis XI, on his tomb at Notre Dame de Cléry, Paris, was depicted only as a priant. Only Cardinal de la Grange at Avignon was apparently depicted by a votive figure as well as by a recumbent effigy.

it would have been too avant-garde for the conservative tastes of the executors of the will of Henry VII, and possibly even for the young Henry VIII who at this point in his life was still strongly influenced by older members of his father's Council.[13]

Pietro Torrigiano and the Tomb of Henry VII

The choice of Pietro Torrigiano for the final version of the tomb rested on the artist's proven ability to adapt his native style to suit the taste of his patron, as he had proved able to do for the executors of the will of the Lady Margaret Beaufort. The executors included Prior Matthew Bolton, who was responsible for 'sendyng for diverse werkmen from beyende the sea for making of the seide tombe'.[14] Also involved was John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, the chief adviser to Henry VIII at the beginning of his reign.[15] Torrigiano also cut the budget for the tomb down to

---

[13] In 1509 the Privy Council of Henry VIII included the Chancellor, Archbishop Warham of Canterbury; Fox, Bishop of Winchester and Lord Privy Seal; the Bishops of London, Rochester and Durham; the Earls of Surrey, Oxford, Worcester and Shrewsbury; Sir Thomas Lovell; Sir Henry Marney; Sir Thomas Brandon; Sir Thomas Englefield; Sir Edward Poynings; Sir John Hussey; Sir Henry Wyatt; Sir Thomas Darcy; Dr. John Yonge; Thomas Docwra; Sir John Cutte; and Sir John Fyneux. Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547, (L&P) ed. J.S. Brewer, et al, London, 1862-1910, vol. I, lxxxi.

[14] See R.F. Scott, 'On the Contracts for the Tomb of the Lady Margaret Beaufort...with some illustrative Documents', Archaeologia, 2nd series, vol. XVI, April 1915, pp. 365-72, p. 370.

[15] E.E. Reynolds, The Life of St. John Fisher, Wheathampstead, 1972, pp. 39-43.

a more acceptable £1500.[16] Once entrusted with the important commission, Torrigiano, although referring back to his completed tomb for the Countess of Richmond, went on to experiment with a freer use of classical motifs and more luxuriant decorative work.

The design of the tomb of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York obviously developed from Torrigiano's earlier creation for the Lady Margaret Beaufort (fig. 5), the mother of Henry VII, whose tomb is situated in the south aisle of the Lady Chapel in Westminster Abbey. For the King and his consort, the design of the Beaufort tomb was augmented and developed into a double sarcophagus, a fairly predictable step for the second commission of an artist for the same royal family. This compares interestingly with the two tombs (figs. 6 & 7) the Florentine sculptor Domenico Fancelli executed for the Spanish monarchs.[17] More rigid restrictions had obviously been imposed on the artistic freedom of the sculptor for the first commission. Not only was Torrigiano to adhere to 'diverse patrons for my ladies

---

[16] In the contract for the tomb of Henry VIII reference is made to the cost of the tomb of Henry VII, '...for the some of Ml. Vc. li. st'lings expressid in the same Endentures of Coven'nts a Tombe or Sepulture...'.

[17] J.H. Perera, Escultores Florentinos en España, Madrid, 1957, p. 13, comments on the practice of reworking and enlarging an artist's first successful design for a subsequent commission. The author compares the tomb by Domenico Fancelli for the Infante Don Juan in Santo Tómas, Avila, with the larger project for the Catholic monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella, by the same artist, in the Royal Chapel in Granada. Here, the first tomb was more Florentine than the second, though both were carved in Italy. Fancelli visited Spain to assemble the finished tombs and the second tomb may have been influenced by the Spanish setting.

tombe', already drawn by the painter 'Maynard', possibly a Frenchman or a Fleming, but he was also obliged to accept English collaboration in the design and casting of the heraldic escutcheons and the Perpendicular housings and tabernacles framing the effigy, as stipulated in the contract supervised by the executors and overseers of the will of the Lady Margaret.[18] For the tomb of the Lady Margaret the conventional Tudor table-tomb had been only modified by the Florentine artist. Both of the Italian tombs are distinguished from the earlier royal tombs in Westminster Abbey by their incorporation of black marble and gilded copper elements on the tomb chest. Torrigiano had proved himself able to adapt to the needs of his patron and to the existing architectural environment his work was to be located in. More directly influential on the English royal tomb, through their influence on Pietro Torrigiano, were the effigies produced by Guido Mazzoni for the tomb of Charles VIII, and the Pollaiuolo Papal tombs of Innocent VIII and Sixtus IV.

The Influence of the Tomb of Charles VIII

Guido Mazzoni had designed a kneeling gilded bronze effigy for the tomb of Charles VIII which changed the French royal predilection for the white marble recumbent effigy on a black

---

[18] Will, dated 6 June 1508, reprinted by R.F. Scott, op. cit., pp. 365-68. The reference to Maynarde Vewike appears in documents of the accounts of the executors of the Lady Margaret, for November 1511, preserved amongst records of payments for the colleges of Christ and St. John, Cambridge.

slab.[19] The date of the erection of the completed tomb has not been determined.[20] Almost certainly Charles had commissioned the tomb during his lifetime. Mazzoni was in France by 1497. Payments continued from Charles's successor, Louis XII, the second husband of the widow of Charles, Anne of Brittany. Anne employed both French and Italian artists on family tomb projects: that of her parents, Francis II Duke of Brittany and his wife, at Nantes (fig. 8); and the tomb of the children of Charles VIII (fig. 9) at Tours.[21] The tomb at Tours was finished by 1505, and Mazzoni visited Italy in 1507, which suggests that the tomb of Charles VIII had already been completed by this date.

Although Henry VII had left his place of exile, France, for England, long before the Mazzoni tomb had been considered, Henry may have seen the tomb of Louis XI, with its kneeling effigy at Cléry. A plan of the Mazzoni project for the tomb of Henry VII would have been sent over to England, though it is possible that Mazzoni himself actually visited the English court.[22] As the tomb

---

[19] T.C. Verdon, op. cit., pp. 121-33. If the drawings of French tombs in the late fifteenth century by Gaignières are accurate, the use of the white marble effigy on a black base occurred in most French funerary monuments. For the tomb of Louis XI at Clery, see P. Pradel, Michel Colombe, le dernier imagier gothique, Paris, 1953, pp. 19-22.

[20] The Venetian ambassador related in a letter to the Venetian Senate: 'Videssimo la sepultura di Carlo Ottava con la imagine sua dal naturale fatta per quel istesso maistro che fece quelle figure in S. Antonio a Venetia', A. Baschet, La diplomatie vénitienne, Paris, 1862, p. 376, n. 1.

[21] P. Pradel, op. cit., pp. 44-48.

[22] H. Dow, 'Two Italian Portrait Busts of Henry VIII', The Art Bulletin, vol. XLI, 1960, pp. 291-94.

is difficult to envisage from a description alone, a model may have been presented for consideration.[23] Mazzoni finally returned to Italy where he died in 1516.

Pietro Torrigiano and Rome

Torrigiano was obviously influenced by the bronze effigies executed by the Pollaiuolo brothers for the Papal tombs in St. Peter's in his treatment of the effigies of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. Pietro Torrigiano was working in Rome on the stucco decorations of the Borgia apartments, begun between June 1492 and the winter of 1493, for Pope Alexander VI.[24] Pinturricchio and a whole troop of lesser artists were engaged on the project. The brothers Piero and Antonio Pollaiuolo were at work on the tomb of Sixtus IV (died in 1488) for his nephew, Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. Antonio brought many workmen with him.[25] Torrigiano was living in Rome as late as 4 September 1498, the date of his will.[26] The tomb of Sixtus IV (fig. 10) was

---

[23] T.C. Verdon, op. cit., fig. 91, made a reconstructed plan of the tomb project for Henry VII. See also B. Hochstetler Meyer, op. cit., p. 360: 'Item, the kinges iii master masons sayen that the workmanshippe of the blacke towche stoon and the whyte marbill stoon for the said tomb after the maner of the mouldinge of the patrone which master Pageny hath made woll coste lxxx li. which wolbe delyvered redy wrought within the space of one yere...'.

[24] E. Muntz, Les Arts à la Cour des Papes Innocent VIII, Alexandre VI et Pié III, 1485-1503, Paris, 1896, p. 423; L.D. Ettlinger, Antonio and Piero Pollaiuolo, Oxford, 1978.

[25] L.D. Ettlinger, 'Pollaiuolo's Tomb of Pope Sixtus IV', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XVI, 1955, p. 245. See J. Pope-Hennessy, I.R.S., fig. 72.

probably finished by 1494, but the Pollaiuolo brothers and their workshop remained in Rome to work on the tomb of Pope Innocent VIII. They continued on this project until 1498. Pietro Torrigiano may have been engaged as an assistant to the Pollaiuolo brothers, though this is undocumented. His presence in Rome would certainly have allowed the young sculptor to study the tombs. In Rome during this period were some of the finest artists of the late Quattrocento, assembled for the massive programme of Borgia patronage. Andrea Bregno engaged a large and constantly changing workforce for the tombs he worked on in Sta. Maria del Popolo and Sta. Maria sopra Minerva. Torrigiano was thus able to draw on his knowledge of some of the latest developments in sepulchral sculpture in combined bronze and marble tombs. The Pollaiuolo tomb of Sixtus IV - a free-standing tomb, rather than the wall-tomb of Innocent VIII - was especially significant, as it was closer in type to the taste of English patrons and most suited to the architectural limitations and demands of the Westminster Abbey commission.

Torrigiano and Italian Clerics

Another consideration arising from the sojourn of Pietro Torrigiano in Rome is his possible encounter with Giovanni Gigli, the papal nuncio and collector in England during the papacy of Alexander VI. Gigli was responsible for the recommendation of the

[26] A. Ferrajoli, 'Un testamento inedito di Pietro Torrigiano e richerche sopra alcune sue opere', Bolletino d'Arte, vol. IX, 1915, pp. 181-92.

Cardinal of Siena, Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini, as Cardinal Protector of England in 1492. This same Cardinal, later briefly Pope Pius III, in 1502 had employed Torrigiano to make a figure of St. Francis for his altar in the Duomo at Siena.[27] Later, Galeotto della Rovere, nephew of Pope Julius II, the former patron of the Pollaiuolo, was chosen to succeed Piccolomini as Cardinal Protector of England. The most truly influential Italian clerics in England in this period were Gigli and Cardinal Castellesi (Bishop of Hereford from 1502), whilst in 1511 Cardinal Bainbridge assumed most of the responsiblities of the post in Rome.[28] Any of these clergymen could have provided Torrigiano with recommendations to the King and court of England.

The Influence of the Beaufort Tomb

A further consideration influencing the English patrons of the tomb of Henry VII was the current taste of the influential Burgundian royal house for funerary monuments that featured a gilded copper effigy with darkened face and hands.[29] The tomb of

---

[27] G. Milanesi, ed., Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese, Siena, 1854-1855, vol. III, p. 22, 'Item perchè vi ha un san Francesco di marmo facto per mano di Pietro Turrisiani; si domandà per il Cardinale, che esso Michelangelo per suo honore et cortesia e humanità, non essendo quello finito di pannamenti e testa, che el finisca di sua mano in Siena...'.

[28] W.E. Wilkie, The Cardinal Protectors of England; Rome and the Tudors before the Reformation, Cambridge, 1974. For Cardinal Bainbridge see D.S. Chambers, Cardinal Bainbridge and the Court of Rome, Oxford, 1965.

[29] A. Higgins, 'On the Work of the Florentine Sculptors in England', The Archaeological Journal, vol. LI, 1894, p. 131.

the Lady Margaret Beaufort in Westminster Abbey by Pietro Torrigiano was strongly influenced by the tomb of Mary of Burgundy (fig. 11). As Sydney Anglo has commented, during the early Tudor period, Burgundian culture exerted a powerful influence on the English court, as it had during the Yorkist period.[30] However, since the will of the Lady Margaret reveals that her tomb was not begun during her lifetime, the choice must have rested with Henry VIII and the executors of her will, most of whom were also the executors of the will of her son.[31] There is a strong similarity between the tomb of the Lady Margaret Beaufort and the tomb of Mary of Burgundy, who died on 27 March 1482.[32] Both tombs make use of the contrast of the gilded copper effigy (figs. 12 & 13) against a black marble slab supported on a high black tomb chest. The sides of the tomb chest of Mary of Burgundy are decorated with genealogical trees and enamelled beribboned shields, rather than with the Florentine garlands surrounding shields suspended by ribbons, and separated by Corinthian pilasters, of the Beaufort tomb. A tiny statuette of an Evangelist sits at each corner of the Burgundian tomb, each in its own niche below a tiny baldaquin. Surrounding the effigy are archaic tabernacles and a cast baldaquin.[33] The effigy in this

---

[30] S. Anglo, Spectacle and Pageantry in Tudor England, Oxford, 1969, p. 104.

[31] These included the Bishop of Rochester, Dr. John Yonge, Sir Henry Marney and Sir Thomas Lovell.

[32] On the tomb of Mary of Burgundy see H.S. Hymans, Guide à Bruges et ses environs, Brussels, 1900, pp. 28-29.

[33] This type of framing for the effigy occurs more frequently on

setting is like that of a prioress. The Lady Margaret wears the barbe of a widow: no marital effigy accompanies her, in spite of the fact she was married three times. An elaborate wrought iron grille, with eight coats-of-arms, is a prominent feature of the Beaufort tomb. The Burgundian tomb was designed by Jan Borman, cast by Renier van Thienen, and gilded by the unfortunate silversmith Pierre de Beckere of Brussels.[34] The tomb was begun in 1495 for Mary's son, Philip the Fair, and was set up in the choir of Notre Dame, Bruges, by 1502, enclosed by an elaborate grille. Almost certainly Pietro Torrigiano passed through Flanders on his way to England and was impressed by the tomb.[35] (stop

The Effigies of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York

The gilded copper effigy was regarded as the prerogative of the English monarch, with the exception of the superb effigy of Richard Beauchamp, in St. Mary's church, Warwick.[36] English skill

---

fifteenth-century ecclesiastical tombs.

[34] De Beckere suffered from crippling paralysis and some of his workmen died as a a result of mercury poisoning in the gilding process. A long legal wrangle ensued, and was finally resolved in 1519 when Charles V agreed to pay compensation. M. Alexandre Pinchart, 'Notices sur Pierre de Beckere', Bulletins de l'Académie, 2nd series, vol. XVIII, p. 227.

[35] Torrigiano may have worked on sculptural projects for Margaret of Austria in Flanders, as well as having repaired a terracotta portrait bust of Mary Tudor, the sister of Henry VIII. See C. Cochin, 'Un lien artistique entre l'Italie, la Flandre et l'Angleterre, Pietro Torrigiano en Flandre', La revue de l'art ancien et moderne, vol. XXXVI, October-December 1915-19, pp. 179-82.

in the casting and finishing of the gilded effigy reached a new degree of excellence in the stylized effigies of Richard II and Anne of Bohemia, made according to contracts of 1395-96.[37] Again, with the exception of the Beauchamp effigy, the last surviving royal example was the reliquary-like, silver-plated oak effigy of Henry V. By the early sixteenth century, the contemporary French royal effigy was, by contrast, white marble on a black slab.

In early Quattrocento Europe the cast bronze for monumental statues and effigies had been undergoing a renaissance. The equestrian statues of the Gattamelata by Donatello, and the Colleoni monument by Verrocchio, brought significant advances in this process.[38]

---

[36] In a lecture on English later medieval tomb sculpture, delivered at the Courtauld Institute in March 1979, Christopher Hohler mentioned the probable existence of a bronze effigy, commissioned by the Princess of Wales for her first husband, formerly in the church of the Greyfriars, Stamford, until it was appropriated by the Commonwealth in the seventeenth century.

[37] T. Rymer, Foedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunque generis acta publica... 20 vols., London, 1703-35, vol. VII, pp. 795-98, for contracts of Nicholas Broker and Godfrey Prest 'citizens and copersmythes of Loundres'.

[38] On the development of the Renaissance equestrian monument see J. Pope-Hennessy, An Introduction to Italian Sculpture, London, 1970 ed., vol. II, Italian Renaissance Sculpture, (referred to hereafter as I.R.S.), pp. 52-56. On the Gattamelata monument by Donatello see H.W. Janson, The Sculpture of Donatello, Princeton, 1957, pp. 151-61. On the Colleoni monument see C. Seymour, The Sculpture of Verrocchio, Greenwich, Conn., 1971, pp. 62-64.

Compared to the other effigies in Westminster Abbey, the Tudor examples reveal a more subtle exploitation of the qualities of bronze. In his treatment of the bronze effigies of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York (fig. 14), Torrigiano emphasized textural qualities. The hair of the effigies of the King and Queen melts into the ceremonial pillow, and the incised strands flow into the smooth surface of the cushion. The cowl neck and edgings of Henry's robe are differentiated from the over-mantle by means of deep grooves reflecting and refracting light to suggest the characteristics of fur. The corded edgings of Elizabeth's bodice and the tassles fastening her mantle simulate twisted fibres.

The hieratic stiffness so characteristic of the earlier royal effigies, for example, that of the dignified and rigid cylinder representing the body of Edward III, is tempered by a degree of naturalism in the three effigies created by Torrigiano. The impression of comfortable horizontality, the heaviness of limbs and robes meeting the resisting surface of the tomb chest below, contrasting with the plump yielding of the cushions to the royal skulls, is not encountered elsewhere amongst the earlier gilded copper effigies in the Abbey. Although the portraits are idealized, they compare quite closely with the death masks that were available for the artist's use.[39] The meticulous concern

---

[39] F. Grossman, 'Holbein, Torrigiano and a Bust of Dean Colet', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XIII, 1950, pp. 220-21, discusses this change from informal portraiture, based on a life-study or a death mask, to the formal effigial portrait. See also W. H. St. John Hope, 'On the Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England', Archaeologia, vol. LX, 1907, pp. 517-70. See also H.J.

with texture and surface representation might argue a familiarity with contemporary Flemish portrait sculpture and painting.[40] However, this could just as easily be explained by Pietro's familiarity with recent Florentine or Roman trends. Italian works, like the head of the effigy of Sixtus IV from the Pollaiuolo tomb, or the terracotta bust of Giovanni Cellini by Antonio Rossellino, or the donor portraits in a Lamentation group by Guido Mazzoni, suggest that Torrigiano was merely in tune with a general preoccupation with realism in contemporary European portrait sculpture.[41] Torrigiano, not unexpectedly, was cautious not to move too far beyond the limits of English tradition, embodied in the royal gilded copper effigies surrounding him at Westminster Abbey. In these English works, naturalism is tempered with a respectful depersonalization befitting the royal office.

Plenderleith and H. Maryon, 'The Royal Bronze Effigies in Westminster Abbey', The Antiquaries Journal, vol. XXXIX, 1959, pp. 87-90; R.P. Howgrave-Graham, 'The Earlier Royal Funerary Effigies', Archaeologia, vol. XCVIII, 1961, pp. 469-471. The spectographic analysis of seven samples of metal from different parts of the tomb and the grille surrounding prove that the alloy compounds are so similar that it has been suggested that they were cast by the same founders, though Torrigiano was responsible for design and modelling of the tomb bronze only. Reported in A. Darr op. cit., p. 403.

[40] See M. G. Ciardi da Poggetto, 'Pietro Torrigiano e le sue opere italiane', Commentari, vol. XXII, 1971, pp. 309-11.

[41] See J. Pope-Hennessy, I.R.S., figs. 75, 128.

The Angels

The precariously perched clothed angels at each corner of the tomb chest introduce a markedly Florentine aspect to the otherwise conventionally English tomb. They function as shield-bearers to the deceased (fig. 15). Originally the angels carried the sword of Justice (northwest corner); the scales of Justice (southwest corner); the royal banner (southeast corner); and the insignia of Cadwallader (northeast corner). In profile, the illusion of arrested flight is created, each angel having alighted momentarily to recline against the sloping chamfered marble edge of the tomb chest (figs. 16-19). The legs do not appear to touch the tomb itself, rather they are poised in mid-air, a feat of celestial balance, though the indentation of draperies behind them confirms the seated posture of the angel on the ledge itself. They act very effectively to break up the parallel horizontal echoes of the tomb, effigies and grille, by emphasizing the oblique curve of the chamfering, and they create visual links with passing onlookers circulating around the outside of the grille. This oblique thrust is especially pronounced when corner angles of the tomb are photographed.

Although clothed, these angels by Torrigiano are the direct descendants of the putti of Verrocchio. The angels on Henry VII's tomb compare closely with the facial type of Verrocchio's *Eros with a Dolphin* (Palazzo della Signoria, Florence), and with the

infant in the Virgin and Child in the Bargello, Florence.[42] They share the same protruding, heavy-lidded eyes, and the circular, incised curl formation in the hair. In keeping with their dignified position as the guardians of the deceased English King and Queen, these angels are clothed. The naked standing putti on the tomb chest are more intrusively 'foreign' and belong to the spiritual and dematerialized realm of the heraldic supporters and the Italianate saints of the lower level of the tomb chest. The clothed angels carry the regalia and heraldic accoutrements that identify the temporal status of the deceased royal couple. The device of the seated angels accompanying the effigy recalls the tomb of the Cardinal of Portugal, in the church of San Miniato al Monte.[43] Antonio Rossellino's naked putti perch on the end of the bier of the youthful and virginal Cardinal, their nakedness referring here to his innocence and purity. On the Rossellino tomb the putti enhance and reveal the compositional pyramid of the monument, and emphasize the horizontal axis of the effigy, instead of acting as oblique visual devices at the narrow end of the tomb chest, as is their function on the tomb of Henry VII. In England the use of clothed angels as supporters of heraldic devices was common, but the appearance of their nude Italianate counterparts on an English tomb was unprecedented.

---

[42] H.W. Janson, op. cit., plate 46 for the Virgin and Child. See C. Seymour, The Sculpture of Verrocchio, plate 46, for Eros and the Dolphin.

[43] See J. Pope-Hennessy, I.R.S, fig. 64.

The Decorative Sculpture on the Tomb of Henry VII

By the early sixteenth century it is seldom possible to trace the origin of a particular decorative classical motif to a specific artist or work, since there was already a common repertoire of decorative motifs amongst Italian Renaissance sculptors. The pilasters and panels of Henry VII's tomb combine traditionally English royal and Tudor heraldic motifs: the portcullis, Tudor rose and fleur-de-lis, with items of frequently encountered classical and allegorical imagery such as urns, arabesque work, exotic flowers and birds, other symbols of the resurrection, and triumphal themes (figs. 20 & 21). The bronze pilasters separating each garlanded pair of saints are identical. The lowest horizontal panel at the base is also repeated. A grotesque mask, whose beard and hair are metamorphosed into acanthus leaves, folds around each corner of the lower bronze frieze, again echoing the oblique angle of the putti (fig. 22). Each corner of the panel enclosing the roundels of saints is filled by a delicately wrought Tudor rose with stem and leaves extended to occupy the triangular space (fig. 23). Here, as in every element of the floral work, minute attention to details, for example, the individually serrated edges of each rose leaf on its thornless stem, draws attention to the high quality of the craftsmanship and finishing. The black marble garlands are reminiscent of Della Robbia terracotta work, combining triumphal laurel and oak leaves with acorns and pomegranate heads in prominent relief, bound by rippling gleaming ribbons caught

loosely in a bow at the upper centre. The play of light on the contrasting gilded copper roundels and panels against the smoothly finished black marble creates a very rich and lively effect. Torrigiano was working in a very sophisticated manner with a variety of different media.[44] At the rim of the tomb chest, in gilded bronze letters between stamped guilloche bands, is the inscription desired by the King in his will.[45] A heavy black marble cornice separates the tomb chest from the white marble chamfered sides of the upper slab, creating a more harmonious scaling-down of the support for the life-size effigies. The chamfering recalls that of the bronze bier of the tomb of Sixtus IV already discussed.

The use of contrasting black and white marble recalls the French practice, as illustrated in the tomb of the children of Charles VIII and the tomb of Duke Francis II of Brittany.[46] Even in the white marble areas of the tomb of Henry VII the relief is deep. The maximum effects of light and shadow are solicited by the undercutting of the forms. A curious raised platform effect, visible beneath certain rose heads, increases the plasticity of

---

[44] This compares with Verrocchio's sarcophagus for Piero and Giovanni de' Medici in the Sacristy of San Lorenzo, Florence. This tomb combined bronze, marble, porphyry and serpentine, with all their diverse inherent characteristics, in a very rich and opulent manner. See J. Pope-Hennessy, I.R.S, fig. 69.

[45] For the inscription see F. Sandford, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

[46] See P. Pradel, op. cit., pp. 44-48, and pl. IX for the tomb of Francis II of Brittany. The tomb of the children of Charles VIII is described in P. Pradel, op. cit., pp. 53, 89 and pl. XXVII.

the forms. Two Italianate half-length naked putti support two cartouches containing individual commemorative inscriptions to Henry and Elizabeth (figs. 24 & 25). The two bronze putti in relief supporting the royal arms at the foot of the effigies are more closely related to the figures at the corners. These robust figures almost free themselves from their reliefs: their feet actually rest against the narrow sloping ledge of the first level of the base. The shield they support curves over the ledge and is highly convex. The style of the decorative work is, on the whole, very similar to Tuscan examples, as opposed to the more florid and cluttered Lombard decorative style.

The Roundels

Torrigiano must have been influenced by the section of the will of Henry dealing with the 'avouries' to be depicted around his tomb chest. Each side of the tomb chest consists of three roundels containing bronze reliefs of pairs of saints (fig. 26). Like divine attendants at the chantry of the King, all of the named intercessors appear, with the addition of St. Christopher, to join with the holy and historical personages found in the chapel itself. The iconographic programme for the decoration of the chapel reveals the essentially orthodox Catholicism of the religious beliefs of Henry VII.[47] The choice of roundels enclosed by garlands is, however, totally alien to the English practice of

[47] J.T. Micklethwaite, 'Notes on the Imagery of Henry VII's Chapel, Westminster', Archaeologia, vol. XLVIII, 1883, pp. 361-80.

depicting either weepers in niches or quatrefoil panels supporting heraldic scutcheons. On French and Italian tombs roundels seldom enclose figures of personal saints, but rather Virtues, a single depiction of the Virgin and Child, or, like the English practice, shields of heraldic arms. The tomb of Medea Colleoni by Antonio Amadeo in the Colleoni Chapel in Bergamo may have furnished Torrigiano with a model for the use of 'antique' medallions (enclosing in this case heraldic shields) in panels divided by Renaissance pilasters (fig. 27). A French example of this type of tomb chest occurs in the tomb of Bishop Guegen by Michel Colombe in Saint-Pierre, Nantes (fig. 28). The tomb of the Dukes of Orléans (now in St. Denis) by Michele d'Aria, Girolamo Viscardi, and the Florentine sculptors Donato di Battista Benti and Benedetto di Bartolmmeo, incorporated twelve apostles in the arcading of the tomb chest, rather than the traditional pleurants (fig. 29). In Italy, the special saints of the deceased were usually incorporated in the painted retable at an altar in the donor's chapel, rather than shown on the tomb chest.[48] Henry VII may not have intended such an interpretation of his request - he also requested a table for the display of relics, which was to be adorned with his 'avouries'. It is possible that this first scion of the new dynasty did not feel able to muster the array of royal

---

[48] Sculpted figures were also depicted on altars: for example, the Piccolomini altarpiece, for which Torrigiano made a St. Francis. The sculpted altar seems to have been growing in popularity in the late Quattrocento. For Torrigiano's part in the Piccolomini altarpiece, see W. R. Valentiner, 'Michelangelo's Statuettes of the Piccolomini Altar in Siena', Art Quarterly, vol. V, 1942, pp. 3-44.

relatives required by convention to fill the niches of the royal tomb chest.[49]

The saints are depicted in the order of naming in the will: the Virgin, 'sweetest Lady of mercy, veray Moder and Virgin; well of pitie and surest refuge of all nedeful'; St. Michael, closest to the head of the King; St. Edward the Confessor and St. Vincent by the head of the Queen. Only the inclusion of St. Christopher next to St. Anne interrupts the continuity of the will. The Queen's side includes all the female saints, except the Queen of Heaven, who was the particular intercessor of the King. St. Anne, for her association with motherhood, honours the Queen, who died in childbirth.[50] St. Edward the Confessor was an ancestor of the Yorkist Queen Elizabeth. The King counted the powerful Virgin and the warrior saints, St. Michael and St. George and the two Evangelists, all of high religious standing, on his side of the tomb chest.

The sculptor attempted to integrate pairs of figures in a problematic circular frame. Torrigiano may have drawn on his experience of the works of Donatello. However, between the saints in the roundels of the tomb of Henry VII there is no dialogue

---

[49] An early example of this type is the tomb of Aveline, Countess of Lancaster (died 1273) or her husband, the Earl of Lancaster (died 1296), at Westminster Abbey.

[50] R. Holinshed, Chronicle of England, Scotland and Ireland, London, 1577, p. 709, gives an account of the funeral of Elizabeth of York, at which, to signify that the Queen died in childbirth: 'By every horse, a person of honour on foot in a mourning hood and at every corner of the chair a white banner of our Lady, born by a Knight...'.

like that achieved by Donatello in the panels of the Old Sacristy of San Lorenzo (fig. 30). The accommodation of two standing figures in a circular field was not comfortably achieved. A single figure in a roundel presented fewer compositional problems. Torrigiano may also have recalled Donatello's roundels enclosing single Evangelists (fig. 31), again in San Lorenzo. Torrigiano chose to depict the saints from slightly below, perhaps to anticipate their being viewed from below by pilgrims at prayer. Pietro Torrigiano also drew on his previous experiences of Italian types for the saints, but in certain cases reverted to the statuettes already in the chapel for iconography he was unfamiliar with.

The Virgin and Child.

The dedication of the chapel is chiefly to the Virgin, whose image surveys the tomb from the east end of the chapel. The Virgin was always considered the most important holy intercessor for mortals, and her inclusion amongst the other 'avouries' was essential. The Virgin Torrigiano created for the tomb is a more matronly and classical type than the girlish figure favoured by other Italian artists of the period (fig. 32). She compares most closely with the Madonna and Child by Andrea Sansovino in Genoa Cathedral (fig. 33). The contrapposto pose of the child (fig. 32) also echoes the Madonna and Child by Verrocchio in the Bargello, Florence.[51] The Virgin also recalls Torrigiano's early robust

---

[51] See J. Pope-Hennessy, I.R.S, fig. 76.

peasant Virgin and Child (fig. 34) of Fossombrone.[52] The huge, inflated draperies, especially the sleeves, are reminiscent of the Flemish statues in the chapel of Henry VII. Torrigiano's later Virgin and Child, now in the Museo de Bellas Artes, Seville (fig. 35), evolved from the Westminster Abbey type, but they are less classical than the Westminster Abbey type.

St. Michael.

The blessing of the Christ Child is in response to the raised hand of the accompanying Archangel, who may have originally carried a lance. Along with the Virgin, St. Michael was regarded as the most potent advocate of mercy for the mortal soul, and was the champion of man against the Devil (fig. 36). Torrigiano portrayed the saint in his traditional act of weighing the souls, known as psychostasis.[53] The artist followed the Byzantine representation of the saint very closely. One of the oldest surviving models is the depiction of St. Michael in the mosaic ceiling of St. Mark's in Venice, where St. Michael appears as the warrior, not as the long-robed angelic judge of Rogier van der Weyden's Beaune altarpiece.[54] He crushes the demon whilst

---

[52] G.M. Ciardi Duprè dal Poggetto, op. cit., pp. 314-16, for the Virgin and Child of Fossombrone. It should be noted that this work has been rejected as being from the hand of Torrigiano. The present statue may be a copy of an original by Torrigiano. Also see A. Vernarecci, 'Il Torrigiano pittore fiorentino a Fossombrone', Rivista Misena, vol. VIII, 1893, pp. 52-53.

[53] Unpublished notes by V.C. Lafleur, Warburg bequest, on the depiction of psychostasis in art.

[54] See E. Panofsky, E.N.P, plate 189.

wielding a lance in one hand and scales in the other (fig. 37). Praying souls are visible in the scales in Torrigiano's version, and the struggling Devil clutches at one of the scales (fig. 38). St. Michael was not always portrayed as a soldier, nor as a youthful saint. The feathered legs of Torrigiano's saint occur in depictions of the saint by Italian artists like the Della Robbia family, Donatello, Mantegna and Piero della Francesca, and were also familiar in England on the roof angels of East Anglian churches.[55] The saint, with his fellow Archangels, Tobias, Raphael and Gabriel, was especially venerated for his protection of Hebrew and then Christian souls. St. Michael was supposed to have warred with Satan over the body of Moses, and was afterwards particularly credited with the protection of the earthly remains of the deceased at vigils.[56]

As well as being an object of universal Christian veneration, the Archangel Michael was of special importance to the French and English kings. One of the ancient appearances of the saint was said to be that of Mont-Saint-Michel-en-péril-de-la-mer, in A.D. 708. Normandy thus became a northern pilgrimage centre to rival

---

[55] These angels with feathered tights recall the players in medieval mystery plays, and they are depicted in doorways and on hammer-beam roofs in certain churches in East Anglia, for example, at Cawston in Norfolk.

[56] The intercessors of Henry VII are begged: '...not oonly at the houre of dethe, soo to aide, succour and defend me, that the ancient and gostly enemye, ner noon other euill or dampnable Esprite, have no powar to invade me, ner with his terriblenesse to annoy me; but also with your holie praiers, to be intercessours and mediatours unto our maker and redeemer, for the remission of my Synnes and Salvacion of my Soule'.

those of Italy and the Holy Land. The Dukes of Normandy regarded St. Michael as the protector of their domains, including Norman Sicily, Naples, and, ultimately, England. King Louis XI had created the Order of St. Michael at Amboise on 1 August 1469, and national pride permeated the preamble of the Order.[57] The European ambitions of Henry VIII were evident at the time when Torrigiano was working on the tomb. Even Henry VII had carefully stressed his interests in and connection with France, through his grandmother Katherine de Valois and through his negotiations for French marriage alliances.[58] The fleur-de-lis is included on the breast-plate of Torrigiano's saint. Clearly the English did not regard the French claim to St. Michael as exclusive, nor the Saint's protection of Normandy as necessary against the English, who still laid their own claims to it.

---

[57] See F. Enaud, ed., Millénaire du Mont Saint Michel, 966-1966, Paris, 1966, pp. 181-83. The preamble announces: 'A la louange et gloire de Dieu, notre créateur tout puissant, et révérence de sa glorieuse mère et commémoration et honneur de Monsieur Saint Michel archange premier chevalier, qui, pour la querelle de Dieu, victorieusement batailla contre le dragon, ancien ennemie de la nature humaine, et le trébucha du ciel, qui son lieu et oratoire appelé le Mont St. Michel a toujours sûrement gardé, préservé, et défendue, sans être pris, subjugué, ni mis aux mains des anciens ennemis de notre royaume, à afin que tous les bons, hauts et nobles courages soient émus et incités a oeuvres vertueuses...un ordre de fraternité de chevalerie ou aimable compagnée de certain nombre de chevaliers lequel ordre nous voulons être nommé l'ordre de St. Michel'. (Preamble to the Order of St. Michael).

[58] The will again refers to Henry VII's relationship, through his grandmother, with France. His daughter Mary was almost established as the Queen of France, through her marriage to Louis XI, but the sudden death of her new spouse ended her particular claims to the French throne.

St. George.

In spite of his other European attachments, St. George had long been adopted by the English as a national saint (fig. 39). In ceremonial processions his banner was carried for the King: for example, at Henry V's funeral, Hall remarked that:

> His body was drawen with syxe horses richly trapped wt. severall armes, the first wyt armes of S. George, the ij with tharmes of Normandy, the iij wyth the armes of Arthur, the iiij wyth the armes of S. Edward, the fyft the armes of Fraunce and the syxt wyth the armes of England and Fraunce.[59]

Relics of the saint were highly prized by the monarchs of England.[60] Henry VII appears to have been particularly fond of St. George. Amongst the bequests in Henry's will was one to the altar of his chapel:

> ...also the precious Relique of oon of the leggs of Saint George, set in parcell gilte, whiche came to the hands of our Broder and Cosyn Lewys of Ffraunce, the tyme that he wan and recovered the cities of Millein, and geven and sent us by our cousyne the Cardinal of Amboyse Legate in Fraunce.[61]

The archetypal victor of good over evil, St. George had been portrayed by many Italian artists. He appeared occasionally on horseback (Uccello and Carpaccio) though often on foot, as Torrigiano was compelled to portray him within the confines of

---

[59] E. Hall, Union of the two noble and illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke, London, 1548, fol. 1.

[60] W. Dugdale, The Antiquities of Warwickshire, London, 1700 ed., vol. 1, p. 407, lists the brave deeds of Sir Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, at the Council of Constance in 1414, when the Emperor Sigismund gave the Earl his sword and sent the heart of St. George to the king of England.

[61] Will of Henry VII, p. 34.

the roundel. Torrigiano's St. George, of heroic muscular stature, and wearing an embossed breast-plate, recalls one of Mantegna's classically armoured soldiers. The figure of St. George on the tomb is quite unlike the figure in the niche at the south end of the west side of the bronze gate of Henry VII's chantry. This chantry statue is closer to the helmed and plumed knight of contemporary Franco-Flemish imagery.[62] Torrigiano chose a classical Roman warrior type for his model, again showing the influence of Verrocchio (fig. 41). A dragon rather than a serpent was also Torrigiano's choice. St. George was associated with the Order of the Garter, whose buckle surrounds the arms of the King. The Garter was the English equivalent of contemporary European chivalric orders, like the Order of the Golden Fleece, and was enjoying a revival at this time. St. George, as depicted in the twelfth bay of the chapel, wears full armour, his visor raised as he slays the dragon under his feet with his sword.

St. Anthony.

St. George's companion, St. Anthony, was a less immediately obvious choice for the King. Certain of his attributes could explain his popularity: he was invoked as a safeguard against fire, especially that of hell; he was also a protector against skin ailments and contagious diseases, including the plague and syphilis. Henry VII was the victim of frequent illnesses in later life. The solitary life of St. Anthony in the desert, from the

---

[62] See, for example, the woodcut of St. George, by Richard Pynson. (fig. 40).

age of twenty, when he left Alexandria and succeeded in resisting the the repeated fantastic temptations and torments of the Devil, may account for his importance as the champion of those tormented by the horrid imaginings of death and damnation. The seventeen years of exile Henry VII spent before winning his throne may have caused him to reflect on his affinities with this particular saint. As the patron saint of butchers and, conversely, of pigs and swineherds, after he cured a pig of blindness and it became his faithful companion, St. Anthony was usually depicted as an ancient anchorite, and his followers, the Antonites, were allowed to let their pigs roam free in cities, searching for food.[63] The figure of St. Anthony in the second bay of the north side of the chapel carries a bell, unlike Torrigiano's saint, and wears a hat, whilst his beads hang at his right side. A gaunt pig stands on his left.

St. Edward the Confessor.

By the shoulder of the Queen is St. Edward, the Confessor King of England, the most revered English royal saint and the founder of the Abbey (fig. 42). The shrine of St. Edward at Westminster was comparable in importance and antiquity to that of St. Louis at the Sainte Chapelle for the Kings of France. In his will, Henry emphasized the importance of Westminster Abbey as the great ceremonial church and mausoleum of the English Kings, where, '...among the same kings, resteth the holie bodie and reliques of

[63] See J. Seznac, 'The Temptation of St. Anthony in Art', Magazine of Art, vol. XL, March 1947, pp. 270-72.

the glorious King and Confessour sainct Edward'. Henry VII also shared a similar background with the Confessor: both Kings were forced to live in exile in France before their accession.[64] Henry might even have visited the chapel dedicated to St. Edward at Fécamp, in Normandy, where a rare French depiction of the English saint, in stained glass, existed. The chapel was rebuilt by Antoine de la Haye and Antoine Bohier, reusing the medieval stained glass.[65]

Henry III had substantially re-embellished the shrine of the saint and encouraged the cult of his worship, whilst in France the veneration of St. Louis had reached its peak in the late thirteenth century.[66] In his turn, Henry VII appears to have fulfilled his kingly duties very conspicuously with regard to his veneration of national and royal saints, first with new tokens of respect for St. Edward, and more innovatively, through the proposed canonization of the 'martyred' Henry VI, slain by the

---

[64] St. Edward lived in exile in Normandy until 1041, after his mother, Queen Emma, wife of Ethelred the Unready, fled to France in 1016. See P. Hunter Blair, An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England, Cambridge, 1950, p. 100. Henry Tudor experienced exile in Brittany before his accession in 1485.

[65] M. Harrison, 'A Life of St. Edward in early fourteenth-Century stained Glass at Fécamp in Normandy', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXVI, 1963, pp. 22-37.

[66] L.E. Tanner, 'Some Representations of St. Edward the Confessor in Westminster Abbey and elsewhere', Journal of the British Archaeological Institute, 3rd series, vol. XV, 1952, pp. 1-12, discusses the cult of the saint under Henry III of England. Tanner points out that when Edward was canonized in 1161 'neither the Emperor nor the French King had a saint in the family'. See also L.E. Tanner and J. G. O'Neilly, 'The Shrine of St. Edward the Confessor', Archaeologia, vol. C, 1966, pp. 129-54.

Yorkist enemies of Henry Tudor.[67] Not only was St. Edward to appear in a tabernacle at the side of the tomb of Henry VII, but also, in Henry's will, he stated:

> Also we wol, that our Executours, yf it be nat doon by our selfe in our life, cause to be made an Ymage of a king, representing our owen persone, the same Ymage to be of tymber, covered and wrought accordingly with plate of fyne golde in maner of an armed man, and upon the same armour a coote of our arms of England and France enameled, with a sword and spurres accordingly; and the same Ymage to kneel upon a table of silver and gilte, and holding betwixt his hands the crowne whiche it pleased God to geve us, with the victorie of our Ennemye at our furste felde: the which Ymage and Crowne, we geve and bequethe to Almighty God, our blessed Lady St. Mary and St. Edward King and Confessour, the same Ymage and Crowne in fourme afore rehersed, we would be set upon and in the mydds of the creste of the shryne of St. Edward kinge, in such place as by us in our life, or by our Executours after our deceasse, shall be thought most convenient and Honourable. And we would that our said Ymage be above the kne of the hight of thre fote, soo that the hede and half the brest of our said Ymage, may chiefly appere above and over the saide crowne, and that upon booth sides of the saide table, be a convenient brode border, and in the same be graven and written with large letters...and enamelled theise words. REX HENRICUS SEPTIMUS.[68]

This perfect symbol of the restoration of the English Crown to its legitimate lineage by the heroic founder of the new Tudor dynasty was envisaged by Henry VII. Continuity and legitimacy were stressed in the monarchical display and propaganda of the Tudors, who were very sensitive about their seizure of the Crown by force of arms. In his will Henry reiterated his claim through

---

[67] See W. H. St. John Hope, Windsor Castle, vol. II, pp. 478-79 on the protracted efforts to obtain the canonization of Henry VI.

[68] See J. Wall, The Shrines of the British Saints, London, 1905, pp. 181-90.

blood to the throne.[69] The power of family saints bolstered the dynastic hopes of the relatively new royal house.

Of all the twelve figures in relief, none seems to have been more strongly influenced by the bronze figures on the 1509 enclosure of the chantry than that of the Confessor (fig. 43). Both are depicted as majestic elderly kings each in a voluminous robe swelling out at hip-level from a high-waisted bodice and heavily swathed in a cloak. The distinctive crown is repeated in Torrigiano's figure, as is the heavy waved full beard and the tasselled cord hanging from the King's neck. It is perfectly understandable that the Florentine artist felt compelled to seek out an accessible model for such an unfamiliar saint, who only appears in an English or French context. The artist's choice of a model of Flemish origin recalls more directly than in his other English sculpture the monumentality of the work of Claus Sluter. The Confessor King recalls the 'Moses' by Sluter, at Dijon.

St. Vincent.

Following the sequence of the will, St. Vincent (fig. 42) follows St. Edward. St. Vincent was, with St. Christopher, one of Henry's own patron saints.[70] He was the great Spanish Dominican

---

[69] In the will Henry VII, referred to his, '...noble progenitours and blood and sp'cially the body of our graunt Dame of right noble memorie Quene Kateryne, wif to King Henry the Vth., and daughter to King Charles of Ffraunce; and that, we by the grace of God, p'pose right shortly to translate into the same, the bodie and reliques of our Uncle of blissed memorie King Henry VI...we wol that our bodie be buried within the same monastery'.

preacher, a new Evangelist, who was canonized by Pope Calixtus III in 1455. St. Vincent had conducted a celebrated preaching crusade throughout Europe in the fifteenth century, being invited to England by Henry IV to preach on his favourite themes: sin, death, the Last Judgement and Hell. He had 'filled the most insensible with terror', as he reminded the courts of Europe of the perils of worldly greatness.[71] Some artists had depicted the saint with wings to indicate his fervour and his inspirational powers. At his death, Jeanne of France, Duchess of Brittany, washed the body of the saint. Torrigiano's St. Vincent carries a Bible, as does the statue of the saint in the fourth bay of the north aisle of the chapel but, unlike the other statuettes (there is a second one in the central niche of the east side over the site of the altar in the north chapel), Torrigiano's version does not hold three vessels in the left hand.

St. Anne.

The figure of St. Anne is particularly important for a consideration of Torrigiano's sculptural style (fig. 44). The tranquil reading saint bears a close resemblance to the effigy of the King's mother, the Lady Margaret. Her robes, especially the headdress and the wimple (fig. 45) are identical to those of the Beaufort effigy. The book she carries is a reminder that the

---

[70] J. Stanley, Memorials of Westminster Abbey, London, 1869, p. 102.

[71] A.B. Jameson, Legends of the Monastic Orders, London, 1890, p. 401.

mother of the Virgin was traditionally revered as her teacher, and she had acquired the reputation of being a patroness of scholarship, learning and the arts.[72] Although the reference to the King's mother is thus implied, St. Anne also honours the dead Queen, who died during childbirth, in her role as patroness of the family. Torrigiano did not follow the type of St. Anne depicted in the fifth bay of the chapel: this figure is accompanied by the Virgin as a girl standing by her mother's left knee, learning to read.

St. Christopher.

St. Anne appears to be unaware of the presence of St. Christopher (figs. 44 & 46). Though omitted from the King's list of 'avouries', the saint was one of Henry's favourites, and an image of this important saint appeared in almost every English church, usually opposite the main entrance, often on the north wall, in order that it might be glimpsed easily through the door. This practice had its origins in the popular belief that if the believer saw the face of St. Christopher, he would not die that day. St. Christopher had already acquired talismanic associations by the early medieval period. According to the Golden Legend, the saint was a giant, twelve cubits at least in height, who sought to serve the most powerful master, at first the Devil and finally

---

[72] The Lady Margaret was the foundress of St. John's College, Cambridge. She was also the patroness of scholars and artists, including the printer, Wynkyn de Worde. The Lady Margaret had even translated into French The Mirror of the Simple Souls and the fourth book of the Imitatio Christi (printed in 1503). See E.E. Reynolds, St. John Fisher, London, 1955, p. 12.

the mysteriously weighty Christ Child. Only the curved contrapposto of St. Christopher suggests that his full height is obscured by his pose. The Saint personifies the principal of salvation through service and kingly humility. The association of St. Christopher with the healing of sickness and sores could also refer to the thaumatergic powers of the King, and the intention of Henry VII to encourage the veneration of his own tomb as a shrine, after the manner of the Confessor's.[73]

St. Barbara.

The last two female saints, contrasted by their hairstyles, are instantly recognizable (fig. 47). St. Barbara with her tower, a symbol of her disobedience to her heathen father over the doctrine of the Trinity, has her hair caught up in a scarf-like headdress. This type of hairstyle is more frequently encountered in the work of Italian artists, for example, the Madonnas of Fra Filippo Lippi, than in the depiction of the Saint by Flemish artists. To have repeated the long flowing tresses of the youthful Virgin in Jan van Eyck's famous sketch of St. Barbara would have caused a repetition of the Magdalen's loose-flowing hair, in this instance, the symbol of her wantonness.[74] The classically robed saint again recalls the type Andrea Sansovino used for the depiction of certain female saints in several of his Roman monuments, for example, in the Sforza and Basso monuments

[73] K.V. Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic, New York, 1971, pp. 177-78; 192-93, on the 'royal touch'.

[74] E.Panofsky, E.N.P, plate 125.

in Santa Maria del Popolo.[75] As a patroness of architects and builders, St. Barbara suggests a tribute to the claim of Henry VII to be a patron of architecture, particularly his chapel at Westminster and the work at Windsor. St. Barbara was also revered as a protectress against lightning and sudden death without benefit of the sacraments. Another patroness of scholars, she was also the champion of the oppressed in the face of pagan persecution, and the protectress of prisoners. The horribly tortured saint was also known as one of the fourteen holy helpers of the dying.[76] Many Confraternities of the Good Death were dedicated to St. Barbara in the fifteenth century, for instance, that of Laval in 1493. The figure of St. Barbara in the ninth bay of the chapel holds a tower but a book also. This figure also differs in having long hair bound only by a jewelled wreath, and bears little resemblance to the type created by Torrigiano.

St. Mary Magdalen.

The Magdalen's long waving hair contrasts with that of her companion (fig. 47). To reinforce her identity, she carries a jar of ointment and a book, unlike the chapel statuette of the Magdalen, who carries only the cylindrical jar. The Magdalen was,

---

[75] See J. Pope-Hennessy, I.R.S., vol. III, figs. 57 & 58.

[76] Her prayer included: 'Dieu pitoiable, supplie votre bonté infinite, par les mérites de sainte Barbe, qu'il vous palise nous donner grâce et qu'à l'heure du tré pas, par vraie pénitence et entière confession, nous recevrions l'extrême onction qui purge nos péchés, en sorte que sans délai nous soions introduits dans votre gloire.' See H. Laurens, St. Barbare (L'art et les saints), Paris, 1926, p. 14, at the head of the Book of Offices.

of course, the supreme representative of sinful humanity, who was saved through true contrition and accepted into the realm of the saints. Both saints are depicted in classical robes.

St. John the Baptist.

The figure of the Baptist as portrayed by Torrigiano is remarkable chiefly for the way in which the artist has presented the saint in an unusually elegant version of his traditional costume (fig. 48). The rough fur jerkin has been laid aside and the tunic is short, but fringed and not ragged. St. John has been given a courtly appearance for his depiction on the tomb of the English monarchs. The same aristocratic type of Baptist occurs in Andrea Ferrucci's altarpiece (fig. 49) from S. Girolamo, Fiesole (now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London). The motif of the lamb on the book is found in the figure in the niche in the fourth bay of the north aisle of the chapel. The statuette is positioned on the same side of the chapel as the tomb figure.

St. John the Evangelist.

The Evangelist is shown as the youthful saint (fig. 48) who traditionally accompanied the Virgin at the Deposition of the Cross. This is probably to emphasize the association of the saint with the comfort of the bereaved. The type Torrigiano referred to for this relief recalls many Flemish fifteenth-century depictions of the saint.[77] The figure in the bronze enclosure of the chapel

[77] For example, see Rogier van der Weyden, The Entombment (Uffizi, Florence). E. Panofsky, E.N.P, fig. 193.

bears some resemblance to Torrigiano's Evangelist: both are youthful, long-haired, and swathed in voluminous robes, but the enclosure figure carries the chalice (fig. 50). Of the two other statuettes of St. John in the niches of the chapel, one carries a chalice containing a dragon, but the other clasps a closed book marked by the eagle symbol. The classical draperies of this saint again recall the draperies typical of Sansovino, for example, in the St. Matthew from the Altar of the Sacrament, S. Spirito, Florence (fig. 51).

A Lost Tomb Influenced by the Work of Pietro Torrigiano

There are references to a tomb of a prominent courtier of both Henry VII and Henry VIII, Sir Thomas Lovell, which suggest that its design may have been influenced by the work of Torrigiano. The tomb of Sir Thomas Lovell is far earlier than the tombs influenced by Torrigiano's work in Westminster Abbey considered in chapter V, so it is included in this section for its chronological proximity to the date of the execution of the royal tombs by Torrigiano.

Sir Thomas Lovell.

An influential member of the Privy Council of Henry VIII, and a former courtier of Henry VII, Sir Thomas Lovell died on 25 May 1524 and was buried in a private chapel he had founded in 1513 in the nunnery of Halliwell in Shoreditch, Middlesex. We know from his will, dated 14 October 1522, that he had intended to be

buried there.[78] An elaborate record of the Lovell funeral is preserved in the Heralds College:

> The masse fynyshed, the abbot, with them of the quyer, came and buried the body in the chapell under the tombe of whyte marble, wich both hit and the chapell were founded by hym, and it stondethe on the southe syde of the quyre of the said church...[79]

Thus by 1524 the tomb of Sir Thomas Lovell had definitely been completed. Moreover, Sir Thomas's will implied that the tomb had been finished by 1522.

Sir Thomas commissioned a bronze roundel portrait bust of himself (fig. 52) from Pietro Torrigiano.[80] Originally, this had been set in the wall of the gatehouse of his residence, East Harling Manor in Norfolk.[81] The roundel must have been executed by Torrigiano before his departure for Spain in 1522. The bust, in a carved wooden roundel, is now in Westminster Abbey.

As one of the councillors of Henry VIII, and as an executor of the wills of both the Lady Margaret Beaufort and Henry VII, Sir Thomas must have been in frequent contact with the Florentine sculptor.

---

[78] '...his body to be buried within the monastery of nonnes called Hallywell, besides London, in a litell chapell which was by me, the said Sir Thomas Lovell, caused to be made...'. P.C.C. Jankyn 27, 10 December 1522, 24 Fettyplace.

[79] Heralds College MS Funerals, I. ii. p. 82.

[80] T.A. Cook, 'The Bronze Medallion in Henry VII's Chapel', Monthly Review, August 1903, pp. 89-91.

[81] D.N.B., vol. XII, p. 175-76.

It is not unlikely that Sir Thomas may have planned to have Torrigiano make his tomb, considering the previous commission for the roundel; the date of Sir Thomas's death; and the fact that the tomb was of white marble. Since the tomb was destroyed, and no contract for it exists, it is impossible to make any further hypotheses on the artist responsible for the tomb.

II. INTERMEDIARIES

In the sixteenth century merchants and clerics were some of the most mobile members of European society. Their occupations brought them indirectly into contact with artists at the courts of Europe. These incidental connections are worth investigating in the period during which Pietro Torrigiano and other Italian artists were working in England. The role of merchants in England and their dealings with artists and patrons during the Renaissance has been the subject of a very limited amount of study.[1] More attention has been directed to an investigation of the traditional functions of foreign merchants in English society: their regular trading activities, chiefly in the wool trade in the medieval period; their crucial services as bankers and exchangers of currency; and their related involvement as collectors of Papal revenues. To a lesser extent we have been made aware by scholars of the increased reliance of the Tudors on the services of these foreign merchants for raising credit for

[1] L. Einstein, The Italian Renaissance in England, ch. 6, pp. 229-85; A. Ruddock, Southampton Merchants and Shipping, 1270-1600, Southampton, 1951; W. Cunningham, Alien Immigrants to England, London 1891, pp. 135-89.

the Crown, either for interest or for commercial privileges or in return for offices; for their usefulness as royal emissaries or agents at Rome and the diplomatic centres of Europe; and as informal newscollectors for the King.[2]

Far less research has been devoted to one of the subsidiary roles of the Italian merchant in the sixteenth century at the court of England: the merchant as financial guarantor in contracts for works of art; and as economic and social mediator between Italian artists, suppliers of material abroad, and English patrons, for which there is substantial documentary evidence. This chapter focuses on Italian merchants in particular, because of their direct involvement with the sculptural projects for the royal tombs. The most prominent of these merchants are discussed individually, with reference to their connection with the contracts for the royal tomb projects and the artists who executed them. The role of the Hanseatic merchants has not been considered in depth, since they were not directly involved with the royal tomb projects, though there is a

[2] For the earlier medieval period more published research exists. See E.A. Bond, 'Extracts from the Liberate Rolls, relative to the Loans supplied by Italian Merchants to the Kings of England in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', Archaeologia, vol. XXVIII, pp. 207-326; R.J. Whitwell, 'Italian Bankers and the English Crown', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, n.s., vol. XVII, 1903; A. Bearwood, 'Alien Merchants and the English Crown in the later Fourteenth Century', Economic History Review, vol. II, 1929-30. For the wool trade see E.E. Power, The Wool Trade in English Medieval History, Ford Lectures, Oxford 1941. See also W. Page, ed., Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England 1509 -1603, Proceedings of the Huguenot Society, London, 1893, pp. 23-25, on the importance of foreign merchants in England in the fourteenth century.

brief note on the connection of foreign merchants with Hans Holbein, and with displays of civic pageantry, a topic worthy of independent investigation.

From the very beginning of his reign, Henry VIII made enthusiastic gestures to bring England out of what he obviously regarded as a state of provincial medieval obscurity, in order to elevate national prestige as a European power. This he attempted to do both by encouraging European political and economic involvement (dynastic marriages; political alliances and trade treaties) and by revitalizing the new monarchy's means of display. With regard to trade, a royal proclamation was issued in 1509:

> ...that all manner of merchants, denizen and strange, clothiers and artificers and folks of all manner of mysteries and occupations, crafts and merchandises, freely, quietly and peaceably and without fear of forfeit...

should be welcome to work in England. It seemed like a royal invitation to foreign craftsmen to enter England. Henry did not, however, remain constant in his generous welcome to foreigners, and this change will be discussed in a later chapter.

One of the consequences of this increased striving for European involvement was intermittent foreign warfare throughout the whole of Henry's reign. It remained one of his chief legacies to his successors. As early as 1512, war with France had a drastic and adverse effect on Channel trade and traffic.[3]

---

[3] A. Ruddock, op. cit., p. 226.

Sebastiano Giustiniani, the Venetian ambassador at the court of Henry VIII, wrote in his dispatches in 1519 of the particular use the King had for the most important Italian merchants at court:

> The King was always a heavy creditor of the Florentine merchants to whom he lends money in order that they may extend their trade; and they sometimes owe as much as 300,000 ducats, by which means his majesty benefits his favourites in the following manner. He empowers them to collect his credit, and they compromise with the debtors, who allow a certain amount of interest until they have the means of repaying the King; by which method these traders obtain funds at a fair rate, and the King is enabled to benefit his servants without any loss of capital.[4]

Cavallary

One such favourite selected by Henry VIII to supervise his Italian debtors and creditors was Anthony Cavallary. Naturalized in 1509, Cavallary became a burgess of Southampton in 1516.[5] Cavallary acted a middleman for an indenture of January 1519 for the gathering of financial resources from his fellow countrymen, whilst John Myclo and Cardinal Wolsey acted for the King.[6] Cavallary also stood surety for the important contract of January 1518 for the tomb of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon, which will be examined further. Anthony Cavallary was one of the

---

[4] S. Giustiniani, Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII, June 12 1515 to July 26 1519, ed. H. Rawdon Brown, London, 1854, Appendix II, p. 317.

[5] A. Ruddock, op. cit., p. 183; See also M. Pavan et al., eds., Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani, Rome, 1972, vol. XV, p. 295.

[6] L&P vol. II, January 1519, no. 54.

Italians who became fully integrated into the English community. It seems likely that his wife Elyn was English, and it is certain that his family intermarried with English stock.[7] Apart from his involvement with the King, Cavallary was also employed by Cardinal Wolsey, in the work on Wolsey's college, and his tomb.[8] From a letter written by the chief sculptor at work on Wolsey's tomb, Benedetto da Rovezzano, we learn that Anthony Cavallary mediated between the Florentine artist and the patron.[9] The importance of the role of Cavallary is emphasized in another communication from Benedetto to Thomas Cromwell, on the occasion of Cavallary's death in June 1528. In this letter the artist expressed his anxieties over the future of the tomb project and of his own security, now that Cavallary was dead and the fate of the Cardinal appeared to be increasingly gloomy.[10] Cavallary emerges from these documents as a character whom visiting artists trusted and relied on in their dealings with English patrons. It is not clear who, if anyone, replaced him. The Treasurer, Cromwell, certainly did not develop the same type of emotional bond with expatriate artists. The pyramid of dependence and

---

[7] One of his daughters was contracted to marry William, the heir of George Rygby. L&P vol. III, 1521-23, no. 1940. William Rygby leased possessions in Barking, Essex while his mother lived with her second husband, Bartholomew Prowse, at 'Ylfford', Essex.

[8] L&P vol. IV, 1528, no. 5117. A reference occurs to 'Anthony Cavalarye' collecting revenues of £30 from a monastery connected with Wolsey's college.

[9] See A. Higgins, op. cit., Appendix III, reprinted from L&P vol. IV, pt. 3, no. 5743, Master MS. f. 251.

[10] L&P vol. IV, pt. 3, 1528, no. 5743.

patronage was further defined by a letter from Elyn Cavallary, Anthony's widow, to Thomas Cromwell, soon after her husband's decease. Sensing the imminent elevation of Cromwell as the Cardinal's power plummeted, she thanked him for his letter and the kindness he had showed her, and:

> ...begged for his continuance, for she had never so much need. Tonight a servant of my Lord's Grace and a servant of the King came to sequester such poor goods as her husband left.[11]

Buonvisi

Also mentioned in the correspondence of Benedetto da Rovezzano and Thomas Cromwell is Antonio Buonvisi, a merchant of Lucca residing in England.[12] Buonvisi was possibly the most important and influential member of the Italian mercantile community at the time. He was the esteemed friend of Sir Thomas More, Cardinal Reginald Pole, Bishop John Fisher and John Starkey.[13] Born in 1487, he joined the London branch of his family business in 1505, after some experience in Rome.[14]

---

[11] L&P vol. IV, no. 5120.

[12] Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani, vol. XV, pp. 295-99.

[13] L. Einstein, op. cit., p. 43.

[14] B. Corrigan, 'Sir Thomas More: Personage and Symbol', in D.B.J. Randall and G.W. Williams, eds., Studies in the Continental Background of Renaissance English Literature: Essays presented to John L. Lievsay, Durham, North Carolina, 1977.

Antonio Buonvisi's social and business connections with certain executors of the will of the Lady Margaret Beaufort, and with his fellow Italians in England, such as the Frescobaldi, might explain the introduction of Pietro Torrigiano to the project for the tomb of the King's mother. Considering Buonvisi's wide circle of powerful friends at court, it is not unlikely that his prestige, if not his capital, supported the lesser Lucchese merchants, Anthony Cavallary and the Morovelli, whose names also appeared in the contracts for the tombs executed by Pietro Torrigiano and his assistants.

Buonvisi finally left England for Louvain in 1548. The death of Henry VIII brought new insecurity into the lives of even well established and privileged Catholic traders, threatened by the new aggressive Protestantism of Edward VI's government. That Antonio Buonvisi was too deeply involved with his faith to survive the change-over pragmatically was proved by his continued aid and financial support for English and Flemish religious exiles in the Low Countries. He repeatedly provided funds for their safe passage to Rome, and had even, on occasion, arranged hospitality for them at his palace in Lucca.[15] His will, dated 1555, suggested that he had not given up hope of a lasting restoration of Catholicism in England, and his return to that country, for he had made provision for his burial either in Lucca, Louvain or London. He was actually buried in the Franciscan convent in Louvain, after his death on 5 December

---

[15] Ibid., p. 99.

1558. A seventeenth-century tribute to his devotion to the English Catholic cause was his portrayal as the co-hero, with Bishop Fisher, of an opera scenica devised by a fellow Lucchese, Jacopo Rossi. Buonvisi was hailed as the active Catholic layman in partnership with the spiritual martyred Fisher.[16] There is, unfortunately, no further documentary evidence linking Antonio Buonvisi with the project for Henry VIII's tomb.

Frescobaldi

The name of the merchants Frescobaldi (anglicized form, 'Fristobald') occurs frequently in records of the period, and features prominently in the contract for the first tomb Torrigiano created in England, that of the Lady Margaret Beaufort. 'Petir and Leonard Fristobald' stood surety for £500 for the contract.[17]

Repeated references to different members of the Frescobaldi family in Europe reveal the existence of a strong European network of communication and influence that the great mercantile houses created. The Frescobaldi were one of several families that co-operated closely with the Tudor government. As well as a long-standing business relationship with the English Crown, representatives of the family were on particularly good terms with the King's minister, Thomas Cromwell.[18]

---

[16] Ibid., p. 100.

[17] Contract reprinted in R.F. Scott, op. cit., pp. 365-72.

In September 1512 'Jerome Francis, of Florence, Louis de la Fava of Bologna, and Charles Hugohony, of Florence, merchants' were granted safe conduct and protection for trading in England for ten years.[19] This was a formality that all foreign merchants trading regularly in England went through periodically, and it does not imply that 1512 was the date of the first entry of these merchants in England. However, it may be significant that Pietro Torrigiano entered England around this date, and that he might well have been introduced by a prominent member of the Italian trading community, as Vasari had suggested in his 'Life' of the artist. He suggested that merchants helped Torrigiano to find English patrons and commissions for 'operette di marmo e di bronzo in figure piccole...' and added that the artist was:

> ...dai suddetti mercanti condotto in Inghilterra, dove lavoro in servigio di qual re infinite cose di marmo, di bronze e di legno a concorrenza d'alcuni maestri di quel paese.[20]

Both Pietro Torrigiano and the Frescobaldi were involved with the Beaufort contract of 1511. The Frescobaldi retained a factor in Bruges, where the tomb of Mary of Burgundy was situated. Striking similarities between the Burgundian tomb and that of the Lady Margaret have been discussed in the previous chapter. A period of exposure to Burgundian art has been postulated for Pietro by previous writers, and it seems likely that the artist would have

---

[18] L. Einstein, op. cit., p. 264, refers to the contacts between the Frescobaldi and Thomas Cromwell.

[19] L&P vol. II, pt. 2, Jan. 1519, no. 2794.

[20] G. Vasari, Le vite..., vol. IV, pp. 260-61.

passed through Bruges on his way to England along the normal trade-route. Pietro may have received letters of introduction from the Florentine members of the Frescobaldi to their representatives in Bruges and London. The route to England through Milan, Geneva and Bruges was recommended by Cosimo de'Medici and Giovanni Benci to their London agent, as being that most suitable for travellers of the time.[21]

Another pertinent reference to the Frescobaldi and Giovanni Cavalcanti occurred in July 1516, when the two merchants took £2000 'beyond the sea'.[22] Some of this could have been the money for the 1516 altar that Pietro Torrigiano had recently contracted to produce for Henry VII's chapel. The artist required Italian materials, which the money would have procured. An interesting post-script to this incident occurs in a letter written by the consul of the Florentine nation in London, Rinaldo de Ricasoli, to the Signoria of Florence in 1518, requesting that Pietro Torrigiano should get none of the money deposited by the King for the altar, since the artist had left England without his Majesty's permission and under dishonorable circumstances.[23] The chain of communication could be surprisingly quick and effective. Members of the great trading houses remaining in Italy acted as entrepreneurs of materials for artistic commissions, as well as providing introductions for artists themselves.

---

[21] L. Einstein, op. cit., pp. 255-56.

[22] L&P vol. III, no. 1472.

[23] G. Vasari, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 262 note.

Cavalcanti

The name of John Cavalcanti also appeared in contracts connected with the works of Pietro Torrigiano.[24] Like the Frescobaldi, Cavalcanti was granted safe conduct and protection to carry out trade in England for ten years from 1512.[25] Cavalcanti's bond for the Beaufort tomb was £500.[26] The name of 'John Canalcanty' occurs twice in the 1518 tomb contract, linked with 'othir fflorentyne merchaunts'. He was probably one of 'certyn merchaunts fflorentyne' who provided the £1500 surety for the 1512 tomb contract. A note about the supervision of an indenture in 1519, payable by Michaelmas 1524 by A. Cavallary, J. Capra, P. and F. de Bardi, and A. and J. Cavalcanti possibly refers to the money for the 1518 tomb contract.[27] Cavalcanti prospered under Henry VIII, and by April 1522 'J. Cavalcanti', having acquired the office of Gentleman-Usher of the Chamber, was granted a license to import luxury items, 'cloths of gold, silver and damask, gold cloth of "tynsyn saten", with gold, and other cloths wrought with gold'.[28] Henry VIII granted letters of recommendation to the Pope and to others for Giovanni Cavalcanti in return for his services and loyalty. This was another means by

---

[24] Contract reprinted in J. Britton, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 23-25.

[25] L&P vol. II, 1512, no. 1462.

[26] R.F. Scott, op. cit., p. 368.

[27] L&P vol. II, 1519, no. 54.

[28] Ibid., vol. III, pt. 2, 1522, no. 2214.

which Henry rewarded his Italian servants. The Cavalcanti and the Giraldi were also Duke Cosimo de'Medici's London correspondents during the period when Antonio Giudotti negotiated a loan from the Duke. This is a further connection between Pietro Torrigiano, Italian merchants in England and the career of Pietro Torrigiano in Italy.[29]

Morovelli

Other merchants mentioned in the contracts were of Lucchese origin: 'Benedyck Morovelli, m'chaunt of Luka and John Campna and John Baptist Morovellj...ben holde and bound unto the fore said lords and executors [of Henry VII's will] and the said Abbot in M:M marc sterling to be paid after the ffeast of Pentecost...'.[30] This was, in fact, for the altar of Henry VII's chapel.

Bardi

The 1518 royal tomb contract was supervised on the Italian side by 'the foresaid Anthony', presumably Anthony Cavallary, for £2000, 'wheryn certyn merchaunts fflorentynes heraftir named byn hold and bound unto dyvse p'sones councellos of our said Sovraign

[29] G. Vasari, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 256, '...Torrigiano scultore fiorentino, il quale nella sua giovanezza fu da Lorenzo vecchio de'Medici tenuto nel giardino che in sulla piazza di San Marco di Firenze aveva quel magnifico cittadino in guisa d'antiche e buone sculture ripieno che la loggia, i viali e tutte le stanze erano adorne di buone figure antiche di marmo e di pitture, ed altre così fatte cose, di mano de' migliori maestri che mai fussero stati in Italia e fuori'.

[30] J. Britton, op. cit., p. 25.

lord Kyng Henry the viijth'.[31] The first two obligations were for £600, payable within two years at six-monthly intervals. 'John Fraunceis and Reyner de Bard' were responsible for these sureties. John Fraunceis was a merchant of Genoa, according to a denization record of March 1519. Italians of other cities tended to be included in English contracts under the heading of 'othir m'chaunts fflorentyne'. The Bardi were one of the most powerful merchant families in Florence and had been doing business with the English Crown for centuries.[32] As recently as 1465 a new company was formed in Florence to do business with England. Most of the capital was provided by Piero de'Medici and Tommaso Portinari, Gherardo Canigiani and Giovanni de Bardi being appointed as chief representatives in London.[33] In 1522, when a valuation of the goods of the inhabitants of London was made, Philip de Bardi was residing in All Hallows, Barking.[34]

Other Italian Merchants

The role played by Italian merchants at the English court in this period was very complex. Their financial and linguistic skills made them almost indispensable for both artists and patrons. Both parties trusted them. Italian merchants in London maintained connections with Italian shipping agents in

---

[31] 1518 contract, p. 85.

[32] E.A. Bond, op. cit., p. 230.

[33] L. Einstein, op. cit., p. 256.

[34] L&P vol. III, Pt. 2, no. 2486.

Southampton, a long-established centre of Italian settlement.[35] In the sixteenth century one of the most important Italians in Southampton was Nicholas de Egra.[36] Through Southampton and along the Thames, marble for the most important sculptural projects at London and Windsor was transported. In Italy merchants were occasionally also owners of marble quarries. One example of this type of merchant was, coincidentally, Marchio Torrigiano, who may have been a relative of the sculptor Torrigiano.[37] No doubt their London counterparts made use of such convenient connections. From the example of Anthony Cavallary in England, it appears that Italian merchants may have acted as the mentors of Italian artists away from Italy. Italian merchants in Southampton and London may also have been responsible for encouraging the migration of relatives and employees who were lesser artists and

---

[35] In 1453 an Italian, Gabriel Corbet, had been elected Sheriff of Southampton. See A. Ruddock, op. cit., pp. 160-61.

[36] Niccolo de Marini de Egra handled goods for Francesco de Bardi in 1515 and described himself as 'servant and attorney' of Martino Buonvisi of Lucca. He also dealt with the goods of Agostino Pinelli, Andrea Capello and other Italian merchants. With Maurizio Marini of London and the Florentines Antonio and Giovanni Battista Giudotti joint Anglo-Italian ventures from Southampton were made. A. Ruddock, op. cit., pp. 240-51,

[37] C. Klapisch-Zuber, Les Maîtres du Marbre Carrare, 1300-1600, Paris, 1969, p. 117, 'Marchiò (ou Malchion) Torrigiani, lui, est Florentin; homme de confiance des Médicis, marchand de mille négoces, il apporte longtemps à Carrare blé, cuirs, cochon salé, étoffes et, vers 1480, en enlève les marbres pour l'Oeuvre du Dôme de sa patrie. Il finit par se fixer à Carrare. Vers 1498, tandis que son fils poursuit ses affaires, lui-même se découvre une vocation tardive de marbrier. Il prend une carrière en location, engage - quand même! - un ouvrier pour y travailler; s'il n'est pas inscrit a "l'Art du marbre", du moins reçoit-il les commandes de confrères; il en redistribue aussi à d'autres.' A note records that in June 1498 Torrigiani worked for G.P. Buffa and Andrea Cason,

craftsmen to England.

Foreign Merchants and English Pageants

From the work of Sydney Anglo on pageantry and display in the early Tudor period we know that foreign merchants played an active role, at times, in the organization of English ceremonial entries and royal celebrations. In 1522, for example, the Italian merchants were requested to contribute to the cost of celebrations for the entry of the Emperor Charles V to England. They responded by organizing their own pageant, on the theme of John of Gaunt, the dynastic link between Charles V and the English monarchy. The Hanseatic League also created their own pageant to honour the Emperor. For the coronation of Anne Boleyn in 1533 the Hanseatic merchants of the Steelyard financed the pageant of Parnassus, possibly designed by Hans Holbein.[38] Foreign merchants were now expected to make some contribution towards the City of London's entertainments, as compensation for the privileges allowed them.[39]

As late as 1553, the celebrations for the coronation of Mary Tudor included lavish displays by the foreign merchants, whose three pageants, 'wer the myghtest'.[40] The Genoese constructed a

---

business manangers at the Chartreuse of Pavia.

[38] S. Anglo, op. cit., p. 249.

[39] Ibid., p. 186.

[40] C.L. Kingsford, ed., Two London Chronicles, from the Collections of John Stow, (Camden Miscellany, xii, 1910), pp.

triumphal arch over a maiden at Fenchurch Street. The Hanseatic merchants created a mountain and provided a fountain of wine at Gracechurch. Another triumphal arch was the offering of the Florentines: this was the most elaborate and the most classically inspired of all the pageants.[41] These activities reveal that certain foreign merchants were actively involved in financing and directing artistic and cultural projects in England during the first half the sixteenth century, when they were allowed to do so.

Anti-Alien Feeling and Foreign Merchants

During the reign of Henry VIII, the attitude of the government towards foreign traders tended to fluctuate with the economic and political upheavals of the period.[42] For instance, war with France usually brought the issue of a royal proclamation ordering the majority of French workers out of the country, as potential spies, or merely as scapegoats. The existence of an itinerant worker was obviously more precarious than that of a merchant, who offered more valuable services, and who was often protected by a trade agreement, or of a prominent artist. The assistants of artists could be directly affected by such events, and the loss

29-30.

[41] Described in The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor..., translated and published by C.V. Malfatti, Barcelona, 1956, pp. 32, 115.

[42] An anti-alien riot in 1456 was followed by the temporary expulsion of Italian merchants from London. See W. Cunningham, op. cit., p.99.

of this support, coupled with a hostile working environment, made England a less comfortable place for the existence of foreign artists. The attitude of the English populace was very much as it is today: in times of economic hardship it vented its spleen on such obviously different or privileged individuals who were living well whilst English natives complained of hard times. Merchants were conspicuous for their affluence, and Giustiniani recorded a popular contemporary verse in his memoirs:

> Poor tradesmen had poor dealings then;/ And who but strangers bore the bell?/ Which was the grief of Englishmen,/ To see them here in London dwell.[43]

The growth of violent English xenophobia reached a peak in 1517. A bill was posted on the door of St. Paul's, a general meeting-place and public information centre, complaining of 'strangers who brought wools to the undoing of Englishmen'. In Easter 1517 John Lincoln, a broker of London, persuaded a canon of St. Mary's, Spittlegate, Dr. Beale, to preach against 'strangers' for:

> English merchants could have no utterance for merchant strangers brought in silks, cloth-of-gold, wine, iron, and such other merchandize that no man buyeth of an Englishman.[44]

The outcome of the riots against foreigners is well known. Beale led an angry mob of apprentices, the usual participants in riots in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, against the homes and property of French and Flemings in London. The houses of

---

[43] Calendar of State Papers Venetian, vol. II, p. 562.

[44] S. Giustiniani, op. cit., pp. 73-74.

Florentine, Lucchese and Genoese merchants were also the targets of the crowd's violence. Hall recounts how a Lombard merchant, 'Fraunces de Bardi' had incensed the English community by seducing the wife of an English merchant, and worse, had persuaded her to bring her husband's plate with her, afterwards insulting them both in public.[45] The mayor of London's men were ineffectual against the wrath of the English mob. Eventually Cardinal Wolsey, who was frequently reviled as a lover of foreigners, sent in troops to deal more harshly with what was now viewed as a rebellion. Over four hundred of the mob were arrested and sixty were hanged for their part in the riots.[46]

Not until Mary Tudor married King Philip of Spain in 1554 and attempted to restore the Church of Rome did anti-foreign feelings again become so violent amongst the English populace.[47]

---

[45] Op. cit., pp. 73-74: 'This mocke was muche noted, and for these and many other oppressions done by them, ther encreased suche a malice in the Englishe mennes hartes, that at the last it brast oute'. op. cit., pp. 73-74.

[46] M. Holmes, 'Evil May-Day, 1517: the Story of a Riot', History Today, vol. XV, no. 9, Sept. 1965, pp. 642-50.

[47] In January 1554, when the Spanish ambassadors, led by Count Egmont, rode through London, 'the boys pelted them with snowballes, so hatfull was the sight of ther coming in to theym', according to J.G. Nichols, ed., The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Queen Mary, Camden Society, London, 1850, p. 34. While attempting to foster strong Spanish and Papal relations, Mary was also conducting war with France and Scotland, and expelling French and Flemish Huguenots who had sought refuge in England during her brother's reign. This produced a hysterical outburst of anti-alien feelings amongst the populace.

The Departure of Pietro Torrigiano.

It is not surprising that Pietro Torrigiano did not choose to settle permanently in England. Once his reputation as a royal tomb-maker was established, Torrigiano looked to Spain for new commissions.[48] In 1522 Torrigiano may have joined the entourage of the Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain, Charles V, who was on his way back to Seville from the Netherlands, via England. Torrigiano had finished the altar for Henry VII's chapel and Henry VIII was less interested in his own projected tomb at this date. There were many rich ecclesiatical and noble patrons in Spain to engage skilled Italian artists who ventured there.

Italian merchants played an important part in the activities of Italian sculptors at work in England on the royal tombs in the first decades of the sixteenth century. They probably provided letters of introduction for artists to court; they acted as financial guarantors for contracts for major artistic commissions; they interpreted and negotiated contractual bonds between artists and patrons; they provided links between suppliers of sculptural materials and sculptors. It is likely that they played these roles for non-royal artistic commissions too. They also patronized foreign artists directly by commissions for pageants, and possibly through personal commissions for which there is no surviving evidence. In these ways, Italian merchants

---

[48] See J.H. Perera, op. cit., on the Italian sculptors already working in Spain. Domenico Fancelli was in Seville by 1510; Jacopo Florentino was in Granada in the 1520s.

in particular contributed indirectly to the development and support of foreign artists in England during the first half of the sixteenth century. The downfall of Cardinal Wolsey, who had been a major promoter and protector of Italian artists in England, led to the gradual erosion of the network of support between artists, merchants (like Cavallary) and patrons in England, and contributed to the inability of the Italian artists to establish a settled community in England in the latter half of the reign of Henry VIII that might have led to the founding of a serious Anglo-Italian school of artists in England.

III. TERRACOTTA

Between the late 1520s and 1530s, a group of tombs were constructed in England in a material previously unfamiliar to English sculptors and builders, terracotta. The tendency for antiquarians of the seventeenth century to label any surviving terracotta 'Italian' is not entirely incomprehensible. The Italian provenance of the most familiar early Tudor works in this material in England, such as the portrait busts by Pietro Torrigiano, or the panels in the altar of Henry VII's chapel in Westminster Abbey, and the decorative architectural work at Hampton Court, resulted in the word 'terracotta' becoming almost synonymous with 'Italian'. A more objective analysis of the nature of the obvious foreignness of the terracotta tombs in question is long overdue. By tradition, these tombs have been labelled 'Italian', or have been identified by a few bold souls, with little to support their hypothesis other than geographical proximity, as 'Flemish'.[1] Other art historians have devoted a few

---

[1] Those who suggest a Flemish origin for the tombs include A. Michel, L'Histoire de l'art, vol. V, p. 373, who refers to them as 'absolument hollandaises'; and A.P. Baggs, 'Sixteenth-Century Terra-Cotta Tombs in East Anglia', The Archaeological Journal, vol. CXXV, 1968, pp. 296-301.

pages to a discussion of the possible origins of these tombs.[2]

In order to investigate the nature and origins of these tombs more fully, this chapter will initially examine the funerary monuments and other relevant terracotta sculpture produced by the Italian artists working for the King and court circle prior to and during the period in which the East Anglian tombs were executed. The different styles and functions of this Italian terracotta will be compared to the East Anglian examples to ascertain whether the traditional hypothesis that Italians were responsible for the work at Layer Marney (and consequently at the other locations) can still be considered valid. The East Anglian monuments themselves will then be described and given a chronology by means of biographical evidence of the patrons and through any stylistic evolution that is discernible. The fragmentary biographical information, unfortunately, does not permit the firm dating of all of the tombs. Finally, in the absence of any documentary evidence to identify the sculptor responsible for these tombs, and dissatified with the 'traditional' attribution to Italians, the stylistic origins of the work are searched for in contemporary northern French and

---

[2] M. Whinney concludes that 'the leading craftsman was either a Frenchman or an Englishman who had worked with Italians in France', Sculpture in Britain, 1530-1830, Harmondsworth, 1966, p. 6; A. Blunt, 'L'Influence française sur l'architecture et la sculpture décorative en Angleterre pendant la première moitié du XVIe siècle', Revue de l'art, 4, 1969, pp. 17-29; D. Purcell, 'Sixteenth Century Terra-Cotta in East Anglia', Transactions of the Association for Studies in the Conservation of Historic Buildings, vol. I, Dec. 1973, p. 3, attributes them to 'Frenchmen or Englishmen who had worked with Italians on the Continent'.

English sculptural and architectural projects that appear to be related to the East Anglian terracotta monuments.

Anglo-European Relations in the 1520s

At the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520, Henry VIII seemed to flaunt his Italianate taste in the face of his rival, Francis I of France. A Venetian observer remarked of the English fantasy palace at Guisnes, that the recently deceased Leonardo da Vinci, 'non avria saputo fare si ben e con tanta ragione'.[3] Henry VIII was still an obedient and devoted servant of the Pope, having dedicated his theological treatise to the Pope in 1521.[4] When the Sack of Rome was the scandal of civilized Europe, and the Imperial forces had humiliated the Holy Father, Henry espoused the Italian cause with vigour. At the celebrations for the anti-Imperial alliance with France, to be sealed by the marriage of the Princess Mary to either Francis himself or to his second son, the Duke of Orléans, in May 1527, the court decorations were mainly the work of Italian artists brought over by Cardinal Wolsey for his own artistic projects. Vincent Vulpe, Ellys Camyan, Nicholas Florentyne and Domingo were all paid for their work of painting and gilding.[5] The antique heads made by Giovanni da Maiano to decorate a temporary Banqueting Hall were very

---

[3] S. Anglo, op. cit., p.141.

[4] J.J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII Berkeley, 1968, pp. 110-17.

[5] H. Colvin, History of the King's Works, London, 1982, vol. IV, pt. II, p. 102.

fashionable.[6] In July of the same year Italian artists were again prominent in records for the payments for decorative works for Cardinal Wolsey's impressive displays in honour of the French ambassadors visiting England for the ratification of the Treaty of Amiens. The outrages committed against the Pope and Italy by the Emperor's troops were regarded as barbarous by the English and French allies of the Pope. The zenith of the English court's love of things Italian was reached during these years.

The ambitions of Cardinal Wolsey for the Papacy necessitated his already close contacts with Italy. He became the protector of the Italian artists in England and, with his intermediary Anthony Cavallary, he provided the community of Italian exiles with substantial moral and often financial support, making their existence at the English court more comfortable.[7] At the same time, English artists were learning from their contacts with Italians working in England. At the Field of the Cloth of Gold the administrator of the displays and buildings was Sir Edmund Belnap, and the major artists working for him were Englishmen: John Browne, Richard Gibson, John Rastell and Clement Urmeston. All of these men had long careers as court artists.[8]

---

[6] At Greenwich. L&P, vol. IV, pt 2, 1527, p. 1394.

[7] See chapter II.

[8] See S. Anglo, op. cit., pp. 164-68; 261-65.

Terracotta Maquettes and Portrait Busts

Some of the first Italian terracotta sculptures made in England were the portrait busts by Pietro Torrigiano for Henry VIII and members of the court after 1511.[9] These naturalistic portrait busts, for example, that of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester (fig. 53), were sophisticated examples of the work of the Florentine artist. They were impressive and innovatory in the context of the English court. It is likely, however, that another Italian of proven excellence in the medium, Guido Mazzoni of Modena, had already introduced some examples of his work in terracotta to the King. Mazzoni's plan for the tomb of Henry VII would have been an innovative work depending on Mazzoni's earlier tomb of Charles VIII of France at St. Denis, though it still incorporated the traditional English royal effigy of gilded copper.[10] It is believed that the artist may have sent a terracotta maquette of the tomb to England.[11] The production of a model or a terracotta maquette, as well as drawings, to be presented to the patron, was a normal practice for large sculptural programmes, a very famous example being Verrocchio's terracotta model for the Forteguerri tomb. Michel Colombe made

---

[9] See C.R. Beard, 'Torrigiano or da Maiano?', The Connoisseur, vol. LXXXVI, 1929, pp. 77-86; H. Dow, 'Two Italian Portrait Busts of Henry VIII', The Art Bulletin, vol. XLII, 1960, pp. 291-94.

[10] On the Mazzoni project for the tomb of Henry VII see T.C. Verdon, op. cit., pp. 136-40. See also B. Hochstetler Meyer, op. cit., pp. 258-67.

[11] H. Dow, op. cit., p. 293.

'patrons en terre' for the tomb project for Margaret of Austria at Brou.[12] Apart from the terracotta model, Guido Mazzoni was probably responsible for the extremely realistic bust of a child, identified as the infant Henry VIII, now at Windsor Castle.[13]

The Tomb of Dr. John Yonge

The tomb of Dr. John Yonge in the Rolls Chapel of the Public Record Office, London, was the first example of the use of terracotta on a large scale in England.[14] The tomb included a terracotta effigy and lunette with a bust of the Redeemer flanked by two winged putto heads. This project allowed Torrigiano his freest expression of the Florentine Renaissance sculptural vocabulary in England (fig. 54).

Yonge must have been personally acquainted with the artist, since he was closely involved with the court, both as an ambassador for the King abroad, and as an executor of the wills of both the Lady Margaret Beaufort and Henry VII. The sculptor

---

[12] Margaret of Austria was to receive these 'patrons en terre', from Colombe in October 1511 for two hundred livres. Colombe agreed to make the models 'de sa propre manufaiture, sans ce que autre y touche...'. Quoted by P. Pradel, op. cit., p. 61. Document from M. Bruchet, Marguerite d'Austriche, Paris, 1927, document 51. The projects of both Guido Mazzoni and Michel Colombe were rejected in favour of the work of Conrad Meit.

[13] H. Dow, op. cit., pp. 291-92.

[14] On the tomb of John Yonge see A.H. Higgins, 'On the Work of the Florentine Sculptors in England', The Archaeological Journal, vol. LI, 1894, pp. 150-52; R. W. Carden, 'Italian Artists in England during the Sixteenth Century', Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries, vol. XXIV, 1911-12, p. 178.

and the Keeper of the Rolls may even have met at the court of Margaret of Burgundy in 1511.[15] This commission from Yonge's executors would have been attractive to the artist for the greater freedom of design and execution he was allowed in contrast with the royal commissions. From Dr. Yonge's will we learn that the tomb had not been made before his death on 25 April 1516:

> My body to be buried in the chapple of the Rolles, there as the organ now dothe stande. Item, I wille that a tumbe be made over the place of my sepulture.[16]

The overseer of the will was Archbishop Warham, to whom Yonge bequeathed a gold saltcellar. He also left a cup to Cardinal Wolsey.

The tomb obviously recalls the Italian humanist tomb of the late Quattrocento. Interestingly, in this tomb it is neither the decorative nor the architectural details that are executed in terracotta (unlike the terracotta tombs to be discussed), but the portrait elements: the effigy, the bust of the Redeemer and the accompanying cherub heads. Like its Italian precursors, the effigy of the deceased is portrayed with closed eyes, unlike the open-eyed English royal effigies Pietro Torrigiano had completed earlier. The heads of the cherubs in the lunette are almost

---

[15] D.N.B., vol. XXI, p. 1242-43. In 1511, Henry VIII sent Yonge first to Louis XII after the dissolution of the League of Cambrai, and then on to Brussels to meet the Emperor Maximilian and Margaret of Burgundy.

[16] Will proved 17 May 1516. See reprint in Testamenta Eboracensia: Publications of the Surtees Society, vol. II, 1884, p. 72.

certainly later reproductions of the lost or damaged originals (fig. 55). The head of Christ compares closely to the Wallace Collection Bust of the Redeemer (fig. 56), originally located near Abbot Islip's chantry chapel in Westminster Abbey.[17]

The dimensions of sarcophagus and effigy to lunette appear disproportionate in this tomb. A comparison with Florentine examples of the same type, such as the Marsuppini tomb in Santa Croce, by Desiderio da Settignano, shows how much more space the arch surrounding the sarcophagus occupied, resulting in a more elegant and perfectly proportioned composition. However, the tomb of Filippo Strozzi in Santa Maria Novella, by Benedetto da Maiano, is enclosed by a surprisingly low arch (fig. 57). It is known that the Yonge tomb was moved from the north side of the high altar to its present position in the chapel, but we do not know whether the original arch was of a greater height. The pre-existing limitations of the architectural setting may have caused the artist to modify the height of the arch to the detriment of the design.

Other Italian precedents exist for the combined use of terracotta and marble in the same monument.[18] The tomb was also

---

[17] See 'The Obituary Roll of Abbot Islip', Proceedings ofthe Society of Antiquaries, vol. 4, pl. XXIII.

[18] The Federighi monument at S. Trinità, Florence, begun in 1451 and finished between 1454-5, by Luca della Robbia, incorporates both enamelled terracotta and marble. The della Robbia tabernacle at Peretola (1441-3) originally at Santa Maria Nuova, consists of an enamelled terracotta inlay behind the marble group in the lunette, and terracotta cherub heads beneath the pediment and in the spandrels. The Lamentation

apparently naturalistically coloured and gilded, again unlike the East Anglian tombs in question. The tomb was not particularly complex and would not have detained Torrigiano too long from his important altar commission for Henry VII's chapel.

The Altar of Henry VII's Chapel

The incorporation of terracotta panels or sections in Italian altars was not uncommon in late fifteenth and early sixteenth century Italy. The altar Pietro Torrigiano completed for the chapel of Henry VII was innovative in England (fig. 58). The black and white marble altar included a terracotta relief panel and figures, as well as gilded copper panels, according to a contract of 11 March 1516:

> (upon the said crests) he shall sett iiij aungells of erthe bakid in an oven after the colour of white marble evy of them kneeling at the heith of ij foote of assise from the knees upward.[19]

These terracotta angels were to carry gilded copper accessories: a cross and a scourge, reminiscent of the realistic metal additions to the sculpted prophets at the Chartreuse of Champmol, by Claus Sluter.[20]

---

groups by Guido Mazzoni included terracotta 'effigies' of the dead Christ.

[19] Contract for the altar reprinted in J. Britton, Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain, London, 1807-26, vol. II, pp. 29-32.

[20] The use of realistic accessories on Burgundian figural sculpture continued after Sluter. This device may have been noted by Torrigiano from his experience of Netherlandish sculpture.

> Under the same awlter shalbe leyde a bakyn ymage of earthe coloured of criste dede and upon the baksyde of the same awlter shalbe sett a table of copp. gilt in length and brede after the proporcion of the worke and in the sides of the same table shalbe made ij hystories the oon of the resurrection of oure Lorde on the foreparte all gilt and upon the baksyde of the same table shalbe made the hystory of the Nativitie of oure Lorde in lykewise gilt and at evy end of the same table shall be sett a square pyl...[21]

This eclectic monument thus incorporated allusions to some of the finest and most up-to-date works, as diverse as the Corbinelli altar by Andrea Sansovino (fig. 59), the altar of Santa Fina (fig. 60) in San Gimignano, by Benedetto da Maiano, and Torrigiano's own terracotta work (fig. 61) at Volterra.[22]

By now Torrigiano needed Italian assistants familiar with more recent developments in Italian art, rather than the Flemish and English workmen who had supported his more traditionally English projects. With this purpose, he set off for Florence in 1518 to recruit young Florentine artists for the ever-multiplying English royal commissions. He did find able assistants, but one sculptor he approached, Benvenuto Cellini, declined his offer. Cellini's comments on the occasion reveal that Torrigiano's chief concern was the tomb of Henry VIII, 'the great bronze I have

---

[21] Contract, op. cit., p. 24.

[22] For the Corbinelli altar see G. Haydn Huntley, Andrea Sansovino, Cambridge, Mass., 1935, fig. 7; for the altar of Santa Fina see M. H. Longhurst, Notes on Italian Monuments of the twelfth to sixteenth Centuries, London, 1964. plate Q9. Polychromed terracotta reliefs of the Nativity and the Adoration, from the Duomo, Volterra, believed to date from c.1503 have been attributed to Pietro Torrigiano. See M.G. Ciardi Duprè dal Poggetto, op. cit., pp. 316-20, figs. 7-11.

undertaken'.[23] Pietro Torrigiano must have returned to England between 1519 and 1520 with three Italian assistants: Antonio di Piergiovanni di Lorenzo, sculptor, of Settignano; Giovanni Luigi di Bernardo di Maestro Jacopo da Verona; and Antonio Toto del Nunziata, a painter.[24] The altar survived until 1644, when it was destroyed[25]

The Tomb and Bust of Dean Colet

Pietro Torrigiano may also have been the author of a lost terracotta bust of Dean Colet, a close friend of both Erasmus and John Yonge. The history of the Dean's tomb is complex, involving the re-use of components of an earlier memorial planned during his lifetime. Colet stated in his will, on 22 August 1518:

---

[23] 'About this time there arrived in Florence a sculptor called Piero Torrigiani. He had come from England, where he had lived for many years. Now he was a great friend of my master and paid him (the goldsmith Marcone) a visit every day; and having seen my designs and my work, he said to me, "I have come to Florence to pick up as many young men as I can, for I have a great work in hand for my king, and I want the help of my own Florentines. Now your method of working pertains more to sculpture than to the goldsmith's art; so while you are helping me with a great bronze I have undertaken, I will make you both a skilful artist and a wealthy man".' J.A. Symonds, ed. and trans., The Autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini, New York, 1927, p. 12.

[24] These were Torrigiano's contracted assistants, although only the name of Toto del Nunziata appears in subsequent English documents.

[25] See Hist. MSS. Comm. Portland, iii, p. 132. An engraving of the altar appears in F. Sandford, A Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England, London, 1685, p. 168. Only two marble supports and a piece of ornamental frieze from the original now survive. These were incorporated in a reproduction of the Renaissance altar constructed in 1933-34

> First I bequethe my soule to God and to our Lord Christ Jesu, my body to the church of Sainte Paule aforesaid to be buried nyghe unto the image of Seint Wilgefort where I made a lytell monument. As touchynge my burying and funerals, with the circumstance thereof I commit to the discrecion of myne executars...[26]

The ascetic's dislike of funerary pomp and graven images was promptly disregarded by his admirers, who set up 'a very elegant monument, with his effigies'.[27] The monument included a bust of the Dean (fig. 62), 'depicta ad vivum effigies'.[28] The monument, enlarged and embellished by the Company of Mercers, the patrons of St. Paul's School and the colleagues of Colet's father, Sir Henry Colet, was situated in Old St. Paul's, at the entrance of the south aisle of the chancel.[29] Henry Holland's account of the Dean's memorial concurs with Dugdale's engraving.[30] The monument was destroyed in the Great Fire of 1666, but the remains of half

---

after the design of Sir Walter Tapper. Four bronze candlesticks were sold and are now in St. Bavon, Ghent.

[26] Will of Dean Colet reprinted in J. Knight, The Life of Dean Colet, London, 1724, p. 465.

[27] J. Lily, Virorum aliqot in Britannia..., London, 1559, p. 46.

[28] W. Dugdale, History of St. Paul's Cathedral in London, London, 1657 ed., pp. 161-62; F. Grossman, 'Holbein, Torrigiano and some Portraits of Dean Colet', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XIII, 1950, p. 206, translates Dugdale's phrase as 'an effigy coloured and life-like'.

[29] Sir Henry Colet, a mercer, was twice Lord Mayor of London. His own tomb was restored by the Mercers' Company at Stepney in 1505 and again in 1697. See D.N.B., vol. IV, p. 777.

[30] Henry Holland, Monumenta Sepulchraria Sancti Pauli, London, 1614 ed., fol. D, pp. 46-47, writes of Colet, '(he) lyeth entombed with his lively picture and an artificial skeleton, very curiously done'. See W. Dugdale, op. cit., engraving (fig. 62). Another illustration of the lost monument exists as the miniature by Sir William Segar, painted between 1585-86,

of the bust, at first believed to come from the monument of Dean Nowells, though later identified as coming from Colet's tomb, were discovered and existed until 1809.[31] Several busts were produced to commemorate the Dean. Apart from the one on the tomb, a bust was placed over the Master's seat in St. Paul's School. Knight reproduced an engraving (fig. 63) of this particular bust.[32] Stow commented on the curious nature of the material that the bust was made of:

> A lively Effigies, (and of exquisite Art) of the Head of Dr. Colet, cut (as it seemed) either of Stone or of Wood...But this figure was destroyed with the school in the Great Fire; yet was afterwards found in the Rubbish by a curious Man [in the margin 'Mr. Bagford'] and Searcher into the City Antiquities, who observed (and so told me) that it was Cast and Hollow, by a curious Art now lost.[33]

This antiquarian's unfamiliarity with terracotta, and the tone of historical distance adopted by the writer, imply that the use of terracotta enjoyed a brief existence and was not widely known. Strype himself wrote that the figure of Stow:

> ...seems to be of stone, [but] I have been told by an ingenious Person in Antiquities, to be nothing else but clay burnt and painted; a fine Art, known and practised in former times. Of these there were several Effigies in Churches before the Great Fire. One of these was the Head of Dr. Colet, set up both in St. Paul's Church,

---

on the cover of the MS of the Statutes of St. Paul's School, in the Mercer's Hall, London. Hollar's plan of Old St. Paul's shows Colet's tomb between the second and third pillars of the south aisle of the choir. The words 'effigies' and 'picture' refer to the bust.

[31] F. Grossman, op. cit., p. 210.

[32] Engraving in J. Knight, op. cit., facing page 435.

[33] J. Stow, ed., Survey of London and Westminster, London, 1720, Book 1, p. 164.

whereof he was Dean and in his School hard by...[34]

The bust on the monument of Colet was made of terracotta, but we know that Stow's monument at St. Andrew Undershaft was of alabaster, and the remaining bust from St. Paul's was of cast plaster.[35] These writers were apparently unable to identify painted terracotta reliably.

Although the death of John Colet occurred on 16 September 1519, while Torrigiano was still away in his native Florence recruiting artists for England, there can be little doubt that he was responsible for the bust. Stylistically, it recalls the incisive linearity of the firmly attributed royal funerary portraits, even allowing for the different inherent properties of clay and gilded copper. Closest in style to the bust of Colet is the bust of Bishop Fisher, now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.[36]

From the surviving engraving, the Colet tomb appears to have been a fairly traditional canopied altar tomb inspired by Florentine Quattrocento tombs of scholars, where a bust, rather than a full effigy, commemorated the deceased.[37] The bust device

---

[34] J. Strype in his, 'Life of Stow', in J. Stow, ed., op. cit., p. xiv.

[35] F. Grossman, op. cit., p. 218.

[36] C. Remington, 'A Portrait Bust of an English Ecclesiastic of the Sixteenth Century', Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Fine Art, vol. XXXI, 1936, pp. 223-29; C.R. Beard, op. cit.; H. Dow, op. cit., p. 291.

[37] An example of this is the bust of Marsilio Ficino, c.1521-22, by Andrea di Piero Ferrucci, in Florence Cathedral. In England

derives from antique Roman funerary practices and was revived during the Renaissance, to be used chiefly, but not exclusively, on the tomb of scholars and teachers. The Italian vogue for portrait busts of the living became popular at the English court through Torrigiano. The passion for the court portrait bust reached a new peak in the 1530s, encouraged by the presence of Hans Holbein.[38]

Italian Artists and Terracotta Decorative Work at Hampton Court

Apart from Pietro Torrigiano and his three contracted assistants, we know of at least one other Florentine who was skilled at modelling clay and who worked in England in the period: Giovanni da Maiano, a nephew of the the better known Benedetto da Maiano.[39] Giovanni's competence in this medium is attested to by the decorative roundels ordered by Cardinal Wolsey for the exterior adornment of his new palace at Hampton Court

---

a similar type of tomb exists at Tong, Shropshire, to Sir Arthur Vernon, dated c.1517. Vernon was rector of Whitchurch. The bust is set in a shell niche and holds a book in its right hand. See 'Tong Church, Shropshire', in Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society, vol. V, 1882, pp. 305-6.

[38] See J. Pope-Hennessy, The Portrait in the Renaissance, Princeton, 1966, pp. 74-84. For Holbein's English portraits see P. Ganz, The Paintings of Hans Holbein, London, 1956, pp. 9-12. For more recent discussion of Holbein's English portraits see the catalogue by J.B. Trapp and H.B. Herbruggen, The King's Good Servant: Sir Thomas More 1477/78-1535, National Portrait Gallery, London, 1977-78 and Holbein and the Court of Henry VIII, exhibition catalogue, The Queen's Gallery, London, 1978-79.

[39] For the career of Giovanni da Maiano see U. Thieme and F. Becker, eds., Allgemeines Lexikon, vol. XIV, pp. 124-25; E. Auerbach, Tudor Artists, London, 1955, p. 176.

(fig. 64). The commission is recorded by a document of 1521.[40] The roundels are powerfully modelled heads of Roman emperors, encircled by garlands of classical Roman armour, cartouches and trophies. The exaggeration of three-dimensionality and the slight simplification of form necessary for such steeply-positioned decoration suits the medium. Antique roundels were popular contemporary architectural motifs and these recall the marble ones at Gaillon in France and the terracotta decorative work at the Certosa of Pavia.[41] Little is known of the activities of Giovanni da Maiano in England. A receipt survives for his work in stucco and plaster for the decoration of Greenwich in 1527, by 'John Demyans, Italian engraver'.[42] Giovanni was prepared to accept modest commissions and was obviously familiar with making moulds. He is also recorded as working in the Revelling Chamber in the tilt-yard at Greenwich on repair work.[43]

---

[40] L&P, vol. III, no. 13555, 'Cum ex mandato vestrae gratiae fecerim et in vestro palatio apud Anton Cort collocaverim octo rotundas imagines ex terra depictas et deauratas pro pretio librarum duarum solidorum vj et denariorum octo quamlibet eanum: ac similiter tres historias Herculis, ad rationem librarium quatuor pro unaquaque.'

[41] For Gaillon see E. Chirol, Un premier foyer de la renaissance: le château de Gaillon, Paris/Rouen, 1951, and M. G. Le Coste-Messelière, 'Les médaillons historiques de Gaillon', Revue des arts, vol. VII, 1957, pp. 65-70. For Pavia see C. Magenta, ed., La Certosa di Pavia, Milan, 1850.

[42] H. Colvin, op. cit., vol. IV, pt. II, p. 148. Original documents: Treasury Receipts, Exchequer, E. 36/227, fols. 2, 16, 24ff, 52, etc.

[43] S. Anglo, op. cit., p. 214.

After the fall of Wolsey, Giovanni worked as the assistant of Benedetto da Rovezzano on the tomb Henry VIII had appropriated from the Cardinal (figs. 65 & 66). Receipts survive for the work of Benedetto and Giovanni on the tomb from June to November 1531.[44] The same source reveals that a large group of little-known Italians were also employed on the tomb project, including Rinieri; Ambrogio; Fermino; Pietro Baldi; Niccolaio Fiorentino and Giovanni Utrin.[45] Their wages were still being paid in 1535 and 1536. In 1532 Anthony Toto and 'John de la Mayn' were sent from Greenwich to Hanworth in Middlesex, to the house Henry VIII had presented to Anne Boleyn, to set up and 'new garnish certen antique heds brought from Grenwiche to Hanworthe at the Kyng's commandment'.[46] Both Giovanni da Maiano and Benedetto da Rovezzano had returned to Italy in 1540.[47]

It is, therefore, certain that during the period of the execution of the East Anglian tombs, between c.1525 and 1540, there were a number of Italian artists in the country capable of such work. There were also different styles of terracotta work in existence in England to inspire the artists responsible for the tombs under consideration. The first commission in this group, the tombs of the Lords Marney at Layer Marney in Essex, could have been facilitated by the close connection between the patron,

---

[44] L&P, vol. V, p. 753.

[45] Ibid., p. 753.

[46] H. Colvin, op. cit., p. 148.

[47] E. Auerbach, op. cit., pp. 176, 183.

Sir Henry Marney, and the court circle in which the Italian artists were first employed.

The East Anglian Tombs

Layer Marney, Essex.

Sir Henry Marney had been one of the executors of the wills of both the Lady Margaret Beaufort and Henry VII, and he was a prominent courtier: a member of the Privy Council of both Henry VII and Henry VIII; Lord Privy Seal (4 February 1522); Captain of the Body Guard; and created 1st Lord Marney on 9 April 1523, just before his death on 24 May 1523.[48] From his will, it appears that Sir Henry desired a tomb of the traditional early Tudor type:

> With the profit of my said londs that myn executours cawse to be made a Tumbe of marbull to be sett in the wall betwixt the chauncell and the said chapell, which wall I will it be newe and to be vawted over wt. marbull and workmanly wraught wt. such works as shalbe thought convenient by my executours, and my Image to be made of black marbull or Towch, wt. everything convenient and appurteyning to the same, and to be leyde and sett upon the said Tomb. And I will that two Images of laton be made with the pyctours of my two wife wt. ther Cate Armers upon them, that is to say Thomasyn, and she to lie on my right side and Elizabeth, she to lie on my left side, upon the same tomb.[49]

---

[48] See 'The Pedigree of Marney' and C.F. Hayward, 'Architectural Notes on Layer Marney Hall, Essex; and on the Parish Church adjoining', Transactions of Essex Archaeological Society (T.E.A.S.), vol. III, n.s., 1865, pp. 16-32, and F. Chancellor, 'Layer Marney Church', T.E.A.S., vol. XIV, 1918, pp. 65-75.

[49] Will reprinted in T.E.A.S., vol. III, 1869, pp. 148-54.

The tomb of Sir Henry lies on the north side of the chancel a few feet away from the high altar, which the praying effigy faces (figs. 67a & 67b). The 'image of black Towch' was part of the finished monument, but the rest of the tomb was less conventional and did not follow the wishes of Sir Henry in his will.[50] Perhaps Sir Henry's son John survived just long enough to commission the completion of his father's finely carved marble effigy, although his own is of inferior quality, as if inspired by that of his father but executed later by a different hand.

The tomb of Sir Henry was obviously the first of the group to have been executed, since it incorporates certain clearly late Gothic/early Tudor elements no longer present in the later tombs. The Layer Marney tombs are the only ones in the group with surviving effigies, though one of the other tombs included a monumental brass since lost or destroyed.[51] The lower half of the Henry Marney tomb chest, four simple quatrefoil panels below more Italianate garlanded shields divided by attached balusters, though reminiscent of Henry VII's tomb, is close in design to a fairly conventional Tudor tomb chest. It occurs, in fact, on the tomb of Sir Henry's ancestor, Sir William, visible through the

---

[50] D. Purcell, op. cit, p. 4, identified the effigy as being of Catacluse, not black Belgian marble, as earlier writers suggested. Sir Henry Marney actually owned land in Cornwall. See also F.C. Eeles, 'The Black Effigies at Layer Marney re-examined', T.E.A.S., vol. XXII, n.s., 1940, pp. 272-75.

[51] F. Blomefield, The History and Antiquities of Norfolk, Norwich, 1776, vol. IV, p. 229, confirms the theft of the brass commemorating Robert Jannys in St. George, Colegate in Norwich.

canopy of Sir Henry's tomb (fig. 68). The canopied free-standing tomb was a typical early Tudor model.[52] The traditional inclusion of heraldic devices for identification and family honour remained an important feature of the tomb. The incorporation of the royal coats-of-arms within Renaissance garlands had been Torrigiano's solution to the requirements of the English patron for the royal tombs. This innovation must have inspired the sculptor of the Layer Marney tombs to use first the insignia of the Order of the Garter to frame the arms of Sir Henry, and then an antique garland for the arms of John Marney (figs. 69 & 70). The use of the Garter motif recalls the bust of Sir Thomas Lovell, also by Pietro Torrigiano.[53] It is in the decorative Italianate pilasters, the attached balusters, topped with Corinthian capitals, and in the elaborately panelled and turreted canopy, where Renaissance dolphins and flaming urns are found, that the foreign origins of the style and imagery are asserted.

The tomb appears to be the work of a minor artist, a competent modeller or decorative sculptor, but not a great designer. The lack of cohesion of the parts is strongly felt, as if the elements were assembled by other, less skilful, hands. Technically experimental, the canopy sags precariously, and the joint of each section, for example, of a pilaster to its base, is

---

[52] Fine examples of this type of canopied free-standing tomb are those of Alice de la Pole, at Ewelme, Suffolk, and Sir John Peche, Lullingstone, Kent.

[53] See T. A. Cook, op. cit., pp. 89-97. Also C. Justi, 'Torrigiano', Jahrbuch der preuszischen Kunstsammlungen, vol. XXVII, 1906, pp. 265ff.

often insecure. The terracotta at Layer Marney is at present obscured by thick layers of creamish-buff whitewash. The precise origins of some of the decorative architectural details are impossible to determine. Decorative work had become so eclectic by the early sixteenth century that motifs were common artistic property.

The tomb of John Marney is unusually shaped to incorporate its own altar, forming a 'T' shaped monument (fig. 70). It is set in the chapel adjoining the chancel that Henry Marney ordered to be finished and roofed, and his tomb set in the adjoining wall. The tomb of Sir William originally stood in the chancel, but was moved to its present situation at the feet of John Marney's tomb 'within the last twenty years', according to Chancellor, when his book was published in 1846.[54] The leopard-headed stakes roping off the monument of Sir William were originally around Sir John's tomb. In his will, John Marney expressed a wish to be buried in the new aisle, with an altar at the west end of his sepulchre, which was to be 'the same as my father's is made of, yf it may be gotten, or ells of gray marbull'.[55] However, John Marney did not require a 'vawte over and above' his tomb. Instead of the Garter emblem there is a Renaissance garland enclosing the arms of Marney impaling Venables in each of the square panels of the tomb chests and altar. The panels of the tomb chest of John Marney are

---

[54] F. Chancellor, The Ancient Sepulchral Monuments of Essex, Colchester, 1846, p. 20.

[55] Will of John Marney, 10 March 1524-25.

larger than those on Sir Henry's tomb. Narrow rectangular pilasters with reliefs of triumphal imagery: sheaves of arrows, bows, and stylized foliage divide the panels of the altar, and create a junction between the tomb chest and altar at right-angles. Bold egg-and-dart moulding runs around the cornice which supports the black touch moulded plinth and effigy.

By tradition, Italian artists were considered responsible for the terracotta decoration on the parapets and windows (figs. 71a & 71b) of Layer Marney Hall during the lifetimes of both father and son.[56] There is no documentary evidence to support this assumption. But, whoever was responsible for the decorative work at the Hall could have created moulds that would have been available as models for others to use.

---

[56] See F. Chancellor, op. cit., p. 23; P. Morant, History and Antiquities of the County of Essex, London, 1768, vol. I, p. 407. F. Chancellor, 'Layer Marney Church', T.E.A.S., n.s., vol. XIV, 1918, p. 72, concludes: 'About this time Italian artists were attracted to England and succeeded through the patronage of the Marney and other families in impressing upon our architecture a distinctly Italian character, and which has been called the English Renaissance...[Lord John Marney] allowed his Italian artists to design his monument, although not in accordance with his father's will, for we find that with the exception of the effigy, terracotta was introduced where marble was directed by the will.' C.F. Hayward, op. cit., p. 31, writes: 'It seems probable therefore, that the terra-cotta canopy tomb was erected by Lord John out of deference to his taste, or according to his express wishes, and was probably executed by the Italian workmen in the neighbourhood, whom Lord Henry had employed upon the mansion, or was ordered from the same artists in Italy who supplied the terracotta windows and parapets.'

The parapets are decorated by egg-and-dart stringwork surmounted by semi-circular panels of radiating ornament, above which dolphins support the initials 'M' and 'C'.[57] The mullions of the large Gothic pointed windows include terracotta reliefs of panels of floral arabesques and candelabra with Corinthian capitals. The points of the windows are formed by terracotta dolphins in reverse or by scrollwork flanking coarse putto heads and wings. From the will of John Marney we know that some of the new sections had been erected by the time of his death.[58] The initials of John Marney's wife Christian suggest that the terracotta work dates from c.1525.

Oxborough, Norfolk.

The connections between the Layer Marney tombs and the chantry and monuments at Oxborough are not only stylistically certain, there is also a dynastic link between the patrons. Grace Marney, daughter of Sir Henry, married Edmund Bedingfeld of Oxborough. Edmund, along with Sir Henry's other sons-in-law, Thomas Bonam and Lord Fitzwalter, was an executor of Sir Henry's will. Since John Marney died so soon after his father, it was probably left to the executors of his will to provide for memorials to both father and son.

---

[57] The monograms commemorate John and Christian Marney. Christian was the daughter of Sir Roger Newburgh.

[58] He left 'hangings for two chambers of tapestry which be now appoynted for the Pew lodgings in the new gallery in the west side of the Tower'.

The Bedingfeld chantry was founded by Margaret, daughter of John Scot of Kent, commander of Calais, and wife of Sir Edmund, who built Oxborough Hall.[59] Margaret died in 1514 and in her will in 1513, she expressed her desire to be buried near her husband at Oxborough. Their first son, Sir Thomas, was Sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk in 1522 and died in 1538. Robert, the second son, was rector of Oxborough for twenty-eight years, died in 1539 and was buried at Oxborough.[60] Sir Edmund, husband of Grace Marney, was knighted at the fall of Montdidier in France in 1523. He was also custodian of Katherine of Aragon at Kimbolton Castle.[61] Sir Edmund died in 1554 and was also buried at Oxborough. His successor, Sir Henry, was loyal to Queen Mary when the attempt was made to put Lady Jane Grey on the throne.

The identity of the donor commemorated by the large canopied tomb in the chapel is difficult to establish (fig. 72). The two tombs seem to date from the 1530s, rather than after the death of Sir Edmund. The stone slab missing from the top of the chest may have contained a brass or even an effigy, whilst the clay shields which may have contained painted coats-of-arms are now blank. Near the east end of the chapel is a slab with a brass indent, which probably belonged to Margaret Bedingfeld, the founder of

---

[59] E.M. Beloe, 'Oxborough', N.A.S., vol. XIII, 1896, pp. 343-57; Rev. G.H. Mc.Gill, 'Oxborough Hall', N.A.S, vol. IV, 1855, pp. 271-84.

[60] F. Blomefield, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 192.

[61] Biographical information from F. Blomefield, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 179-86, and Oxborough Hall, National Trust, 1978, p. 8.

the chapel. There is a second monument set in the wall separating the chancel from the chapel (fig. 73). The canopied tomb extends into a doorway bridging the gap between the tomb and the exterior wall of the chapel. Semi-circular drums and triangular and semi-circular pediments, alternating with urns, run across the top of the canopy to ceiling height (figs. 74 & 75). This seems to be a further development of the Layer Marney design, which consisted of simpler semi-circular lunettes and putti supporting urns. Urns crown the four corners of the canopy at Oxborough. The irregular arrangement of the drums and pediments again suggests rather haphazard assembly. Both monuments have been restored: the canopied tomb has suffered the most damage, with the lower two-thirds of the archway replaced by restored work. Some restoration seems to be of an earlier date and of a cruder nature than the careful work done in 1964 by Donovan Purcell, an architect with a great interest in the sixteenth century terracottas in East Anglia. An example of the careless earlier restoration is found in the second panel from the left on the other tomb chest, where there is a curiously misplaced half putto head cemented to half a dolphin motif.

Certain motifs, such as the triumphal and resurrection imagery of bows, arrows, dolphins, urns, inverted flames, flowerheads, visors and exotic drinking birds, are of a much higher quality than the malformed clothed putti (figs. 76 & 77), who sport clumsily amongst the turrets of the canopy. These strange creatures have wide, large-featured heads, with sparse hair

covering a tiny cranium, contrasting sharply with the smoothly-handled, more sophisticated relief-work of the panels (figs. 78-82). The heads are, almost certainly, deliberately distorted to compensate for the sharp angle from which they must be viewed from below. These putti occur again on the Jannys tomb in Norwich, and at Wymondham. In the decorative panels, the only occurrence of the putto head makes a comparison of the two difficult, since the panel has been cut through exactly at the central point, and each winged face has been obscured by the clay used to rejoin the panels when the monument was reassembled.

At Oxborough and on other tombs in the group there are traces of black pigment in the ground of the raised portion of the reliefs. On the Jannys tomb there are also areas of polychromy (fig. 90) on the shields and scrolls.[62] The terracotta was deliberately coloured in this manner in order to create the illusion of the monuments being made of a more costly material.

Bracon Ash, Norfolk.

A third tomb obviously belonging to the same workshop is the fragmentary terracotta monument at Bracon Ash in Norfolk. This canopied tomb is set on the north side of the chancel (fig. 83). Only a thin section of it protrudes from the wall. A doorway has been cut below the canopy, which acts as a doorframe of sorts

---

[62] Miss Pauline Plummer carried out tests to determine whether the blackening was applied soon after the erection of the monument, or at a later date. She believed that the pigmentation was part of the original conception of the work.

(fig. 84). The builders of the more recent mausoleum that opens off the chancel simply burrowed through the older terracotta tomb chest and cemented the facade of the terracotta into the opening (fig. 85). The opening is today obscured by a curtain and church furniture, making it difficult to view the lower half of the area of modern concrete work. The church is obviously suffering from penetrating damp, most noticeably in the area nearest to the altar, where the terracotta is slimy to the touch and in real danger of disintegrating altogether (fig. 86). There are thinner layers of limewash on this tomb than on the other examples. The yellowish tone is obviously an attempt to blend the tomb with the yellow sandstone of which the church is constructed. Terracotta was a cheap and adaptable substitute for stone and could be painted to resemble many other materials. However, it is likely that the tomb was painted to match the existing stone setting at a later date. It is clear that the terracotta was almost obliterated by the later monument and would probably have been painted to camouflage its presence even further.

No documentary evidence has yet arisen to determine whether the tomb is in its original position. Where it stands at present conforms with the general placing of the other tombs in the group: as close as possible to the north side of the high altar. Physical clues suggest that this is the original site: the altar rail is wedged into the lower part of the monument; the tomb may have originally risen above the sill level of the two chancel windows, this area having been filled in with masonry later to act as the new chapel wall.

The canopy is badly chipped and the tomb is in poor condition (fig. 87). The hanging balusters repeat the design of the two other canopied tombs, but this monument is less profusely decorated than the other tombs. Again there are blank escutcheons, formerly containing painted arms, the only aid for identification of the donor in the absence of conclusive documentary evidence (fig. 88). It is known that the patrons of the church at this time were the Appleyards.[63] The will of Roger Appleyard is not very helpful, since by it the testator desires that his body is to be buried in the church of:

> ...the gray freres in Norwich, and for my body to be buried there I geve and bequethe to the said freres $4, and they for to sing masses and pray for my soule and all my frends.[64]

A devout Catholic, Appleyard left twenty shillings to every order of friars in Norwich. Blomefield does mention Roger Appleyard amongst the burials inside the church of the Greyfriars in Norwich.[65] It is possible that his family transferred his remains, after the Dissolution, to the family church at Bracon Ash.[66] The will of Roger Appleyard does contain numerous bequests for Bracon Ash church.[67] He left a widow, Elizabeth, and a two

---

[63] N. Pevsner, ed., B.E....North West and South Norfolk, p. 94, does not suggest a donor.

[64] Will of Roger Appleyard, P.C.C. 14 Jankyn, 1529.

[65] F. Blomefield, op. cit., vol.IV, p. 84.

[66] After the dissolution of the Greyfriars in 1535 Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, took possession of the site. It was seized by the King on 6 November 1544 and given to Paul Gresham and Frances Baldero. The city of Norwich bought the site in 1564, F. Blomefield, op. cit., vol. V, p. 84.

year old son (which suggests that the the tomb was not that of this male heir, who presumably died much later, after the period in which these tombs were erected) and three daughters, who were provided with large dowries. The tomb was probably set up by his widow before her death. The manorial lands owned by Roger Appleyard were quite extensive. One of his executors was John Scott, baron of the King's Exchequer, and the Duke of Norfolk was requested to oversee the carrying out of the will. The Appleyards were a prominent Norwich family, whose names occur frequently in the records of the Guild of St. George.[68] Sir Nicholas Appleyard was one of the guests at the marriage of Mary Tudor to Louis XI of France in 1515, along with the more illustrious Duke and Duchess of Norfolk, the Countess of Oxford, and Lord Berners.

Norwich, Norfolk.

The terracotta tomb of Robert Jannys in the church of St. George, Colegate, Norwich, is certainly from the same workshop as the other tombs (fig. 89). This free-standing altar tomb of modest proportions seems fitting for a prosperous grocer, alderman and Mayor. It is not canopied, like the Marney and Bedingfeld tombs. The canopy would seem an appropriate addition to mark a higher social standing. A unique feature of the Jannys

---

[67] He left to the church at 'Braken', his 'vestment of blue sarcenette and the gilt imagies that belongeth to my chapell'. His bay trotting gelding was to be sold to pay for a new porch.

[68] Mary Grace, ed., 'Records of the Guild of St. George, Norwich, 1389-1547', Norfolk Record Society, vol. IX, 1937, pp. 27-157.

tomb is the type of plain terracotta disc, a version of a classical roundel, on the tomb chest.

Robert Jannys was a respected citizen of Norwich. His coat-of-arms is displayed on the central shield. Jannys died in 1530 and his will is dated 20 April 1530.[69] He was a substantial benefactor of St. George's church and held several offices: he rose from member of the City Council in 1511 to Alderman in April 1519 and Mayor in 1517-18 and again in 1524-25.[70] He also played a prominent role in the Guild of St. George, a powerful vehicle of bourgeois display and a counterbalance to the power of the City Council.[71] Jannys was a resident of the parish of St. George, Colegate, living with his wife, Margaret, in the house of the Two Rammes. Margaret was probably responsible for the erection of the tomb, as she was for the gift of a new pulpit in 1537.[72] A brass inscription formerly ran around the top of the monument, reading:

> Norwicensis Fausto sub Bimatu Maioris. Pauperum hic vivens semper amator, Elemosinarum largitate.[73]

---

[69] Will of Robert Jannys, P.C.C. 1 Thower 1530. Copy in Norfolk County Records Office, Norwich.

[70] F. Blomefield, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 218-19.

[71] ed. M. Grace, op. cit., p. 101. The name of Robert Jannys appears frequently in the records of the Guild of St. George.

[72] Now at Old Catton Church. The pulpit displayed the arms of the Grocers', Mercers' and Drapers' company, as well as her own initials.

[73] F. Blomefield, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 467.

Another memorial exists to the memory of Robert Jannys, in the glass of the first window of the Guildhall, Norwich.[74]

Originally the tomb was situated in the easternmost arch of the chancel, north of the high altar. The arms of St. George, the 'avourie' of Robert Jannys, are depicted in five of the six bosses in the roof of the Lady Chapel. Thurlow dates the erection of the tomb to 1533 and its removal to the north side of the chapel at an unspecified later date.[75] There must have been some image of the Guild saint in this part of the church, for the will describes Jannys' desire to be buried in the north aisle, 'before St. George, my avourie'.

It is hoped that the tomb will be restored in the near future. It crumbles beneath innumerable layers of whitewash and coloured pigment. The panels that are visible are a dull mushroom-brown colour, imitating the appearance of sandstone. The panels facing the window wall, though badly damaged (one panel is completely missing) have suffered less from the effects of clogging layers of paint, and the details of the terracotta reliefs are clearer. Although the blanket-like effect of the crude overpainting is to

---

[74] The window displays an image of a man in a winding-sheet, sitting up as he is shot dead by arrows. Opposite is an image of a king, and a band of armed men. The arms of Jannys, the Grocers' and Mercers' arms, and those of the City are also included in the scene. A commemorative verse below runs: 'For all, Welth, Worship and Prosperite,/ Ferce Dethe ys cum, and rested me./ For Jannys praise God, I pray you all,/ Those acts do remayne a Memoriall.' F. Blomefield, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 229.

[75] A.G.G. Thurlow, The Church of St. George's, Colegate, a redundant Church, n.d., p. 8.

be regretted, since it is difficult to distinguish even the type of decorative band around the top of the lunettes, the paint does at least seem to have preserved the 'skin' of the terracotta from deterioration and damage. Traces of gilding remain on the lettering of the scrolls held by the angels, the robe of the right-hand angel, the shields and the wreaths. There may also have been gilding on the upper frieze, above the square panels of the tomb chest. Black pigment is also visible on the panels, as at Oxborough. Crowning the chest is a slab of polished black stone with traces of a brass indent. Complete, the Jannys monument must have been very handsome: black, with gilded and polychromed details. Today a whole panel is missing, as is the brass and inscription. However, the poor state of the Jannys tomb makes it possible to see how the terracotta tombs were constructed. The slabs of terracotta were attached to roughly mortared bricks, as is visible now that the top of the chest is missing. The terracotta is raised off the ground by a stone plinth.

The high tomb chest and the roundels, supported by clothed angels recall the royal tomb chest of Henry VII. However, the crude and naive treatment of the forms of the putti suggests that they came from the hand of an artist who did not fully understand the Italian model he worked from (fig. 90). These figures, and the shields, could be English interpretations of unfamiliar foreign forms. The panels depicting figures of seated monks or the Evangelists are from identical moulds (fig. 91). Unlike the

decoration at Oxborough, there are no putto heads in the centres of the lunettes, but flaming urns. The right end panel repeats the central panel of a shield with coat-of-arms. This panel may have been in a more prominent position formerly than the opposite one (a panel with a seated ecclesiastical figure like the two flanking the central coat-of arms), facing the congregation rather than the altar, for the identification of the deceased. The perspective of the chairs of the seated figures is distorted, again suggesting the work of a minor artist. It must be remembered, however, that the figures look more crude as a result of many layers of overpainting. The sculptor demonstrated a competence in handling simple decorative work, but realistic figures and the correct use of perspective were not within his powers. He may have been accustomed to working for a master on the less important areas of a commission, to the master's plan.

Barsham, Suffolk.

The only other example of a free-standing altar tomb without a canopy in the group is the tomb at Barsham in Suffolk (fig. 92). Again, the tomb is on the north side side of the chancel in a recess, with only one side fully visible. The long side consists of four panels topped by lunettes and divided by broad pilasters, all identical to the tomb chest in the Bedingfield chantry at Oxborough. Each short end consists of one narrow bay that resembles the inner faces of the Oxborough canopy. A large unmoulded stone slab lies on the top of the tomb chest. The

terracotta is raised off the floor by a stone plinth, with chamfered edges, bearing a memorial inscription to Sir Edward Eckingham, who died in 1527. His wife was the heir of Sir John Blennerhasset of Norwich.[76] Edward Eckingham made a very long will, which contains some important information. First, the will, dated 18 June 1526, confirms that the tomb is in the place the testator desired:

> And my body to be buried before the awter in Barsham church on the northe side under the foundation of the chancel wall.[77]

The language used by the testator suggests that Sir Edward was a devout Catholic with a deep concern for the salvation of his soul and the site of the resting-place of his earthly remains. The will mentions the building of a chapel dedicated to St. Katherine:

> Also I will that within short tyme after my deceas myn executors as they may bryng it about bestowe and imploye upon the bilding of a chapel of St. Kateryn on the north side of Barsham chancell there as my fader lyeth buried. The patron of the said chapel to be had at Russheforth College there Sir Robert Wyngfield lyeth buried.[78]

This is an unusual survival of a document naming an existing building as a model to be copied. The will continues, 'And those saints that be myn advouries to be graven in free stone or tymber

---

[76] A. Suckling, The History and Antiquities of the County of Suffolk, London, 1846-48, vol. I, p. 43, remarks that the parish records showed that 'the old ladie Itchingham' was buried on 30 June 1584.

[77] Will of Sir Edward Eckingham, P.C.C. 28 Porch 1527.

[78] This must refer to Rushworth College, which belonged to the Herling family. Anne Herling married Sir Robert Wingfield and endowed the college at his death.

the length of foure fete'. If this had been executed, it would probably have been a panel with carved reliefs of the saints especially dear to Sir Edward. Sir Edward seems to have had plans for founding a family mausoleum as he requested that his mother 'who lyeth buried at Blondeston in Lothinglon' be brought to Barsham and buried next to his father in the same chapel.[79] Prayers were to be said for the souls of his two wives: his present wife, Anne, and his former wife, Mary, 'that lyeth buried in St. Patrik's church in Ireland on the north side of the ladies chapell'. The connection with the owners of the chapel plan, the Wingfields, is explained by a mention of Humphrey Wingfield, 'for the familiar acquaintance from our childhood unto this day'. The will proves that Eckingham was quite wealthy, owning a substantial amount of land and 'botes'. He also seems to have been well connected: he offered Sir Brian Tuke, Master of the King's Posts and secretary to Cardinal Wolsey, the choice of his daughters for a bride.

The chapel of Sir Edward was demolished around 1780.[80] Suckling wrongly refers to the donor of this tomb as Thomas Blennerhasset, who was buried 1 May 1592.[81] The Eckingham tomb must have been erected by Sir Edward's widow, probably in the 1530s.

---

[79] Lothinglon is a hundred of Suffolk.

[80] A. Suckling, op. cit., p. 41, 'A small north aisle or chapel was taken down about sixty years ago, [Suckling wrote in 1846] which has materially injured the stability of the fabric.'

[81] Source Ibid., p. 42.

Wymondham, Norfolk.

The last monument in the group, at Wymondham Abbey, a few miles from Norwich, was believed, from an eighteenth century source, to be the tomb of Abbot Elisha Ferrars. It is more likely that it was erected as a sedilia, rather than as a tomb. The Ferrars family was one of the most important families in Norwich in the sixteenth century.[82]

The monument is situated south of the high altar of the parish church of the former Abbey at Wymondham (fig. 93), under one of the original round-headed arches of the chancel.[83] Before the eighteenth century there is no documentary evidence to prove that this is, indeed, the tomb of Abbot Ferrars, or even that it is a tomb at all. The Abbot's will throws little light upon the problem:

> ...my body to be buried in Christian buriall for according to the discrecion of myn executors.[84]

Ferrars died in 1548. He had been handsomely pensioned at the Dissolution of the Abbey.[85] Thomas Essex, 'prest', and Ferrars'

---

[82] The Records of the Guild of St. George contain several references to the Ferrars family. Elisha's brother Robert was elected with Robert Jannys by the council auditors on 24 April 1511. M. Grace, ed., op. cit., p. 101.

[83] F. Blomefield, op. cit., vol. II, p. 520, wrote, '(he) lies buried under the old monument under the south wall, in the altar rails of Windham church, but it hath no arms or inscription'.

[84] Will of Elisha Ferrars, P.C.C. 24 February 1548.

[85] When the Abbey was dissolved in 1537, Elisha Ferrars, his brother George, and Thomas Essex received pensions for their services to the Abbey. W. Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum,

cousins, William and John Butler, were named as the executors of the will. In 1545, the Abbey was acquired by Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey. The powerful Catholic family became the protectors of much ex-monastic land in Norfolk.[86]

The tall memorial bows and cracks as a result of rather unskilful execution and assembly. The edges of the monument are untidily and unevenly embedded in the wall, with some rough replastering of the edges and a stone support at one side (fig. 94). Certain panels are badly matched up: the two halves of one cartouche which had been split down the centre, are out of alignment as a result (fig. 95). One of the putti from the central turret is missing, and another large chunk of terracotta is obviously absent from the right-hand cornice of the middle tier (fig. 96). A mutilated version of the original leaf-and-dart moulding replaces a damaged horizontal section. The sagging arches remind one of the relatively fragile nature of the material. A stone plinth raises the terracotta off the floor of the chancel.[87]

London, 1722-23, vol. VI, pt. 2, p. 521.

[86] The Howards in Norfolk compare interestingly with the De La Warr family, who became protectors of Catholicism in Sussex after the Reformation.

[87] In the case of all these tombs it is debatable whether the use of the stone plinth to separate the terracotta from the stone floor is an aesthetic device or a practical one, to prevent dampness affecting the terracotta.

In spite of considerable damage, the surface condition of the terracotta is good. The relatively plain lower panels contain the blank shields common to the tombs. On the pilasters next to the arches supporting the second tier, the full range of triumphal imagery utilized at Oxborough is employed. The most unusual motifs are tiny wreaths, grotesque masks and one small patch of chequering, in the centre of the inner arch. This chequer motif, is also found at Layer Marney at the feet of the effigy of Sir Henry (fig. 97). This may be a type of mason's mark. Slightly horseshoe-shaped lunettes are set directly above the semi-circular lunettes crowning the back walls of the arches. Bulbous-headed putti sit astride the crowning turrets. The drapery enclosing their awkwardly posed arms creates a puffed-sleeve effect instead of disclosing the pose of the arms. They are, without doubt, of the same genus as the angels at Oxborough and Norwich. The central motif of the diving dolphins repeats the motif of the Barsham tomb. Drinking birds appear at Bracon Ash instead.

No traces of blackening or gilding remain on this monument, though this, too, has been painted to blend in with the stone wall surrounding it. A small wooden door in front of a recess in the inner arch close to the altar acts as a tabernacle for the host. It has been suggested that the strange appearance of the monument results from the combining of two terracotta monuments, one the sedilia and the other a tomb from the former Abbey

church, which was demolished by 1539.[88] The use of the cupboard for the host suggests that the monument was intended to act as an altar. The bunch of grapes in the keystone of the central arch is a symbol of the sacrifice of the Mass. Two wooden planks now serve as shelving for the altar ornaments.

Elisha Ferrars became Abbot of Wymondham in 1534. He and one hundred and thirty monks subscribed to the King's Supremacy on 22 August 1537. A letter from the Abbot to Cromwell requested that the lease of the former Abbey be granted to William Clifton of Happisburgh Manor. A second letter to the Privy Council on 30 January 1538 proves the determination of Elisha Ferrars to see the named claimant favoured. A later dispute raged between John Flowerdew, the royal grantee, who stripped the church of its bells and lead, and the villagers of Wymondham, who kept part of the church. Part of the Abbey was demolished in 1539. Ferrars became Archdeacon of Suffolk and Prebend of Norwich after his submission.

Fragments of a Norwich Tomb

The existence of at least one more terracotta tomb is indicated by the survival of fragments of terracotta at Crown Point House, Trowse, Norwich, and in Norwich Castle Museum. When Arminghall Old Hall (fig. 98) was built in the sixteenth century, the builder incorporated fragments of terracotta from the

---

[88] A.P. Baggs, op. cit., p. 297.

Carmelite friary in Norwich.[89] Arminghall was, in its turn, demolished, and various fragments were taken by Russell Coleman and built into his house at Crown Point House, Trowse, and the Vinery (demolished in 1970s). The seven panels Coleman used at Crown Point included decorative brick that probably came from new secular architectural decorative work dating from the erection of Arminghall, but also included Renaissance busts (fig. 99) and panels of seated ecclesiastics like those on the tomb of Robert Jannys.[90] Coleman also gave two brick panels with Renaissance busts to Norwich Museum. These resemble decorative panels that adorned contemporary brick building in the area, rather than tombs.

The reuse of fragments of terracotta from tombs dismantled during the Reformation proves that there may have been other lost examples. The tombs that survived, with the exception of the one in Norwich, were in private chapels, in most cases attached to the estates of gentry, and thus better protected by the families of the deceased than were those in large city churches. The tomb in St. George, Colegate, was in a guild church, which also provided greater protection for the tombs of its benefactors.

---

[89] The Carmelite friary was dissolved in 1538.

[90] Barbara Green, Keeper of Archaeology at the Norwich Castle Museum says they are 'from the same moulds as the tomb chest in Robert Jannys' tomb'. A.P. Baggs op. cit., p. 296, believed that they were from the tomb of William Gladwyn, who died in 1487, and was to be buried in the Carmelite friary, according to his will. The panels may belong to the Jannys tomb, since one side of the tomb is missing.

It does seem likely that there were other terracotta tombs in East Anglia. They were cheap, easily assembled, and adaptable to the purse and the requirements of the patron and the site. The empty shields would have been painted with the arms of the deceased. The tombs in this group vary from a simple altar tomb to an elaborate canopied type. Other fragments of moulded or stamped brick (figs. 100-102) found in Norwich also appear to be from a secular setting, by tradition, from the old Canonry House of the Cathedral.[91] The subject matter of some of these panels (the Judgement scene and Judith and Holofernes figs. 101 & 102), is more esoteric than one would expect to find in a local English workshop, which suggests that these panels were imported from the Netherlands or northern France. The question of imported or locally produced terracotta will be addressed more fully towards the end of this chapter.

Over half of English brick building dating from before 1550 is found in Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, areas without a local supply of good building stone.[92]

---

[91] See entry of D. Thomson in A. Borg, et als., Catalogue of Medieval Sculpture in Norwich Cathedral, n.d., p. 40.

[92] R. Brunskill and A. Clifton-Taylor, English Brickwork, London 1977, p. 14.

The Stylistic Origins of the Tombs: Normandy and England

To determine a more specific origin for the workshop responsible for these monuments it is necessary to examine certain contemporary sculptural and architectural projects both in northern France and in England.

Normandy in northern France was one of the most important centres for the dissemination of Italian Renaissance style throughout France and the Low Countries in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. Attracted by the patronage of the Archbishop of Rouen, Cardinal Georges d'Amboise, the most powerful minister of King Louis XII of France, and the French Vice-Roy in Milan, dozens of artists and craftsmen - Italian, French, Flemish, and from other parts of Europe - worked on the Archbishop's château and chapel at Gaillon, close to Rouen, from 1502 until after the Cardinal's death in 1509.[93] Marble works were also imported from Italy. For instance, the fountain sculpted by Antonio della Porta and Pace Gaggini was brought from Genoa for the gardens. The entrance gate at Gaillon (fig. 103) was profusely decorated with friezes, pilasters, medallions enclosing antique heads, and shell-headed windows.[94] This group

---

[93] For Gaillon see E. Chirol, Un premier foyer de la renaissance: le château de Gaillon, Rouen/Paris, 1951. For the published accounts of payments to artists working at Gaillon see A. Deville, Comptes des dépenses de la construction du château de Gaillon..., in Collection des documents inédits de l'histoire de France, Paris, 1850.

[94] See M.G. La Coste-Messelière, 'Les médaillons historiques de Gaillon', Revue des arts, vol. VII, 1957, pp. 65-70.

of artists of diverse origins created works of art that mingled French Late Gothic and Italian Renaissance (predominantly Genoese and Milanese in its origins) styles. This synthesis of different styles is exemplified by the decoration of the carved wooden stalls in the chapel (fig. 104). Begun in 1509 and completed c.1515-16, they are the work of Nicholas of Castille.[95]

About fifty kilometres northwest of Rouen lies Fécamp, the focal point of the patronage of another French prelate, abbot Antoine Bohier. Bohier, like Cardinal Georges d'Amboise, also visited Italy and was an ardent promoter of the new styles. Amongst surviving examples of sculpture from Fécamp are items of specific relevance to this study: the carved stone screens (fig. 105) surrounding the chapels of the choir consist of a pierced frieze of dolphins and urns, supported by curious balusters, resting on panels of acanthus leaves in relief, with semi-circular headed doors. The acanthus reliefs are particularly reminiscent of the soffits of the canopies at Oxborough and Layer Marney (figs. 106 & 107). All of the elements of these screens reappear in the East Anglian monuments, though less clearly articulated. The dolphins and beakers occur in relief in panels at Layer Marney rather than as a pierced frieze at Fécamp. These screens are some of the only other monuments that incorporate the same combination of elements as the English examples.

---

[95] On the stalls at Gaillon see J.J. Marquet de Vasselet, 'Les boisseries de Gaillon au musée de Cluny', Bulletin Monumental, 1927, pp. 321-69.

The screens were erected before 1519, when Bohier died. It is known that the Genoese artist Girolamo Viscardi (who was also co-author of the Orleans tombs) was commissioned to make the tabernacle, sarcophagus and reliefs over the high altar at Fécamp.[96] At Fécamp, as at Gaillon, Renaissance decorative pilasters and friezes are layered on top of Late Gothic architecture.

The tomb of the Cardinals of Amboise (fig. 108) in Rouen Cathedral exhibits a complex juxtaposition of a whole range of sculptural and architectural styles fashionable in the decade in which it was built, c.1515-25. It is, indeed, a testament to the many different hands involved in the project. Its form evolved as it passed from one master's charge to another. Jean Lafond originally credited Arnold of Nimegen, the painter and glass designer responsible for the glass at Tournai cathedral and St. Etienne-des-Tonneliers, Rouen, and the retable of St. Etienne-La-Grande, with providing 'cartons' for the tomb after the Cardinal's death in 1510.[97] However, Arnold left Rouen for Antwerp in 1513 and the chapter passed the project on to Roulland Le Roux, a prominent architect in Rouen, in 1515. Le Roux was to be particularly responsible for 'les portraictz'. The Cardinal desired a free-standing tomb, but this wish was denied by the

---

[96] The chief work on Fecamp is E. Chirol and J. Bailly, Les clotures de Fecamp, Paris, 1950.

[97] J. Lafond, 'A. de la Pointe, peintre at verrier de Nimègue et les autres étrangers à Rouen aux XVe-XVIe siècles,' Bulletin de la société des amis des monuments rouennais, 1911, pp. 141-79.

canons of the Cathedral, causing many rearrangements in the project.[98] Le Roux was probably responsible for the kneeling figures (fig. 109), reminiscent of the type on the tombs of Louis XI, Charles VIII and, by this period, many lesser French donors on contemporary tombs. The hand of Nicholas Castille is evident in the luxuriant floriated carving of the frieze of the baldaquin and for the choice of the exotic iconography of the sibyls (figs. 110 & 111) in the niches of the tomb chest.[99] As has been noted previously, Nicholas Castille worked on the stalls for Gaillon. The hanging pendentives and baluster work on this tomb are reminiscent of the English terracotta versions at Wymondham, Layer Marney and Oxborough. This type of pendentive is specifically Norman. The Amboise tomb at Rouen is a prime example of the synthesis of Lombard decorative work with French architectural and decorative work, and a French type of priant. The eclecticism of this tomb was a natural outcome of the lively interplay of the divergent styles of the artists responsible for it. The Wymondham sedilia is equally eclectic but less aesthetically successful.

Other buildings in Normandy and beyond reveal the origins of the type of decorative work found on the East Anglian terracottas. The exterior of the choir (fig. 112) of the church

---

[98] G. Lanfry, E. Chirol, and J. Bailly, Le tombeau des cardinaux d'Amboise, Rouen, 1959, p. 16.

[99] Y. Bottineau-Fuchs, 'La décoration des tombeaux des cardinaux d'Amboise à la cathédrale de Rouen: Arnoult de Nimègue ou Nicolas Castille', Gazette des beaux-arts, vol. C, 1982, pp. 191-200.

of Saint-Pierre, Caen, is covered with applied decorative pilasters, friezes and applied balusters. The octagonal tower is crowned with turrets topped with flaming urns. This feature is close to the idiosyncratic triangular and semi-circular turrets on the canopies at Oxborough, Wymondham, and Layer Marney. The same overloading of applied Renaissance decoration on an underlying Gothic structure occurs on the exterior of Saint-Pierre as it does on the East Anglian terracotta monuments. Hector Sohier was the architect of the choir of Saint-Pierre, which dates from 1518, 1538 and 1545, according to the inscriptions on the balustrades. Georges Huard added the names of Hugues Le Fournier and Jéhan Masselin to that of Hector Sohier, when researching the origin and execution of the plans of Saint-Pierre.[100]

In Rouen and Caen there are still many fragments of buildings erected in the early sixteenth century that were adorned with Renaissance pilasters and decorative work reminiscent of the English terracotta type.[101] A fine example of this is the facade of the Hôtel Bourgthéroulde, Rouen (fig. 113), the work of Guillaume Le Roux and Jean La Rue.[102] Rouen was full of talented

---

[100] G. Huard, La paroisse et l'église de Saint-Pierre de Caen, (Mémoires des antiquaires de Normandie, vol. 35) quoted by R. Herval, Caen, Caen/Paris, 1935, pp. 138-39.

[101] See La renaissance à Rouen, exhibition catalogue, Musée des Beaux-Arts de Rouen, 1980-81.

[102] C. de Beaurepaire 'Les architectes de Rouen dans la première moitié du XVI siècle', Bulletin de la société des amis des monuments rouennais, 1904, pp. 119-53.

architects and masons who had experience of the work at Gaillon.

The projects at Gaillon and Fécamp created in Normandy an exciting meeting-point for Italian and northwest European artists. Not only could French and Flemish artists examine imported Italian sculptures, rather than just the woodcuts and engravings of Italian works that they had been forced to rely on, they could now work alongside Italian artists. The Italians also learned from those they encountered. Normandy witnessed a fruitful interchange and assimilation of different styles. There were interesting collaborative projects, like that of the St. George tabernacle for the chapel at Gaillon. In this work the great sculptor Michel Colombe from Tours contributed the superb relief of St. George and the Dragon, whilst Jerome Pacherot created the decorative frame.[103] The division of labour in such collaborative projects did not always result in the allocation of the decorative work to the Italian contributors. However, it is obvious that in many Renaissance-influenced buildings of the first quarter of the sixteenth century in Normandy and elsewhere, Italian decoration was literally applied to fairly traditional Late Gothic architecture. The decorative work of northern Italian artists was particularly appealing to French taste, since French Late Gothic was closer to Lombard styles than to the more severe classicism of Florentine Renaissance architecture.

---

[103] See P. Pradel, op. cit., pp. 56-58.

The work at Gaillon influenced a whole generation of artists. Many of those who worked at Gaillon went on to work in Rouen, and from here to other parts of France, and as we have seen in at least one case, to the Low Countries.[104] In many cities in the Low Countries the new styles quickly appeared. The decorative work of the East Anglian terracotta monuments appears to have been inspired by the work in northern France and the Low Countries.

England

In England in the middle years of the reign of Henry VIII several new mansions incorporating decorative terracotta work were erected by patrons who had seen the new work across the Channel. The New Renaissance mansion at Sutton Place, Surrey, was probably built by Sir Richard Weston between 1523 and 1527. The lease of the manor of Sutton was granted by Letters Patent of the King of 17 May 1521 to his Privy Councillor as a mark of high esteem. The manor had belonged to the estate of the King's

---

[104] E. Chirol, op. cit., pp. 237-47, traces the influence of Gaillon through artists and craftsmen who went on to work on the chateaux at Vigny, Meillant, Chaumont, (all belonging to the family of Amboise), Blois, Saint-Ouen de Chemazé, the Manor of la Possonière, Fleury, Montsoreau and Châteaudun. In Rouen itself at L'Hôtel Généraux des Finances (1509-1512), the home of Thomas Bohier, brother of Antoine Bohier; L'Hôtel Bourgthéroulde (c.1520); L'Hôtel Romé (1525); L'Hôtel Jubert (1523) the Gros Horloge (1527); and the chapel of Saint-Jacques at Dieppe. The departure of Arnold of Nimegen for Antwerp introduced the new styles to the Low Countries. Chirol even notes the influence of Gaillon as far as Portugal, where Jean of Rouen, who had worked on the Amboise chapel in Rouen Cathedral, went to work on the royal tombs and at Coimbra.

grandmother, the Lady Margaret Beaufort.

Sir Richard Weston's career involved extensive travel in the King's service. In 1511 he accompanied Lord Darcy on a mission to assist King Ferdinand of Spain against the Moors.[105] Weston was in attendance at the marriage of Princess Mary, the sister of Henry VIII, to Louis XII of France in October 1514. In 1518 Weston made a five-month long trip to France for the ratification of a peace and the marriage treaty between the infant Princess Mary, Henry VIII's daughter, and the baby Dauphin, the heir of Francis I. Weston passed through Calais, Paris and the Loire valley during his visit to the Prince in Cognac. He was again in France for the Field of the Cloth of Gold celebrations. From August to December 1525 Sir Richard Weston served in the French war under the command of the Duke of Suffolk. Finally, in 1525, he was appointed Treasurer of the Town and Marches of Calais, in the place of Sir William Sandys.

During his period as a Privy Councillor Weston was in close contact with Sir Henry Marney. Weston was also patronized by Cardinal Wolsey, who had recommended his appointment as Treasurer of Calais.

The terracotta decoration at Sutton Place is extensive. In the south front, it consisted of two tiers of panels (twelve in all) of crudely-formed putti carrying what appear to be rosaries and instruments of the Passion (fig. 114), divided by pilasters

---

[105] E. Hall, op. cit., pp. 520-22.

filled with baluster-work in relief, with a central acanthus leaf in a diamond on a square panel. These putti reappear in Gothic cusped panels, high up under the embattled parapet. More putto panels appear in the north doorway. The windows are decorated with reliefs of sheaves of arrows, cartouches, shields, and floral motifs in the mullions (fig. 115). All over the building is the rebus of the owner - a tun with what may be a bunch of hops, flanked by dolphins. This confirms that the decorative moulded work was ordered specially for the site, rather than coming from ready-made stock.

Keys to the dating of the house include the date of the bell in the tower, which reads 'Pierre Baude ma faicte 1530'.[106] In the great Hall, the arms of Nicholas Lepton, vicar of St. Nicholas, Guildford, appear. Lepton died in 1527. The inclusion of the pomegranate device of Katherine of Aragon in the terracotta fireplaces in the Great Hall and the panelled parlour suggest that they were built while the Queen was still in some favour with the King. Frederick Harrison has suggested that Weston was such a close attendant at the Court that he would have been careful to exclude the Queen's arms the very moment he heard of the King's first interest in a divorce. Harrison's date of pre-1527 is somewhat premature, however. Katherine was not expelled from the palace until 1531, although she was obviously in serious disfavour from about 1528.

---

[106] F. Harrison, Annals of an Old Manor House, Sutton Place, Guilford, London, 1893, p. 120-21, n. 1.

There are striking similarities between Sutton Place and Layer Marney Hall, both architecturally and in the decorative work. They share the common features of hexagonal turrets, parapets and circular staircases. Both make extensive use of diaper work and, of course, there is very similar moulded brick decoration. The dolphin motifs occur in the decorative panels of both. The panels of baluster work (fig. 116) between the Sutton putti are compressed variations of the half-balusters on the tombs at Layer Marney, St. George, Norwich, and Bracon Ash. The putti in square panels at Sutton Place recall those in the vault of the oratory of the Hotel Lallemand (fig. 117), in Bourges, and also, I find, in the vault of the organ gallery at Caudebec. The measurements of the panels dividing the putti are 19 1/4" x 4 1/8".[107] The length of the baluster on the tomb chest of Henry Marney is also approximately 19".[108]

An examination of the use of moulded terracotta in early Tudor architecture in the East and South of England provides some assistance in the attribution of the terracotta monuments that are distributed in the same geographic area.

One of the earliest occurrences of moulded terracotta (as opposed to cut and carved brickwork) is the light pinkish-coloured framing of the four-light Gothic windows at Great Cressingham Manor in Norfolk (fig. 118). Terracotta panels

---

[107] See F. Harrison, op. cit., plate H. and other drawings, with measurements, of details of the terracotta work.

[108] My measurement.

also decorate the upper storey of the south front (fig. 119) of the house. The devices of Jenney (a falcon on a gloved hand) and a wreath enclosing the initials 'J.J.' and 'M.' appear in the larger panels.[109] Panels shaped like the ones below the embattled parapet on the south front of Sutton Place also contain terracotta devices.

Great Snoring Rectory in Norfolk is decorated with square moulded panels (figs. 120 & 122), like those at Sutton and Great Cressingham. Renaissance busts (fig. 121) are found in these panels.[110] The rebus of the owner, Ralph Shelton appears throughout the programme of decoration.

Again in Norfolk, moulded terracotta decorates the window frames at Mannington Hall.

The exterior of East Barsham Hall (figs. 123-27) is covered with moulded terracotta decorative work, including busts in panels, like those at Sutton Place, heraldic plaques and the remains of large heraldic beasts supporting arms over the doorway.[111] At Shrubland Old Hall near Ipswich similar decorative work occurs on the window frames (fig. 128).

---

[109] Rev. J. Kestell-Floyer, 'English Brick Buildings: Henry VII-Henry VIII', The Archaeological Journal, vol. 80, 1923, p. 303; D. Purcell, op. cit., p. 6; J.A. Gotch, Early Renaissance Architecture in England, London, 1914, pp. 60-70.

[110] J. Kestell-Floyer, op. cit., p. 303; D. Purcell, op. cit., p. 5; J. Gotch, op. cit., p. 71.

[111] R. Blomfield, A History of Renaissance Architecture in England, 1500-1800, London, 1897, vol. 1, pp. 4-5.

The rather bulbous nature of the East Anglian terracotta reliefs may derive from decorative woodcarving. There are several examples of this style in woodcarvings in the same area. The finest example is the carved rood screen and stalls in King's College Chapel, Cambridge, dating from c.1532-36, by unknown artists (figs. 129-33). The baluster motifs do appear to derive originally from Norman sources like those found in the churches of Saint-Pierre, Caen, Le Grand Andely and Tillieres-sur-Avre. The quality and the clearly ordered architectural organization of the tiers of decorative friezes, pilasters and semi-circular panels in the Cambridge screen are far superior to the rather haphazard assembly and idiosyncratic design of the East Anglian terracotta monuments.

The ceiling of Bishop West's chapel in Ely Cathedral, also draws ona range of motifs similar to those found on the terracotta monuments. The ceiling (fig. 134) dates from the 1530s. Bishop West visited France in 1518, 1519 and 1525, and was extremely interested in Renaissance art. Finally, one local example of woodcarving that may relate to the terracotta monuments is the pulpit (fig. 135) at Old Catton church, dated 1537. The pulpit was erected for Margaret Jannys, the widow of Robert Jannys of Norwich. The balusters and panels of Renaissance arabesque work are stylistically very similar to the decorative work of the terracotta monuments.

The French taste for predominantly Lombard decorative work applied to native architectural forms was echoed by English patrons during the reign of Henry VIII. It was relatively cheap to incorporate strips of decorative work or 'antique' medallions on traditional Tudor buildings. It is not surprising that moulded brick featuring some Renaissance motifs achieved a degree of popularity with the patrons of these projects. Several of the owners of these houses had visited northern France and the Low Countries and admired the combination of the old with the new in architecture there. There were long-standing traditions of both the import of stone from Caen and the migration of craftsmen from the Low Countries and occasionally from France.[112]

It is quite possible that one or other of the patrons of the architectural projects in East Anglia found craftsmen in Normandy or the Low Countries who returned to help create the Renaissance motifs for the decorative work. On the other hand, the close connection of some of the patrons with the court, and in Sir Richard Weston's case, with Cardinal Wolsey, may have brought them into contact with one of the minor artists working on the terracotta decoration at Hampton Court. Some of the artists at Hampton Court quite possibly worked in northern France before arriving in England.

---

[112] On the import of stone from Caen, see chapter IV. Flemish workers were paid for making and laying bricks for Thomas Stonor's mansion in Oxfordshire in 1416-17. See The Stonor Letters and Papers, ed. C.L. Kingsford, (Camden Society Publications, 3rd series, vol. XXIX), London, 1919, vol. I, p. 30.

It is almost certain that the terracotta tombs were the result of a collaboration between artists of different training and of varied skills. An artist with some experience of working in terracotta or with some knowledge of Renaissance decorative design, possibly from Hampton Court, or from Normandy or the Low Countries, shared his knowledge with craftsmen with little or no experience of true Renaissance art. This would account for the great disparity between the quality of areas like the pilasters filled with motifs culled quite accurately from the classical repertoire, and the crudely fashioned putti or the seated ecclesiastical figures. This collaboration also helps to explain the odd design of the monuments.

There is documented evidence of collaboration between English and Flemish craftsmen in the early Tudor period. Between 1480 and 1481 at Kirby Muxloe in Leicestershire English foremen supervised brickmakers from the Low Countries in the building of the Castle with applied brick reliefs. Six of these foreign workers were paid at a higher rate, presumably for more skilled work, in 'laying anew le Basse Towers...cum pyctura muri'. This is also significant for the evidence it provides that much of this type of work could be applied after the main brickwork was laid.[113]

---

[113] A. Hamilton Thompson, 'The Building Accounts of Kirby Muxloe Castle, 1480-84', Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological Society, vil. XI, parts 3-6, pp. 193-245.

It is even conceivable that the supervision could have been done by an English artist who had worked in France or the Low Countries. Too little documentary evidence survives from this period to construct biographies of contemporary artists and craftsmen. There must have been more English workmen who, like John Hudde, an English mason who worked on the north portico of Bourges cathedral between 1511 and 1515, made the trip across the Channel.[114] There were also, of course, many English workmen employed at Hampton Court.

The numerous building projects where moulded brick occurred in this period suggest that there were enough commissions to support the existence of a workshop or workshops locally. It would seem logical for the kilns to have been set up in England, rather than abroad, as has been suggested by other writers. The terracotta monuments were very probably an off-shoot of the workshop set up for the production of moulded brick decorative work for the architectural projects considered in this chapter. The unconventional aspects of the design of these tombs would be more comprehensible in this context. In the Kirby Muxloe documents, it is stated that the bricks were burned nearby.

Most writers who have studied this group of terracotta monuments suggest that there must have been some reuse of common moulds.[115] There is certainly reuse of moulds within each

---

[114] See H. Dow, 'John Hudde and the English Renaissance', Renaissance News, 18, 1965, pp. 289-94.

[115] Those who have examined the monuments most closely, A.P.

monument. Certain measurements, such as the lengths of pilasters in different cases are close, but the specific combination of elements varies from commission to commission. The Layer Marney tombs do not include the rather clumsy putti that appear in all the other examples except Bracon Ash and Barsham. This may suggest that these monuments are earlier than the others, and that the workshop may have changed slightly afterwards. Perhaps a less skilled artist inherited the patterns from these earlier models and added to the scheme with figures. Technically the work may look unorthodox, but the large size of certain portions that were evidently fired in one piece attests to the skill of the man who fired them.[116] There is also evidence that the monuments were originally gilded in the raised areas and blackened in the contrasting areas, to imitate more expensive materials. The forms would consequently have appeared less 'flabby', and more sophisticated, even in the areas of the awkward clothed putti.

The terracotta busts that Pietro Torrigiano executed in England obviously had no influence on the terracotta tombs without effigies. However, the monuments do exhibit certain characteristics that may derive from the royal tombs by Torrigiano. For instance, the tombs were originally blackened in

---

Baggs, and D. Purcell, who repaired some of them, both claim that common moulds were used but give no measurements to support their assertions.

116 Some of the largest sections from the canopied tombs were 24" x 11" x 3". To fire such large pieces without considerable cracking or warping 'represents a considerable technical achievement' according to A.P. Baggs, op. cit., p. 300.

the shallow areas and gilded in the raised areas to imitate the use of gilded copper and black marble of the royal tombs. This combination of materials was also popular in the Low Countries and in France, as was described in chapter I. If the tombs were made in England, which I believe they were, then the English examples may have been influential. The roundels and garlands on the Marney and Jannys tomb appear to imitate the work of Torrigiano, and the high tomb chest of the Jannys monument may also have been influenced by the extremely high chests of the royal tombs.

To sum up these conclusions: the terracotta monuments were produced by a workshop formed from the collaboration of English sculptors with an artist who had experience of Italian Renaissance decorative work of Lombard origin, probably acquired through experience of Renaissance sculpture in Normandy or the Low Countries. The tombs were also connected with the workshops that produced moulded brick decorative work of a Renaissance type for certain contemporary secular architecture in the East and South of England in the period between 1525 and 1545.

IV. TOMBS IN SUSSEX AND HAMPSHIRE

The Tombs

The group of tombs and the related chantry chapel discussed in this chapter were selected because they incorporate sculpted reliefs of Renaissance motifs within traditional English architectural structures. Evidence provided by biographical information about the donors is integrated with stylistic and iconographic evidence to produce a chronology for the execution of the works. The iconographic origins of the sculpted ex voto relief figures are traced from earlier monumental brasses. The origins and evolution of the imagery of both the decorative areas and the ex voto figures with their devotional centrepieces are examined in order to identify the nature of the workshop responsible for the tombs and chantry.

The Donors of the Tombs

The people commemorated by these monuments were all courtiers or well-to-do gentry. Their names appear frequently in local records in connection with all aspects of local government, such as

responsibility for musters, etc., and they held other offices, both in local government and at court.[1] At least two of the donors participated in the assessment or purchase of former Church lands and properties after the Dissolution.[2] Clearly, Thomas West, 8th Lord La Warr and the 9th Lord, also Thomas, were the most socially and politically prestigious individuals of this group.[3] The rest were from families on the periphery of the court circle, in an area geographically well-placed for trade and access to continental Europe. The families in question were also, in some cases, related by marriage, which facilitated the exchange of patterns and the recommendations of artists or masons between patrons.[4]

---

[1] Sir John Dawtrey, for example, was Sheriff of Sussex in 1527. In 1542 William Ernley was Representative for Chichester.

[2] The Commissioners who assessed Boxgrove Priory when it was suppressed were Sir John Dawtrey of Morehouse, near Petworth, William Palmer of Angmering and Thomas Mores. Thomas West bought Boxgrove from the King for £136 13s. 4d. J. Dallaway and E. Cartwright, A History of the West Division of Sussex, London, 1815-30, vol. II, p. 126.

[3] D.N.B., vol. 20, pp. 1252-55. Thomas West, 9th Lord La Warr, was made a commissioner for Sussex to receive oaths to the Act of Succession in 1534. He maintained his allegiance to Roman Catholicism after the Reformation as faithfully as was possible without endangering his life. In December 1538 he was detained in the Tower, suspected of sympathizing with the Northern Rebellion. He acted more cautiously after this incident, but did declare himself for Mary Tudor when Northumberland attempted to put Lady Jane Grey on the throne.

[4] Sir John Ernley of West Wittering, who died in 1521, married Margaret, daughter of Edward Dawtrey of Petworth, for his second wife. Rev. Codrington, 'Ancient Coats-of-Arms in Chichester Cathedral', S.A.C., vol. XLVIII, 1905, pp. 138-44,

Architectural Style of the Monuments

In the meagre literature where a discussion of these tombs is found, local antiquarians or architectural amateurs frequently remark on the strange mingling of English Gothic architectural forms with 'foreign' Renaissance motifs. Architecturally, these tombs were the newest update on the traditional English Tudor type of a simple tomb chest of quatrefoiled panels supporting coats-of-arms, set in a wall recess under a depressed Tudor arch. The type of tomb chest at Racton, Petworth and Westhampnett consists of three panels of twelve diamond shapes supporting arms. At Racton and Petworth the three panels are separated by two narrow vertical rectangular trefoiled niches, once containing the statuettes of saints. At West Wittering there is a slight variation: three panels of arms divided by four narrow rectangular panels with a baldaquin containing pitifully fragmentary figures of saints. This is closer to the form of the tomb of the 8th Lord La Warr at Broadwater, where the tomb chest is composed of four panels alternating with five pointed niches. At Selsey the type is varied - three panels of ten compartments with no dividing panels, the saints set in panels flanking the central reliefs of the donors in the upper panel of the wall recess. The second tomb at Broadwater appears to be the final development of the type, possibly by a later artist. There are no donors, only larger figures of the Virgin and Child, and St. George, flanking a missing central relief, probably a

---

p. 143 identifies the arms of this union.

representation of the Gnadenstuhl, or Throne of Grace, judging from the outline of the form that remains. At West Wittering, on the monument that may be the tomb of William Ernley, the tomb chest is radically different: pilasters of flattened decorative work, consisting of candelabra supported by putti, and exotic floral and arabesque work of a primitive quality flank a scene of the Annunciation. The tomb chest at East Tisted consists of three square panels containing coats-of-arms, enclosed by Renaissance decorative motifs of flaming urns and floral arabesques. The urn motif replaces the older trefoil to fill the corner spaces.

It is on the chantry at Boxgrove that the fullest and most unusual range of Renaissance imagery and motifs is found, juxtaposed with conventional English motifs imposed on an early Tudor architectural structure. Sinuous arabesques and floral flourishes are entwined around the English type of clothed angels supporting traditional heraldic devices on a canopy crocketted and pinnacled in a Gothic manner. Similar crocketted pinnacles and balusters occur on the tombs at Petworth and Racton, and a later variant on the same theme at Broadwater. The chantry is a free-standing structure, like a huge canopied tomb, with a doorway in one side allowing entrance to the chantry altar. The lower half of the walls is decorated with diamond-shaped panels, divided by vertical niches. Attached columns support the canopy. Two tiers of friezes run around the pinnacled and crocketted canopy. On all of the tombs except at Selsey and Westhampnett are found traces of Renaissance motifs: drinking birds or

elaborate candelabra with flabby putti acting as heraldic supporters. The absence of such devices at Westhampnett and at Selsey suggests that these were the earliest monuments in the group, along with the tomb of the 8th Lord La Warr at Broadwater. However, the canopy of the Selsey tomb is missing, and may have included Renaissance motifs.

The Donor Imagery: Influence of Monumental Brasses

One of the most striking features of the tombs is the relief portraying kneeling donors. The image of the kneeling donor in funerary art appeared frequently on monumental brasses of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in England and northern Europe. In France and Flanders the donor sometimes caused a small inscribed plaque to be set on the wall behind the tomb to record the number of masses founded for his soul. In certain cases the plaque was accompanied by an image of the deceased kneeling before a Crucifix, or a Pietà, with donor saints. Many examples of this type were destroyed during the Wars of Religion.[5] An example of a French donor with a Pietà is that of Rénaud de Brunfay (died 1503) from the Charniers des Innocents, Paris (fig. 136). French and Flemish manuscript illuminations, panel paintings and glass influenced the development of the motif.[6] However, the votive figures usually made their devotions to a

[5] M. Norris, Monumental Brasses: the Craft, London, 1978, p. 291.

[6] M. Norris, op. cit., p. 76, n. 13. At St. James, Ghent, the deceased, Wouter Gautier, is commemorated in a painting by Hugo van der Goes.

representation of the Virgin and Child, a Pietà, the Trinity or a Crucifix. In this respect the Sussex reliefs do not conform to the earlier types, since newer iconographic centrepieces are the objects of veneration for the donors in some of these tombs. All of the reliefs in the Sussex group employ an image associated with the Resurrection or the Sacrifice of Christ, implying a strong link with the Easter Sepulchre.

One of the earliest surviving examples of a donor figure engraved on a monumental brass in England is that of a lady at Sedgefield, Durham, which dates from around 1320. One of the first of this type that can be identified with a named donor is that of John Strete (died 1405) at Upper Hardres in Kent.[7] A further development of the theme occurs at Kenton in Suffolk. Here John Garneys and his wife kneel, each at a prie-dieu, with attendant children, scrolls and a Crucifix above.[8] The brass of William Crysford (died 1520) at Ewhurst, is one of the first of this type to appear in Sussex.[9] Another early Sussex brass of this type is that of John Goring (died 1520) at Burton (fig. 137). The first surviving example in Sussex with a central

---

[7] M. Norris, op. cit., p. 76. Other early examples are John Ruggewyn (died 1412) at Standon, Hertfordshire (Norris, plate 90); John Stathum (died 1454) and wife at Morley, Derbyshire (plate 89). The Stathum brass includes a figure of St. Christopher.

[8] Ibid., p. 103, fig. 98.

[9] Burrell Additional MS 5697 fo. 57r records the lost inscription for this brass: 'Hic jacet Will(e)lm(u)s Crysford qui obit sexto/ Die Februarij anno D(omi)ni M CCCCC et XX/ Cujus a(nima)e propricietur Deus. Amen.'

devotional image is that of a knight and his three wives on a brass at Slaugham, and it dates from the 1520s.[10] Here four members of the Covert family pray to a fragment of a scene of the Resurrection. The inclusion of the Resurrection and the positioning of the tomb suggest that the tomb functioned as an Easter Sepulchre. The Resurrection is depicted by an open sarcophagus in which the Redeemer stands erect, holding a staff and a cross in his left hand, whilst his right hand is raised in benediction. In front of the sarcophagus, which is decorated with roundels, lie two sleeping soldiers, the head of a third protruding from behind the tomb.

Many more examples of this type survive in Sussex. The Shirleys of Isfield were commemorated by a series of brasses. Ralph Shirley's memorial includes images of himself and his wife, both kneeling; his two sons and five daughters; three shields; two scrolls and a (lost) Holy Trinity. John Shirley, who died in 1526, also chose to be remembered by a (lost) brass, whose indent and inscription remain. His will survives, and reveals that he specified the type of sepulchral monument he desired, including brasses:

> My body to be buried in the parishe churche of Isfield in the countie of Sussex wt my chapell there where the Lordes of the said Lordeship hath ben accustomed to be buried, in such place ther as shalbe devysed by myn

---

[10] Mrs. C.E.D. Davidson-Houston, 'Sussex Monumental Brasses: Part IV', S.A.C., vol. LXXIX, 1937, pp. 74-131, p. 124, suggests that the elements of the composition of the Slaugham brass, Richard Covert, his three successive wives and the Resurrection, were engraved at different dates, c.1525, 1527 and 1547. Richard Covert died in 1546.

> executours under a Tombe of marbill there sett and made by my meanes at my costes and charges, wt pyctours printed in plate and myn armes therin shewed and stryken in the said Tombe.[11]

The prevalence of this type of memorial for Sussex gentry in the period up to about 1530 reflects contemporary sepulchral trends in the rest of England, particularly in the South.[12] The brasses were a fairly inexpensive and yet impressive and durable form of memorial for those in the middle of the social register: clerics; prosperous merchants; and the lower gentry.[13]

Although few examples from the 1530s and 1540s survive in Sussex, there are some very interesting brasses from this period elsewhere in England and Ireland. One of these is the brass of Geoffrey Fyche (died 1537), in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. This extremely fine brass depicts a Knight, dressed in Parliamentary robes, kneeling at a prie-dieu, a scroll recording his prayers. He gazes at a small altar, rendered in perspective, where the Virgin and a holy group form a type of Pietà.[14] A cross

---

[11] The will of John Shirley is dated 1 March 1526 and was proved 23 November 1529. The original state of the memorial can be seen in a fragmentary drawing in The Anastic Drawing Society, 1878, plate 34 (Resurrection); J. Lewis Andre, 'Female Head-dress exemplified by Sussex Brasses', S.A.C., vol. XLII, 1899, pp. 1-18, no. 14 (head of a Lady).

[12] See J. Bertram, Lost Brasses, North Pomfret, Vt., 1976, pp. 116-40, for a comparison of Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Surrey and Sussex over a period of five hundred years. In all of these counties the 1540s were declining years for the production of brasses.

[13] The cost of a brass of average size and quality varied between £2-£4, M. Norris, op. cit., p. 53. The average-sized brass from c.1465-1538 rarely exceeded £2.

is visible in the background. The whole scene takes place in an engraved trompe-l'oeil panelled chapel. This setting is closer in effect to the panelled niches enclosing the later sculpted reliefs in this group of tombs. This particular brass was probably imported from Europe.

An even later occurrence of a similar type of brass memorial is that of Thomas Fromond (died 1542), at Cheam in Surrey.[15]

A survey of both lost and surviving brasses in Sussex for the period c.1300-1700 reveals that the peak period for the production of these memorials was around 1490-1510, with a decline from over forty at the zenith to less than five by c.1550.[16] A gradual recovery seems to have taken place in the 1550s and a new peak was reached by about 1600. A decline in the economy, beginning in c.1520, may have been one of the chief factors affecting the drop in production.[17] Until the later Elizabethan period, and most particularly during the reign of Edward VI, religious and political instability tended to discourage the commissioning of elaborate sepulchral monuments

---

[14] M. Norris, op. cit., plate 232.

[15] Ibid., plate 268. In the 1540s, at a time when brasses were not being produced so frequently elsewhere in the South of England, they continued to be particularly popular in Surrey. This may suggest a tendency for the nouveau-riche, living within a reasonable distance of London, who made up a large section of the community, to aspire to conservative forms of memorials, although brasses were becoming less fashionable.

[16] J. Bertram, op. cit., p. 122., and table 10, p. 120.

[17] Ibid., p. 121.

with controversial religious iconography. The situation in Sussex is fairly representative of the general pattern in England in the sixteenth century.

Dating the Tombs

Dating the tombs is extremely difficult. Only by combining fragmentary information from the wills of donors and church records with any signs of stylistic development can any date be suggested. The following pages present a collection of such information about the tombs that allows some conclusions to be formed about the chronology of the works.

Broadwater, Sussex.

The tomb (fig. 138) of the 8th Lord La Warr may not have been finished by his death in 1524, though it may have been begun following the death of his first wife, Elizabeth Mortimer, since the Mortimer arms are on the monument. By his will, dated 8 October 1524, he requested that:

> my body to be buried in the Tombe of freestone within the chauncell of the parishe churche of Brodwater.

He also called for the sale of his Garter collar, chain, and several silver objects to ensure that he might be buried 'according to my honour'.[18] The tomb was complete by 1536, according to Elynour West, who survived her husband and wrote in her will:

---

[18] Will dated 8 October 1524 (P.C.C. 12 More fo. 37) proved 12 February 1525.

> ...and my bodie to be buryed in the tombe wt my Lord Thomas Laware my late bedfelowe being in the chauncell in and of the parishe churche of Brodewater in the countie of Sussex...[19]

This does not prove that the tomb was already finished by this date, although the body had been interred there, since Elynour went on to request:

> Also I will that five and fifty pounds be bestowed upon all necessary and requisite thyngs pteyning or incydent to my sepulture or burying according to my honour.

Boxgrove, Sussex.

Around the northeast pendant of the chantry at Boxgrove Priory (fig. 139) an inscription runs:

> Of your charitie pray for the soul of Thomas La Warr and Elizabeth his wife...1532.

The building of this chantry was the project of the 9th Lord La Warr. Through the dowry of his first wife, Elizabeth Bonville of Halnaker, the patronage of Boxgrove Priory had passed to the West family. At the Dissolution Boxgrove was bought by Lord La Warr, and later passed into the hands of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, who died in 1579.[20] Thomas West obviously planned to be buried at Boxgrove, but the chantry was not finished by the time the monastery was suppressed. The 9th Lord La Warr wrote to

---

[19] Will dated 10 May 1536 (P.C.C. Hogen fo. 41) proved 14 November 1536.

[20] Rev. A.E. Turner, 'The Priory of Boxgrove', S.A.C., vol. VII, 1863, p. 103, notes that at the Dissolution Boxgrove was valued at £125 13s 4d, and it housed eight monk/priests and one novice. See also E. Popham, Round and about Boxgrove Priory, Chichester, 1934; W.H. Blaauw, 'Sussex Monasteries at the Time of their Suppression', S.A.C., vol. VII, 1865, p. 217.

Thomas Cromwell to explain that he had knocked down the church and monastic buildings and wished to keep 'the poor chapel' of his ancestors.[21] Although Thomas West was initially granted Boxgrove, he was forced to accept Wherwell Abbey, in Hampshire, in 1540 in exchange for it. This explains the use of Broadwater for his burial site instead. The chantry is a development from the model of the tomb of the 8th Lord: each unit of the chantry resembles the tomb chest and canopy of the earlier tomb at Broadwater.

Petworth, Sussex.

At Petworth the most likely donor of the monument (figs. 140 & 141) is Sir John Dawtrey, who died in 1542, and whose will reads:

> And my bodie to be buried in the churche of Petworth, nere where my wife lyeth.[22]

John Dawtrey's first wife was Jane Shirley of Wiston, whose arms appear on the tomb. Since no sum of money was set aside in the will of the first John for his sepulchral monument, this was probably built during his lifetime for his wife, who died before him. Dawtrey wished to be buried near his wife, suggesting that the tomb had been built after his wife's death and before 1542.

---

[21] W.H. St. John Hope, 'Boxgrove Church and Monastery', S.A.C., vol. XLIII, 1899, pp. 158-66, p. 161.

[22] Will dated 23 August 1542 (P.C.C. Spert fo. 15).

[23] A.H. Maude, The Story of Petworth Parish Church, New Malden and Haslemere, n.d., p. 6. See also T.W. Horsfield, The History, Antiquities and Topography of the County of Sussex

The monument was cleaned and restored in 1958.[23] John, his son, stated that he wished to be buried 'in St. Thomas' chapel'.[24]

Racton, Sussex.

The tomb on the north side of the chancel at Racton is particularly difficult to date (figs. 142 & 143). The will of a John Gunter of Racton exists and could be connected with the donor of the monument. By this will, dated 30 September 1557, John Gunter stated, '...and my body to be buried in the chapel at Racton'.[25] Yet the 'I.G.' in the spandrels of the tomb could equally well refer to an earlier Gunter of the same name, who died in the 1540s (fig. 144). The stylistic similarities linking this with the other tombs in the group suggests that it, too, was more likely to have been built in the 1540s.[26] The arms are all Gunter impaling Cooke. Neither of the wives of the John Gunter who died in 1557 was a Cooke (his first wife was Jane Aylworth and his second Jane Tyrrel).

West Wittering, Sussex.

Lewes, 1835, p. 179.

[24] Will of John Dawtrey, 13 December 1549 (P.C.C. Coode, fo. 1).

[25] Will of John Gunter, 30 September 1557 (P.C.C. Noodes, fo. 29) proved 17 July 1558.

[26] See also V.C.H of Sussex, vol. IV, pp. 116-17.

The two monuments at West Wittering (figs. 145-148a) are also not easy to date. They have been moved from their original position (fig. 148b), at right-angles to one and other, and now lie along the same wall.[27]

The monuments are definitely connected with William Ernley, who died in 1545.[28] Again the initials of the donors, 'W.E.' and 'E.W.' are set in the spandrels of the arched tomb recess, and in the escutcheons. On the chamfered slab is inscribed: '...yr charity pray...William and Elizabeth hys wif...'. William Ernley was Representative for Chichester in 1542, and the son of the Chief justice of Common Pleas. Ernley's first wife was Elizabeth Bond, who died in 1528. Their son was Francis Ernley (died 1547). William's second wife was Briget Spring of Lavenham.[29] The arms of Spring appear on one of the monuments. Ernley's will states: '...and my bodie to be buried in the churche of West Wittering...if I die within...myles...'. His 'loving wyff Brigett' was his executrix.[30]

---

[27] J. Dallaway, op. cit., p. 297. See Buckler drawing, BM Addit. MS 5674 fo. 70 (133).

[28] V.C.H of Sussex, vol. IV, pp. 220-21.

[29] J. Dallaway, op. cit., p. 297. See W. H. Godfrey, 'West Wittering - the Ernley Tombs', Sussex Notes and Queries, vol. VI, 1937, pp. 120-21.

[30] Will of William Ernley, dated 15 January 1545 (P.C.C. Alen fo. 3) proved 18 February 1546.

Briget married for her second husband Sir Henry Hussey of Slinfold, a firm supporter of Queen Mary and the restoration of Catholicism.[31] Briget's will of 23 September 1557 reads:

> ...and my bodie to be buried within the churche at West Wyteringe...my executors shall doo see and provide the last will and Testament of my said husband William Ernley and all his debtes, legacies whiche yet be not performed or paied be by theym...and my said executors and pay Henry Hussey's debts too.[32]

This suggests that William had already completed the monuments at West Wittering before his death in 1545. The monuments appear to date from this period. It has been suggested that the eastern tomb may commemorate William's first wife, Elizabeth Bond, since the arms of Bond are found on that tomb (figs. 145 & 146). The second monument (figs. 147 & 148) may be a separate Easter Sepulchre. Briget Ernley was eventually buried at Slinfold with her second husband.[33]

Westhampnett, Sussex.

Of all the tombs in the group, the one at Westhampnett is the most difficult to connect with a donor or documents (figs. 149 & 150). It has been identified as the tomb of Richard Sackville and his wife Elizabeth, and dated to 'around 1535'.[34] A will exists

---

[31] See J. Lewis Andre, 'Slinfold', S.A.C., vol. XL, 1896, pp. 51-52.

[32] Will of Briget Hussey, dated 24 September 1557 (P.C.C. Noodes fo. 18), proved 2 May 1558.

[33] W. H. Godfrey, op. cit., pp. 120-21.

[34] V.C.H of Sussex, vol. IV, p. 178. See also G.M. Hills, 'West-Hampnett Church, chiefly in reference to its Roman Remains', S.A.C., vol. XXI, 1869, pp. 33-43. See also Buckler

for a Richard Sackville who died on 24 May 1523. The testator refers to his wife Isabel and son Richard. This seems too early for the style of the monument. The most likely explanation is that the tomb is of Richard Sackville's son Richard or another relative named Richard, for whom the date of death is not known. The second Richard Sackville married Elizabeth Thetcher, daughter of Thomas Thetcher of Westhampnett who died in 1536. Richard and Elizabeth may be commemorated by this monument of the 1540s.

Selsey, Sussex.

The tomb at Selsey poses fewer problems concerning the date of its execution. (figs. 151a & 151b). It is certainly the tomb of John Lews, who married Agatha Lovel, daughter and heir of Richard Lovel and Agatha Gorge.[35] John later married a second wife at a later date, after Agatha died in 1537. The tomb was erected to commemorate Agatha, probably shortly after her death. John Lews died on 12 April 1567. According to his will, his body was to be buried in the tomb that had already been constructed on the north side of the the chancel of what is now Church Norton church.[36] John Lews was responsible for the muster of 1539, and he wears armour appropriate to his office, instead of the more usual civilian dress worn by the donors of the other monuments.[37] The

---

drawing BM Additional MS 5674 fo. 66 (125).

[35] See E. Heron-Allen, Selsey Bill, London, 1911, pp. 250-254 and pl. XXX.

[36] V.C.H of Sussex, vol. IV, p. 208.

[37] E. Heron-Allen, op. cit., p. 254.

lease of the bishop's demesne of Selsey came to John Lews through his marriage to Agatha. He was her third husband, after John Wayte and John Rede. The inclusion of the arms of Lovel, Gorge and Wayte strongly imply that the monument was paid for by Agatha to commemorate her family and first husband. The inscription, 'Sanctus Trinitas. deus. deus' suggests that the missing centrepiece was another depiction of the Gnadenstuhl. No children are included on this monument. John's daughter, Briget Lews, married Thomas Lewknor, the grandson of Richard Lewknor and Mary West, a member of the La Warr family.

East Tisted, Hampshire.

The tomb at East Tisted is in the south aisle (fig. 152) of the church.[38] The relief depicts the kneeling figures of Richard Norton and his wife Elizabeth Rotherfield. Richard died in 1556 and it is thought that the tomb was erected before his death. The centrepiece is a Resurrection scene. Eight sons and ten daughters are depicted in relief beside their parents. Included in the monument are the arms of 1) Norton; 2) Norton impaling Rotherfield and 3) Rotherfield. Richard Norton married a second wife, Anne. This monument was probably erected by Richard Norton after the death of his first wife, Elizabeth Rotherfield. The relief of the Resurrection is in better condition than the other reliefs in the group. Stylistically, it looks later than the other tombs, and probably dates from the 1550s.

---

[38] V.C.H. of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, vol. III, p. 34.

Yapton, Sussex.

This tomb is very badly damaged. The most interesting surviving panel shows fragments of the torso of Christ, flanked by the instruments of the Passion and Flagellation (fig. 153). The lower halves of the reliefs of the donors and their children remain under a round-headed arch with traces of Renaissance decorative work. Since no arms survive on the monument no donor can be conclusively connected with the tomb. The church was leased through the Fitzalans of Arundel, but the sources are too fragmentary to be of use. The only testator of the period who can be linked with the church is Richard Trowell who desired that his body be buried in the church of Yapton.

Broadwater, Sussex.

There is evidence to establish the latest possible date by which the tomb of Thomas West, 9th Lord La Warr, was completed. West died in 1554 and stated in his will:

> ...and my body shalbe buryed by sufferaunce of god within the parishe churche of Brodewater, in a power remembraunce that I have made there in the south side of the said churche...[39]

The monument must have been begun before 1554, though not necessarily finished by that date (figs. 154-156). The tomb was situated in the south aisle of the church until the 1820s. By 1854 it had been moved to the south transept.[40]

---

[39] Will dated 5 September 1554 (P.C.C. More 37) proved 12 November 1554.

[40] V.C.H of Sussex, vol. VI, pt. 1, p. 80. See also W. Burges,

The Tombs and the Easter Sepulchre

The form of the Easter Sepulchre, particularly in England, has been the subject of many studies.[41] By the sixteenth century it usually consisted of a moveable wooden structure that was placed on a flat altar in the chancel before Good Friday. The consecrated host and a crucifix from the high altar were set in place until Easter Sunday, concealed, often by curtains (usually the gift of the donor in his will), and a watch was set up until Easter Eve, in commemoration of the imprisonment, Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ. Lights were burned at the vigil, and these, once again, were often provided for in the testators' wills.

The positioning of the Easter Sepulchre on the north wall of the chancel was customary in England by the thirteenth century. Frequently testators stated that their tombs should be erected on the north side of the chancel, as near the high altar as possible, and that their altar tomb should serve as the Easter

---

'The Tomb and Helm of Thomas La Warre', The Archaeological Journal, vol. XXXVI, pp. 78-87; F. Harrison and O.H. Leeney, 'The Church of St. Mary, Broadwater', S.A.C., vol. LXXIV, 1933, pp. 98-130.

[41] One of the most recent studies with an up-dated bibliography on the topic is P. Sheingorn, 'The Sepulchrum Domini: a Study in Art and Liturgy', Studies in Iconology, vol. IV, 1978, pp. 37-60, taken from the author's 1974 doctoral thesis for the University of Wisconsin. Prior to this, N.C. Brooks, 'The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy', University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Urbana, vol. IX, 1921, pp. 139-247, is useful. For England see A. Heales, 'The Easter Sepulchre', Archaeologia, vol. XLII, 1869, pp. 263-308, and P.H. Philibert Feasey, 'The Easter Sepulchre', The Ecclesiastical Review, vol. XXXII, 1905, pp. 337-55.

Sepulchre.[42] A local example of this is found in the will of Thomas Fenys, second Lord Dacre, who died on 1 September 1533. The will reads:

> And my body to be buried in the p'ishe churche of Herstmonceux in the north side of the high awlter there where the Sepulchre is used to be made and ordeyned convenient for the making and setting of the same Sepulchre...[43]

Newer Iconography of the Passion and Resurrection

One explanation for the introduction of the newer iconography of the centrepiece around which the donors are grouped in these reliefs, instead of the more traditional motifs found in the earlier monumental brasses discussed previously, is that the tombs were intended for use as Easter Sepulchres and the imagery is consequently more closely linked to the scenes of Christ's Passion. This imagery indicates a new theological emphasis on personal salvation through prayer.[44]

---

[42] K. Bonnell, 'The Easter Sepulchrum in its Relations to the Architecture of the High Altar', P.M.L.A., vol. XXXI, 1916, p. 665, cites examples from many wills where the testators chose the place already established for the Easter Sepulchre and provided a more durable form of the traditionally more portable structure the donor's family set up as an Easter Sepulchre.

[43] The will of Thomas Fenys, 2nd Lord Dacre (died 1 September 1531) refers to the setting up of his tomb as an Easter Sepulchre: 'And apparell to be made and bought for the said sepulchre at my cost and charge in the honour of the most blessed sacrament and my Saviour Jesu Christ. And I will that myn executours geve towarde the light of the seid sepulchre oon hundred poundes of wax to be made in Tapers of tenne poundes oon pece to bren about the same...'.

[44] See C. Christensen, Art and the Reformation in Germany, Athens, Ohio, 1979, pp. 155-90 on epitaph memorials. This

The tombs in question depict representations of the Resurrection with sleeping guards, on the Ernley monument at West Wittering and the Norton tomb at East Tisted in Hampshire; of the Risen Redeemer on the Gunter memorial at Racton; of the Crucified Christ revealing his wounds, again at West Wittering; of the Gnadenstuhl, showing the Crucified Christ supported on the lap of God the Father, at Westhampnett, and possibly again at Petworth (the central portion of each has been lost: only the outline of the image and 'IHS' remain) and Selsey; and Christ and the instruments of his Passion at Yapton. Even the panel of the Annunciation at West Wittering is also linked with the imagery and meaning of the Easter Sepulchre in this context: 25 March, the date celebrated as the time of the arrival of the Angel to Mary, was also regarded as the day of the death of Christ and Adam.[45] At Godshill (Isle of Wight), there is a fresco of a budding cross, with an image of Christ crucified on a triple-branched lily.[46]

---

study examines about seventy Protestant epitaph memorials, dating between 1540 and 1600, in Germany. The themes of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection were the two most popular subjects occurring on the memorials. Both of these subjects are associated with redemption through sacrifice, and suggest a greater doctrinal emphasis on personal salvation.

[45] G. Schiller, The Iconography of Christian Art, Greenwich, Conn., 1981, vol. I, p. 34.

[46] H.A.M. Worsley, Godshill: its Church and Its Churchyard, Newport, 1927, p. 11, refers to Sir John Leigh obtaining a license for the chapel to be turned into a chantry in 1520, suggesting that the painting was executed afterwards.

The donor figures of the Sussex reliefs could be interpreted as the representatives of mankind, the descendants of Adam, thus providing a connection between the Fall, the hope of man's Redemption and its achievement through Christ's Passion and Resurrection.

It is also significant that none of the tombs portrays the deceased as a recumbent effigy, only as a kneeling figure in the presence of the Saviour, now presumably possessed of eternal life. This compares interestingly with the German practice of making an effigy of a dead Christ to fit in a tomb recess where the Easter Sepulchre was to be set, surrounded by figures representing the mourning holy women.[47] The English Easter Sepulchre usually omitted the effigy of the dead Christ altogether. The empty tomb was intended to promise the Resurrection.[48] Most English tombs that were intended to double as Easter Sepulchres do not have an effigy of the deceased donor, either. Instead they often substituted an inlaid brass, or as in

---

[47] P. Sheingorn, op. cit., pp. 44-45, notes examples of the Holy group at St. Florein, Niedershaslach, where the holy women are grouped around an effigy of the dead Christ. Sleeping guards appear in the arches below. In Italy, the sculptors Guido Mazzoni and Niccolo dell'Arca produced the strange large-scale terracottas of free-standing, dramatic groups of holy mourners and the dead Christ. It is thought that the donor had himself portrayed as one of the mourning figures in these groups. There are also many examples of large-scale representations of the dead Christ in French churches of the time.

[48] Ibid., pp. 43-44, 'The lack of an effigy states the message that the tomb is empty, the soldiers are sufficient evidence that it was Christ's tomb. At Lincoln, Christ's empty tomb explicitly stating the promise of Resurrection is especially meaningful in combination with the donor's tomb which adjoined immediately to the west.'

these tombs, a sculpted relief of the donor kneeling and worshipping in the tomb recess, almost as if in life, in an illusionistic room or chapel. The scrolls of entreaties and prayers also contribute towards the function of these monuments as highly personal vehicles of private devotion. They are depictions of the deceased in his or her own private chantry. Although from 1529 no payment for masses for the dead was permitted, the practice continued for many years. By 1547, however, the wealth of the chantries had passed to the Crown. These memorials suggest a powerful affirmation of the triumph over death personified by the figure of Christ after the Resurrection.

The tomb of the 8th Lord La Warr at Broadwater probably included a painted Resurrection scene in the recess where the Garter shield stands today. There are earlier examples of painted Resurrection scenes on tombs at East Berholt (Suffolk); Ashton (Devon); and St. Mary-de-Crypt (Gloucester).

Early English Printed Books and the Imagery of the Reliefs

The imagery found in the sculpted reliefs on these tombs, and in particular on the chantry at Boxgrove, is very similar to the type found in early Renaissance French and English printed books. A comparison between images sculpted on the Boxgrove chapel and illustrations from a group of early printed books proves that the artist responsible for the chantry took as his source early

printed books originally of French provenance. The examples shown here are the closest parallels so far identified between these illustrations and the Boxgrove reliefs. The first example is, however, of an illustration that is identical with the relief, and is unquestionably the origin of the image.

The iconographic programme at Boxgrove was composed of subjects found in the decorative borders of Books of Hours associated with the printer Philippe Pigouchet, originating in the 1490s. These subjects that were deemed appropriate to accompany the main illustrations of Books of Hours, included the Labours of the Months; the zodiacal signs; figures of saints; scenes from the life of Christ; histories of Susanna, or the Prodigal Son; prophets, sibyls, and other signs prefiguring the end of the world or the Last Judgement; the sacraments; scenes of games and pastimes; the combat between the Virtues and the Vices; 'grotesques', including wild men, putti and animals; and 'danses macabres'.[49] These small border scenes were often regrouped according to the choice of the printer. Many of the comparisons selected originated in the shop of the printer Philippe Pigouchet for Simon Vostre, although it must be acknowledged that these images circulated for about twenty-five years amongst printers who included Antoine Vérard, Jéhan Du Pré, and Thielman Kerver.[50]

---

[49] See G. Souchal, 'Un grand peintre français de la fin du XVe siècle: le maître de la Chasse à la Licorne', Revue de l'art, vol. 22, 1973, p. 29 n. 29.

[50] G. Souchal, op. cit., pp. 33-49, connects these engravings with the illuminator of the Très Petites Heures of Anne of Brittany, Paris, B.N., MS. Nav., acqu. lat. 3120. She suggests

English printing in the early sixteenth century was chiefly influenced by French printers, mainly from Paris and Rouen. Richard Pynson's Missale ad usum Sarum, produced for the bibliophile Cardinal Morton, around 1500, has been hailed as 'the first artistic book' produced in England.[51] In England in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth century, printers like Wynkyn de Worde, Richard Pynson and Julian Notary continued to use blocks from French and Flemish sources, particularly border and in-text illustrations. Illustrations were neglected and often omitted from English books in the early period of English printing.

The Chantry at Boxgrove

Two Men Throwing Fruit to a Girl.

On one of the columns supporting the roof of the chantry, two males in Tudor dress climb a tree and pluck fruit, which they throw down to a girl who catches it in her apron (fig. 157). This scene does not have any obvious iconographical prototype. It may be a reference to picking the fruit of the Tree of Life, or, it has been suggested, may be a more general allusion to Paradise.[52]

---

that this unknown illuminator may have supervised the translation of his miniatures into engravings for the great printers of Paris in the 1480s.

[51] H.R. Plomer, English Printers' Ornaments, London, 1924, p. 19.

[52] G. Schiller, op. cit., vol. I, p. 40 and fig. 77. The Tree of Life yielded her fruit every month for the redemption of the faithful. Walter Cahn suggested this reference to Paradise.

This image is identical to a border illustration from a page of the Hours of Rome (fig. 158) printed by J. Burges, P. Huvin, and J. Cousins.[53] This is itself a reverse of an image that originally came from the printer Philippe Pigouchet (fig. 159).[54] This illustration shows two youths in late fifteenth-century dress climbing a vertical tree trunk and picking fruit to throw to the maiden below, who holds her apron open to receive the fruit. The scene may depict a scene from the Labours of the Months.[55]

The similarity of format - the narrow vertical border of the page and the slender upright of the Caen stone column forming one corner of the box-like chantry - may have suggested the employment of the model of the printed page for a pattern. As a composition, the climbing scene acts as a visual device to emphasize the column's vertical form.

Prophet Busts.

The strange busts of 'oriental' figures that appear in the upper frieze of the canopy of the chantry (figs. 160 & 161) are also found in Books of Hours. The busts also fulfil a compositional function, filling in the corners of the frieze, as

---

[53] Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 2862.

[54] Book of Hours, 16 September 1498. Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 2912.

[55] One of the Labours of the Months in a medallion in the vault of the choir in Salisbury Cathedral depicts two youths harvesting fruit and throwing it into the apron of a girl below. The frescoes date from the fourteenth century.

their printed counterparts functioned as a space-filling device in the corner of a page border. In printed book illustrations, prophets also appear on pedestals that frame the main scene (fig. 162). One figure appears at each end of the frieze. The left-hand figure is distinguished by a type of crenellated headdress and tasselled capped sleeves. The right-hand one wears a turban-like hat with a tassel and ringlets. This bearded figure is the most deliberately exotic. Both hold blank scrolls to represent their prophecies. The scrolls may have originally contained painted messages, like those in the printed images. The figures point meaningfully at the central images of the angels supporting the coats-of-arms of the deceased.

These figures are similar to ones found in Oswen of Ipswich's Exhortation to the Sick of c.1549.[56] Busts of prophets, displaying scrolls, decorate the border of this popular devotional book (fig. 163). The same type of motif occurs quite commonly in other book illustrations (fig. 164). For example, Richard Pynson produced a woodcut of the Resurrection of Christ (fig. 165) in which an exotic city-scape, representing Jerusalem, is framed by columns supporting an arch. In the spandrels of the arch are two half-length figures, in 'eastern' dress, one of whom points to the scene below.[57] Other examples occur in Philippe Pigouchet's 1496 Book of Hours (fig. 166). Prophets and sibyls

[56] H.R. Plomer, English Printers' Ornaments, fig. 81.

[57] See J. Hodnett, The English Woodcut, 1480-1535, London, 1923 fig. 116: Richard Pynson, no. 1356, 1512, 8 kal. Mar., Missale ad usum Sarum.

prefigured the Nativity, but could also prefigure the death of Christ, as was appropriate for a chantry chapel.

God the Father in Creation.

At the opposite end of the chantry to the prophet figures, in the lower right corner of the upper canopy frieze, is an image representing a crowned figure kneeling before the sun and the moon (fig. 167). In the opposite corner of the same face of the canopy is a standing figure pointing to a group of fluttering birds. The next frieze contains a crowned figure pointing to clouds with the left hand, while the figure in the opposite corner points to an angel above, and appears to be standing on two tiny angels or children (fig. 168). Each figure faces away from the central motif, in the first case, the arms supported by two clothed angels and in the second, the arms supported by a dragon and a yale. The figures may represent God in the act of creation.[58] A similar depiction of God appears in several printed devotional books of the late fifteenth century. For example, in the illustration of the Virgin of the Litanies from Kerver's Hours, of c.1505 (fig. 169), God the Father is shown in benediction, with the stars and moon below.[59] Another example is God the Father in the Annunciation scene (fig. 170) from Philippe

[58] Professor Cahn suggested a possible reference to God in Creation. See also A. Heimann, 'Three Illustrations from the Bury St. Edmunds Psalter and their Prototypes', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXIX, 1966, pp. 39-56; on the imagery of God the Creator with reference to the Stuttgart Psalter, pp. 46-56.

[59] Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 1509.

Pigouchet's Hours of 27 September 1501.[60] God is also depicted with triple tiara in a scene (fig. 171) from the Mass of St. Gregory from the Missal of Verdun of Jéhan Du Pré.[61]

Grotesques: Wild Men, Beasts and Putti.

Wild man imagery occurs all over Europe in the medieval period, and was common in England until the Black Death. However, the image of the wild man almost disappeared in England from the mid-fourteenth until the early sixteenth century, when a revival occurred. In theatrical festivities, such as the Twelfth Night celebrations of Henry VII's court, and in civic pageantry, such as the Lord Mayors' processions in various English cities, as well as in all types of artistic decoration, the wild man underwent a renaissance.[62] The reappearance of the wild man in the visual arts was precipitated by a late fifteenth century revival of courtly literature, in which the wild man played several roles. At times warlike and promiscuous, the wild man symbolized the bestial aspects of human nature without the

---

[60] Paris, B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 1555.

[61] Paris, B.N., Impr., Rés. B942.

[62] R. Bernheimer, Wild Men in the Middle Ages: a Study in Art, Sentiment, and Demonolgy, New York, 1979, pp. 70-71. At the Twelfth Night celebrations of 1515 the wild men joined with Roman gods, sylvans, and fauns in the mock-battle that took place: 'Eight wyldemen, all apparayled in gren mosse with sleved sylke, with ugly weapons and terrible visages...there foughte with eight knyghtes...'. The St. George's procession of 1610 in Chester was headed by: 'two men in ivy with black hair and beards, very ugly to behold, and garlands upon their heads, with great clubs in their hands, with fireworks to scatter abroad to maintain way for the rest of the show'.

restraints of civilization. The alternative view of him was as an ideal primitive being, living in harmony even with the wild beasts of the forest and free from the vices of civilized society in the Golden Age. The paradoxical characteristics of the wild man created a complex mythology and made him an extremely flexible primitive image. The constant inner struggle between his ferocious animality and his gentle, simple courtliness, was resolved by his conversion to civilized values through the love of a lady and the trials he had to endure to be worthy of her love.[63] The love of the lady prefigures the love of Christ essential to the Christian for salvation.

Malory described an encounter of knights, whose ensuing savagery was reminiscent of the habitual behaviour of wild men, 'When several wildmen meet the result is usually a battle...'.[64] This is the scene depicted in a part of the frieze on the canopy at Boxgrove, where two naked men wearing helmets and brandishing curved swords face each other, crouched as low as beasts, ready for battle (fig. 167). It is possible that this was a rebus for the family name of 'La Warre', since the partners of the wild men are two lions holding the entwined 'T&E' initials of the Christian names of the founders of the chantry.

---

[63] Ibid., p. 11, gives a brief history of the involvement of the wild man in the Breton chivalric tales.

[64] T. Malory, 'Morte d'Arthur', in The Works of Sir Thomas Malory, ed. E. Vinaver, Oxford, 1947, pp. 409-602.

The image (fig. 172) in the border of the illustration depicting Bathsheba's Bath is very close to the sculpted image at Boxgrove. The pose of the right-hand figure - his back turned to the viewer - reveals the spine and ribs beneath the skin. Even the central flower and the two prickly buds on either side are repeated, as is the type of helm the figures wear, and the type of pointed shield the right-hand figure carries.

Another use of the image of the wild man occurs on one of the columns of the chantry. Two naked men scale a thick vertical stalk and attack and grapple with ferocious wild animals (fig. 173). The artist chose an adventurous contorted pose for the naked figures, creating a three-quarters view of their backs. This compares very closely with the figure in the upper left corner of a border illustration of 1498, again from Pigouchet for Vostre (fig. 174). Instead of their usual fratricidal strife, the wild men are undertaking combat with beasts, an allegory of mankind's internal struggle with the evil or animal side of human nature.

In another frieze in the chantry, the peaceful characteristic of the wild man is alluded to in a scene of wild men riding naked and bare-backed on other mythical creatures, gryphons (fig. 161). A similar beast, but ridden by a monkey and chased by a bearded wild man, is found in a Book of Hours, of c.1502 (fig. 175), also for Vostre.[65] These scenes on the Boxgrove chantry reflect the

---

[65] B.N., Rés. des Impr., Vélins 1559.

general confusion of attributes the wild man had acquired by the sixteenth century.

A further use of the wild man at Boxgrove is his portrayal, along with a wild woman, as the supporter on one of the columns of a cartouche, now empty, that presumably once contained arms or a name. These are exceptionally refined-looking specimens of wild folk, with the minimum of bodily hair (fig. 176). The female even wears a fashionable type of French hood, which gives additional proof of the date of the inscription, 1532. The use of wild men as the supporters of heraldic devices was quite common in the period. Printers were particularly fond of this device (fig. 174) for their colophon.[66] This may be a reference to the printers' pride at being self-made, successful men, through skill rather than by birth. Printers created their own unconventional heraldic arms by which to distinguish themselves. On the opposite column two naked figures, who may represent Adam and Eve, appear. Adam and Eve also appeared in the border illustrations of Books of Hours of the period (fig. 177).

The image of a putto with a musical instrument climbing a floral stem (fig. 178) is found on two of the supporting columns of the chantry, and occurs frequently as a motif in the decorative borders in the title-page of contemporary printed books. It is found, for example, in the 1510 edition of the Liber

[66] For example, Philippe Pigouchet used a wild man and a wild woman as supporters for the cartouche bearing his printer s mark. Also Peter Treveris used the device of the 'woodwoses . See R. Plomer, English Printers' Ornaments, fig. 171.

de triplici motu (fig. 164) by Poncet le Preux.[67]

Skeleton and Princess.

This image of a skeletal figure holding the arm of a crowned maiden (fig. 179), is taken directly from a Dance of Death series (fig. 180) by Hans Holbein the Elder.[68] Details of the relief are identical to the woodcut. For example, the manner of representing emaciated flesh - parallel lines striping the arms, legs, and feet of the figure vertically - is treated in the same way. Round holes for eyesockets and the irregular jagged cavernous hole representing the noseless face below occur in both the relief and the woodcut. The fall of drapery in the right hand of the female figure, as well as her pose and costume, is copied exactly from the woodcut. This woodcut is one of the most primitive in the series, and may have been the work of one of Holbein's assistants, or one of the later additions of Hans Lutzelberger, made between 1522 and 1526, before the series was published by the printer Melchior Trechsel at Lyons in 1538. The 'danse macabre' was another of the subjects of the border illustrations in these Books of Hours.

Hunter.

---

[67] P. Rénouard, Imprimeurs et libraires Parisiens du XVIe siècle, Paris, 1964, vol. I, pl. A25, printer G. Anabat.

[68] Hans Holbein's Dance of Death and Bible Woodcuts, New York, 1947, fig. 51.

Another figure on the Boxgrove chantry may have been influenced by a woodcut from the same source. The figure of a young man in fashionable dress, standing with legs apart on one of the columns (fig. 181) is reminiscent of the young man in the left corner of an illustration to the Assertio septem sacramentorum (fig. 182) the origin of which was a 'coarsely-cut copy of a composition designed by Hans Holbein the Elder'.[69] The man carries a sheaf of arrows and may represent a hunter, another Labour of the Month figure.

The Tombs and Contemporary English Woodcuts and Engravings

Both the brass memorials and the stone reliefs are closely related in style and subject matter to contemporary English devotional woodcuts. Popular devotional woodcuts were often accompanied by inscriptions promising remission from Purgatory. For example, Syon MS Rawl. D. 403 shows a Pietà with an attached indulgence offering remission of 6,755 years of purgatory to those:

> that before this image of pity devoutly five times say their pater nostre and ave, piteously beholding these arms of Christ's passion...

The inscriptions reveal that the piece was from the press of Wynkyn de Worde or Richard Pynson.[70] The tombs thus incorporate

---

[69] eds. R.B. McKerrow and F.S. Ferguson, Printers' and Publishers' Devices in England and Scotland, 1485-1640, London, 1932

[70] C. Campbell Dodgson, 'English Devotional Woodcuts of the late Fifteenth Century with special Reference to those in the Bodleian Library', The Walpole Society, vol. XVII, 1928-29,

reliefs of images that generally accompanied the remission of years of purgatory in the context of a chantry chapel where a priest was paid to say masses for the soul of the deceased for the same purpose.

The Gnadenstuhl.

Specific iconographic details from the stone reliefs can be traced from contemporary woodcuts. The tomb at Westhampnett portrays the two donors, each kneeling at a prie-dieu, scrolls issuing out of their mouths, and flanked by their sons and daughters. The figures are grouped around a central image of the Gnadenstuhl (fig. 150). God the Father supports Christ on his lap, while Christ reveals the wounds of his Passion. Since the figures of both God the Father and Christ have suffered at the hands of iconoclasts, it is not possible to tell whether the figures were crowned. This may have offered a clue to the origin of the motif.[71] The group represents God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice. A figure of Adam rising out of the grave was often included to symbolize the fruits of the sacrifice. Here the donor figure represents Adam or mortal man.

The relief bears a close resemblance to a woodcut from the Dyetary of Ghostly Helthe (fig. 183) by a continental printer working in England. God the Father, crowned, supports the

---

plate XXXV (c), pp. 95-108.

[71] G. Schiller, op. cit., pp. 122-24 for the iconography of the Throne of Grace.

slumped figure of Christ, with a rayed nimbus.[72] The third element of the Trinity, the Dove, descends on a seated writing nun, possibly Saint Bridget. The large triangular folds of the figures' drapery and the simplified primitive features of the faces recall the rather crude reliefs of the Sussex tombs.

The Resurrection.

At West Wittering the Resurrection scene (fig. 146) on the tomb of William Ernley is also strikingly similar to a woodcut of the Resurrection from the Missale ad usum sarum, (fig. 165) attributed to Richard Pynson.[73] However the figures in the woodcut are treated in a more refined manner than those in the relief. Pynson's Missale was commissioned in 1500 by Cardinal Morton, and is a variation on the work of Du Pré, Hopyl and other contemporary French printers. It is worth noting that Richard Pynson was possibly of Norman birth and still undertook commissions for French patrons although he was established in London.[74]

The Virgin and Child and St. George.

---

[72] D. Skot, no. 2277 from the Dyetary of Ghostly Helthe, 15 November 1521. E. Hodnett, op. cit., fig. 200.

[73] No. 1356, 8 March 1512. From E. Hodnett, op. cit., fig. 116.

[74] H.R. Plomer, Wynkyn de Worde and his Contemporaries from the Death of Caxton to 1535, London, 1925, p. 109.

The relief of the crowned Virgin and Child on the later tomb at Broadwater (fig. 156), is stylistically similar to the Virgin in the title-page of the Year Books of Edward III, also by Richard Pynson (fig. 184). The type of St. George found in another of Richard Pynson's works (fig. 40) seems to have inspired the St. George on the Broadwater tomb (fig. 155). In c.1515, Pynson printed a Lyfe of St. George by Baptista Spagnuoli, translated by Alexander Barclay for the Duke of Norfolk.[75]

The Annunciation.

The relief of the Annunciation at West Wittering (fig. 185) may have been sculpted using the model of a woodcut, for instance, the Annunciation (fig. 186) from an anonymous woodcut.[76]

Woodcuts from devotional books would have served as cheap and easily available patterns for the reliefs. The crude Sussex reliefs are translations of the simple forms of the woodcut into stone.

---

[75] MS Trinity College, Cambridge no. 1493.

[76] See P. Rénouard, op. cit., pl. A6, Missale ad usum sarum.

The Use of Patterns

Very little research has been done on the relationship between two-dimensional imagery, such as woodcuts or early engravings, and three-dimensional embodiments of the same imagery. Apart from certain well-known examples of the use of woodcuts as patterns for the wood reliefs of great masters, like Schongauer, Veit Stoss and Michael Pacher, it is often impossible to prove the direct use of a woodcut or an engraving as a model for a sculpture.[77] There are more later cases of the direct transference of imagery from drawings to furniture.[78]

Little is known about the transference of imagery through pattern books also, although motifs are frequently attributed to unspecified 'pattern books' in the early Renaissance period by

[77] R. Field, Catalogue of Fifteenth Century Woodcuts and Metalcuts in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1965, writes of woodcuts in the fifteenth century, 'It was a craft that served a specific market for popular imagery, usually religious in nature, it was rarely associated with any of the ateliers of the artists - painters, sculptors or even engravers - and this seems to have been especially true in Germany, and least true in Italy. Obvious corroboration emerges from the total lack of contact between the woodcut image and any other; historians have forged very few significant or accepted links between these arts, with the exception of some late fifteenth century woodcuts that relate to engravings by such masters as E.S. or Martin Schongauer.' A. Shestack furnished some concrete examples of the transference of an engraved image to a wood carving. He cites the engraving of the Baptism of Christ by Martin Schongauer in the Rosenwald Collection in the National Gallery, Washington, D.C., and the woodcarving of the same subject by a follower of Veit Stoss in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. A. Shestack Fifteenth Century Engravings of Northern Europe from the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1967, Introduction.

[78] J. Thirion, 'Perrier et la diffusion des modèles antiques le meuble du musée fabre'. Revue du Louvre, no. 21, 1971, pp.

many art historians.

The use of woodcuts and early engravings as patterns for these sculpted reliefs would seem to have been an obvious means of obtaining sources of imagery when three-dimensional examples were unavailable to the sculptor.[79] This type of imagery, with its emphasis on the graphic and the decorative, was attractive and easily accessible to artists working within the traditions of the English late medieval decorative and flattened sculptural relief style.[80]

It seems pertinent at this point to mention that Elynour West, the wife of the 8th Lord La Warr, made a reference in her will to a 'printed antyphones' and to a bequest to her son of 'one printed masse bok'. The very inclusion of the word 'printed' implies an interest and pride in this new process on the part of the donors, at least.[81]

141-56.

[79] See A. Blunt, 'L'Influence française sur l'architecture et la sculpture décorative en Angleterre pendant la première moitié du XVIe siècle', Revue de l'art, 4, 1969, p. 23 on the Renaissance decoration on the 'Gothic' structure of the chantry chapel of the Countess of Salisbury at Christchurch: 'La manière plate, sans modelé, dont sont sculptés ces rinceaux, qu'on dirait découpés dans du carton, peut faire supposer que les artisans travaillaient non sur des modèles en pierre mais d'après des gravures sur bois, faites pour orner les marges d'un livre. Or, les éditeurs français de Paris et de Rouen avaient depuis longtemps exploité le marché anglais, et quantité de livres d'heures "à l'usage de Sarum" furent imprimés en France exprès pour être exportés en Angleterre.'

[80] Fifteenth-century alabaster carvings of the Nottingham school are characteristic of the style of the delicate yet vigorous reliefs of this period of English sculpture.

The Geographic Location of the Tombs

The area where these tombs were erected, Sussex and Hampshire, was a prosperous part of England, particularly for merchants. Southampton itself was a flourishing port, supporting a large foreign mercantile community, including a number of Italians.[82]

Other Related Decorative Sculpture

Other sculptural work that is stylistically related to the tombs is found in Winchester Cathedral, where Bishop Fox patronized a workshop of sculptors with knowledge of Renaissance styles. The cresting of the presbytery screen in the Cathedral is carved with floral work, urns and roundels, reminiscent of those found at Gaillon and elsewhere in northern France (fig. 187). More Renaissance decorative work is located in the jambs of the door between the choir and the north aisle, near the arms of Henry Broke (died 1524) (fig. 188). The mortuary chests commissioned by Bishop Fox for the bones of former worthies of the Cathedral are also decorated with Renaissance motifs. The tomb chest of the twelfth-century Bishop Poyntes (fig. 189), commissioned by Bishop Fox in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, is composed of panels divided by pilasters of Renaissance urns and flowers. The tomb of Bishop Toclyve (died 1501), also commissioned by Fox, reveals fragments of Renaissance

---

[81] Will of Lady Elynour West, 10 May 1536 (P.C.C. Hogen, fo. 41).

[82] A. Ruddock, op. cit., ch. II.

work. The two panels flanking the central cartouche supported by fluttering ribbons are decorated with floriated arabesques (fig. 190). Members of the workshop at Winchester may have had knowledge of the northern French projects. The chantry chapel of Bishop Fox included only small areas of Renaissance adornment on a conventional Tudor monument.

The workshop established by Fox at Winchester may also have been responsible for Renaissance decorative work at Christchurch Priory in Hampshire, on the chantry chapels of both Prior John Draper (died 1529) and the Countess of Salisbury (figs. 191a & 191b). The latter dates from the late 1530s and combines strips of flattened Renaissance decorative work applied to a conventional Tudor architectural structure.

The Source of the Workshop for the Tombs

Although Caen stone was imported for these monuments, there is no evidence to prove that the monuments themselves were imported ready-carved from France.[83] The English actually occupied Caen between 1417 and 1450. After the French retook the city, all exports to England declined during the war.[84] Caen stone was so

[83] See G. Désart, ed., Histoire de Caen, Toulouse, 1981, pp. 43-44. Caen stone was exported from France to England from the eleventh century. For more than a century the major buildings in the South of England - Canterbury Cathedral, Westminster Palace, the Tower of London, and parts of Battle Abbey - were constructed from Caen stone. Thousands of tons of this material, including ready-carved portions, were shipped from Caen.

[84] However, some safe conducts were issued for those taking Caen

readily available through the ports in the South and East of England (especially Boston and Ipswich) that it continued to be used regularly for architectural and sculptural projects through the seventeenth century. The quarries were located at Saint-Julien, Saint-Gilles, Fleury-sur-Orne and Vaucelles.[85]

From the number of surviving monuments and their nature - built into walls instead of being more easily assembled, free-standing tomb chests - and from the existence of many examples of stylistically similar and contemporary architectural decorative work in the area, there were sufficient projects to support a workshop in the Chichester region, possibly linked to the Cathedral. The members of the workshop responsible for the tombs discussed in this chapter must have included masons primarily familiar with English architecture, as is evident from the conventional English Tudor architectural composition and construction of the tombs and the Boxgrove chantry chapel. The sculptors of the reliefs of the devotional centrepieces took as their models early devotional woodcuts from the sources already discussed. The flattenened and linear style of these reliefs reveals the influence of a two-dimensional source. For the reliefs of the donor figures the sculptors developed the type found in the earlier monumental brasses in the area. The workshop would have required the services of a painter-engraver for at

---

stone to England to complete work at Westminster Abbey. Ibid., p. 11.

[85] See D. Tourmente, Le port de Caen: étude économique, Caen 1914.

least patterns and probably for assistance with the transference to larger-scale images. The limited knowledge of Renaissance decorative work that the workshop demonstrated also came chiefly from the early engravings discussed previously. Certainly, the more sophisticated forms and the complex iconographic programme of the Boxgrove chantry would have necessitated the collaboration of an artist of superior skills.

The Cathedral at Chichester provided an artistic focus where many artists and craftsmen resided and worked. There is evidence that a painter of Flemish or northern French origin worked in the area for a long period of time in the employ of Bishop Sherborne and the local gentry.[86] Lambert Barnard has been credited with the two large panel paintings (figs. 192 & 193) now located in the transept of Chichester Cathedral (formerly in the south wing of the transept).[87] These panels, King Caedwalla Granting the See of Selsey to St. Wilfred, and King Henry VIII Confirming the Royal Protection of Chichester Cathedral to Bishop Sherborne, with a 'Cathalogus' of the Kings of England below, in spite of centuries of over-painting and cleaning, are stylistically quite similar to the sculpted reliefs at Boxgrove. The panels date from 1519, according to the uncovering of this date when heavy

---

[86] F.W. Steer, 'Richard Sherborne, Bishop of Chichester: some Aspects of his Life reconsidered', Winchester Papers, no. XVI, 1956, pp. 108-25.

[87] See E. Croft-Murray, 'Lambert Barnard: an early Renaissance Painter', The Archaeological Journal, vol. XIII, 1956, pp. 108-25.

eighteenth century overpainting was cleaned in 1953.[88] Barnard was also responsible for the delicate floral frescoes in the vaults of the Cathedral. Only those those in the vaults of the Lady Chapel survive (fig. 194), but these compare closely enough with the frescoed ceilings at Boxgrove Priory (fig. 195) to suggest that Lambert Barnard was responsible for the fresco work at Boxgrove. Floral decoration occurs more frequently in the vaults of churches in northern Europe, for example, the church of St. Jacques in Liège (fig. 196).

The painted panelled ceiling at the Bishop's Palace, Chichester, is also thought to be part of Barnard's output (fig. 197). The inclusion of the emblems of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon date the work to the period prior to the divorce, and stylistically the work looks as if it belongs to the late 1520s.[89] For example, the medallions enclosing the heraldic devices of the King and Queen, Bishop Sherborne, Thomas West, 9th Lord La Warr, William Fitzalan, 18th Earl of Arundel and Sir Henry Owen, are similar to those that enclose the donors' initials on the tombs at Petworth and elsewhere. Another work that has

---

[88] The painting was restored by Tremayne in 1748, and paid for in 1749. T.G. Willis, Records of Chichester, Chichester, 1928, quoting Spersholt's Memoirs, gives 1758 as the 'year when the Kings and Bishops in the cathedral (were) painted'. But, according to the Chapter Accounts in the Diocesan Records Office, 1748-49 was the year when 'painting ye Kings at a cost of £12 12s 0d' was recorded. More restoration took place in 1861 when the spire collapsed, and more repainting occurred in 1907-08. When the paintings were finally cleaned in 1953, the date 1519 was found high up in the layer of original paint.

[89] F.W. Steer, 'The Heraldic Ceiling at the Bishop's Palace, Chichester', Chichester Papers, no. 10, 1958.

been attributed to Barnard is the decoration of the Great Chamber of Bishop Sherborne, at Amberley Castle. Eight panels depict the Heroines of Antiquity in half-length portraits. The unknown Heroine (fig. 198) next to Semiramis wears a curved type of hood not unlike that worn by the wild woman on one of the columns at Boxgrove.

Lambert Barnard was probably of northern French or Flemish origin, judging from the style of his surviving attributed works. He worked in the Cathedral at least as early as 1519, and enjoyed the patronage of Bishop Sherborne and the Cathedral chapter for several decades. In 1533 he was granted an annual sum of £3 6s. 8d. by the Dean and chapter of the Cathedral. These payments continued until 1567.[90] The painter settled in Chichester, and is recorded as a tenant of Lathorne Manor in Sussex in 1529. Lambert's will is dated 11 December 1567.[91]

The nature of the sculpted reliefs of the chantry and tombs suggests that they were created by an artist with knowledge of illustrations found in early 'English' printed books, which were strongly influenced by northern French and Flemish artists. The workshop of the painter Lambert Barnard could have been the source of the projects, or could have provided the sculptor with patterns for the decoration of the tombs. Architecturally, the tombs were quite within the capabilities of an English mason.

---

[90] County Record Office, Chichester: White Act Book; Bishop Sherborne's Liber Donationum & Communar Accounts, 1556-61.

[91] Original in the Probate Registry, Winchester.

Although there are no sculptures attributed to Lambert Barnard, it is quite likely that he provided patterns for the workshop responsible for the relief sculpture of the tombs and chantry discussed in this chapter. Since it has been demonstrated that the reliefs at Boxgrove derive from border illustrations of early northern French/English printed books, the services of a painter/engraver would have been required. From Barnard's will we know that he kept pattern books.[92] The mason who used the patterns would have collaborated with Barnard or someone from his workshop for the work on the other tombs. For these tombs the ex voto figures above the tomb chests were influenced by contemporary English devotional woodcuts and engravings, and the decorative work derives from border illustrations of the same origin. The style of the tomb reliefs is less sophisticated than the chantry, suggesting that Thomas West paid for the more extensive participation of a superior artist in the designs for his chantry chapel than did the other donors. The flattened linearity and the emphasized contours of the sculpted reliefs of both the chantry and the tombs testify to the influence of two-dimensional models of the type suggested.

---

[92] He bequeathed to his 'boye John Foster...halfe of his toles and halfe his pattrons'. Will dated 11 December 1567. Barnard's son, Anthony, was also a painter, and died in 1619 at the great age of one hundred and five. Presumably he received the other half of his father's 'pattrons'. E. Croft-Murray, op. cit., p. 112.

V. TOMB SCULPTURE IN LATTER HALF OF THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII

This chapter is concerned with the developments in English tomb sculpture during the period between c.1530 and c.1550, and is divided into two sections. The first focuses on alabaster tombs that reveal the more widespread assimilation of Renaissance innovations, primarily exemplified in the royal tombs by Pietro Torrigiano, by English sculptors in the latter half of the reign of Henry VIII. Although these alabaster tombs span the period during which the abandoned Italian tomb for Henry VIII was in progress, it is precisely because these English tombs represent a response to the first Italian models Torrigiano provided in the first quarter of the century that they are discussed first. Most of these tombs came from a common workshop in the Midlands, but three other tombs from other workshops are discussed with reference to the influence of the royal tombs and also to other works by Italian sculptors in England. It seemed more appropriate to include them with the group of completed tombs than with the abandoned project. The second section examines the abortive Italian project for the tomb of Henry VIII, which was linked with the fate of Italianate art in England by the middle of the

century. Factors contributing to the decline of the Italian school in England after the promising developments in the middle of the reign of Henry VIII are discussed. The completion of another monumental Italian royal tomb in England might have had a considerable impact on tomb sculpture in England during the second half of the century. Finally, some of the implications of Reformation legislation regarding idolatrous images and iconoclasm are considered in relation to tomb sculpture by the middle of the century and as a prelude to future developments in English tomb sculpture.

The Delayed Influence of the Tomb of Henry VII

In the past, the royal tomb had provided the English court and nobility with a model after which to plan their own memorials. It was not politically wise to try to rival the King in magnificence, but it was acceptable to follow his lead in stylistic innovation, in a manner befitting the station of the patron. As Weever explained:

> Sepulchres should be made according to the qualitie and degree of the person deceased, that by the Tombe every one might be discerned of what ranke he was living.[1]

During a period when there was an extended lack of a royal model, for example, during the minority and long reign of a young monarch, or at a time of political instability, when a King who met an untimely end had not made provision for his sepulchre, it

---

[1] J. Weever, Ancient Funerall Monuments, London, 1631, ch. III, p. 10.

was inevitable that the chief nobles either set their own standards, as did Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, in 1455, or conservatively followed more archaic examples based on the tombs of earlier monarchs.[2] The very nature of funerary art preordains that stylistic changes are slow to take effect: a patron who saw an innovatory piece of work and wished to commission a similar piece might not have his taste expressed by his own choice of monument until many years later.

As was discussed in chapter I, Henry VII's tomb was the first tomb project of an English King to be completed in Westminster Abbey since that of Henry V. Although Pietro Torrigiano had obviously modified Florentine style to suit the taste of his English patrons, the tomb must have contrasted startlingly with the medieval tombs of the predecessors of Henry VIII in Westminster Abbey. It might be expected that the form of Henry VII's tomb, after its completion by 1518, would have had tremendous impact on English tomb sculpture.[3] Stylistically, it was not too alien to be unattractive to English patrons. The tomb of Henry VII was a project on a modest scale, quite unlike the monolithic construction Henry VIII later commissioned for himself. Henry VII's tomb type was accessible to both the

---

[2] Richard Beauchamp went beyond the limits of his rank by commissioning a gilded copper effigy for his tomb in St. Mary's Church in Warwick, between the reigns of Henry V and Henry VII, when no other monumental royal tomb project was completed.

[3] The tomb was finished no later than 1518, according to the indenture for Henry VIII's tomb, reprinted in op. cit., pp. 84-88.

aesthetic and economic aspirations of the Tudor courtier. Only the expensive and symbolic bronze and the imported marble of the King's tomb might not be copied. The bronze effigy was a traditional aspect and the prerogative of the English royal tomb (as has been discussed earlier). Prudent humility as well as financial practicality would have prevented the subjects of Henry VIII from attempting to copy the costly materials peculiar to the royal tomb. The form of the tomb was, however, simple and dignified enough to be desirable and attainable without being ostentatious. It introduced little that was beyond the scope of a skilful native sculptor in the traditional medium of alabaster. In addition, English sculptors were gradually becoming acquainted with new Renaissance motifs in the work of the foreign artists working for the King and court, and through foreign woodcuts and engravings, as was discussed in chapter IV.

Having established that there were few obvious reasons why Torrigiano's tomb should not have provided an impetus to the creation of similar types for the English nobility and gentry, it is perplexing to find how little immediate influence the tomb had, and how slowly the innovations it introduced were reflected in a substantial number of other English tombs. It is even more significant when one recalls that after Henry VII's tomb no other royal tomb was completed until that of Elizabeth I.

The first impact of the tomb of Henry VII might be expected to have manifested itself visibly on the tombs of his slightly

younger contemporaries, courtiers who could have outlived the King by as much as fifteen to twenty-five years. In chapter III, the possible influence of the royal tombs - the painting of these terracotta monuments to resemble black marble and gilded bronze, and the elevated tomb chest - was noted, but it was not until this later period that the influence of the tomb of Henry VII can be securely discerned in the tombs of a whole generation in England. This generation also witnessed the effects of a major socio-economic as well as spiritual upheaval in English society: the Reformation of the Church of England.

A group of free-standing alabaster altar tombs dating from around 1530 to 1555 definitely reveal the influence of the royal tombs by Torrigiano. These tombs incorporate iconographic and stylistic innovations directly from the royal tomb and it is possible to trace the development and modification of these specific innovations in the tombs.

The Midland Tombs

Geographic Location of the Tombs.

The tombs in question are all located close to either a good supply of Staffordshire alabaster or to a river that would have afforded easy transport to the quarries and the workshops at Burton-on-Trent, which had become the centre of the English alabaster trade from c.1500, superceding Nottingham.[4] All of the

[4] K.A. Esdaile, 'The Inter-Action of English and Low Country

tombs are of the creamy but reddish-veined alabaster characteristic of the Staffordshire quarries. The traditional qualities of alabaster - its softness, which allowed the carving and cutting of fine and minute details and a high polished finish, and its ability to take colour and gilding well - increased its suitability for the particular type of small-scale decorative narrative reliefs on the sides of the tomb chest. The patrons of these tombs were thus able to depend upon a convenient source of fine alabaster, as well as on the services of a long-established core of skilled alabaster carvers.

Though the tombs are, by sixteenth century standards, far from London, and the source of the royal model, an investigation of the biographies of their donors reveals that most of them had some connection with the court circle, which would have allowed them access to London and to the social group who took some interest in the new artistic trends.

Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire.

The tomb of William Rudhall and his wife, Ann, daughter of Simon Milborne of Tillington, is probably the earliest work in the group (fig. 199). William Rudhall died on 22 March 1530.[5] His eldest son, John, died only two months after his father. William's grandson and heir, also John Rudhall, was only four

Sculpture in the Sixteenth Century', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. VI, 1943, p. 80.

[5] Will of William Rudhall, died 22 March 1530 (P.C.C. fo. 26 Jankyn).

years of age at the time, and was made a Ward of Court.[6] Ann Rudhall outlived her husband to die in 1556. Ann Rudhall and the executors of her husband's will were made responsible for the burial and sepulchral monument of the deceased. William requested a modest funeral: '...it shall please my friends wt as litell expens as may be convenient...'.[7] It does not appear that work had already commenced on his tomb prior to his death. Therefore, the tomb must date from the post-1530 period. Apart from the evidence the will provides, the iconographic programme of the sculpture of the tomb also suggests that the tomb was executed while there was less controversy over the imagery of saints.

William Rudhall's tomb is situated at the east end of the Rudhall chapel in the church of St. Mary in Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire. The Rudhall chapel had been erected in the early fourteenth century.[8] The chapel was dedicated to the Virgin Mary. The tomb is a fairly conventional type for the pre-Reformation period. The arcaded tomb chest abuts the chapel wall at the east end. Nine figures fill the niches on the north side below the recumbent effigy of William Rudhall. On the south side of the altar tomb, below the effigy of Rudhall's wife, are two figures in a larger niche. The tomb is of Derbyshire alabaster, the

---

[6] J. Duncumb, Collections towards the History and Antiquities of the County of Herefordshire, London, 1804-82, vol. III, p. 155.

[7] Will of William Rudhall.

[8] J. Duncumb, op. cit., p. 123. A royal licence had been granted for the endowment of a chantry chapel in 1309. In 1377 Bishop Gilbert united the chantries in the chapel.

surface of which is in fair condition. The finest details of the statuettes in the niches have not been abraded. Originally the whole monument was painted and gilded, and traces of its former splendour are still visible.

The ecclesiastical figures in the arcading may be identified on the north side as St. George, St. Edward the Confessor,[9] St. Dorothy,[10] St. Michael, St. Catherine and St. Anne teaching the Virgin to read. Three angels supporting shields of obliterated coats-of-arms punctuate the rows of saints. On the south side are St. Paul, St. John the Baptist and the Trinity adored by a kneeling man, woman and nine children, presumably representing the deceased and his family, bearing another coat-of-arms. Completing this face of the tomb chest are St. John the Evangelist and St. Peter and two angels carrying more armorial shields.

The depiction of specific and identifiable saints in the arcaded niches, instead of more traditional representations of 'weeper' figures, in the forms of relatives or mendicants, may have been influenced by the tomb of Henry VII.[11] Henry VII had

---

[9] Ibid., p. 123. Duncomb mistakenly identified the figure as 'St. Ethelbert with a church'. The saint is named as St. Edward the Confessor in the R.C.H.M. of Herefordshire, vol. II, p. 160, which is also supported by the naming of Edward the Confessor as one of Rudhall's 'avouries' in his will.

[10] R.C.H.M. of Herefordshire, vol. II, p. 160, names the saint as either St. Dorothy or St. Sitha: Duncomb, op. cit., p. 24 was unwilling to commit himself to any uncertain identification preferring to refer to this figure as 'the patron saint of the family, a nun with book and beads'.

made a special request in his will to have his 'avouries' or patron saints depicted on the sides of his tomb chest. Rudhall's will, although not containing any provision for the imagery of his tomb, does commence with his special supplication for the intercession of particular named saints,

> I bequethe my soule to Almighty God my maker, and beseaching our blessed Lady Saint Mary Virgin, Saint John the Baptist, Saint John the Evangelist, Saints Peter and Paul, Saint Edward King and Confessour, the Virgin and martyr Saint Kathryn and all the Saints to pray to Hym to have mercy on me.[12]

All of these holy personages appear on the tomb chest, suggesting that the executors used the will as some guide to the choice of the iconographic programme the sculptor followed.

At the west end of the tomb is a fine sculpted relief of the Annunciation, flanked by figures of an angel and the donor and his family. The choice of the Annunciation theme may be explained by several factors. The date of the Annunciation, 25 March, was traditionally associated with the day of Christ's death as well as of his conception, a point discussed in an earlier chapter. This association recalls not only the theme of death, both that of Christ and the human donor figure, but also the concept of Christ's sacrifice of blood for the redemption of man's soul. It is possible that the tomb was intended to serve as a permanent Easter Sepulchre.[13] This particular type of Virgin and Angel is

---

11 See chapter I.

12 Will of William Rudhall.

13 See the discussion of the location of the Easter Sepulchre in chapter IV.

derived from the northern French sources investigated in chapter IV.[14] Again, English woodcuts of the early sixteenth century may have provided the source for the sculptor's work. The Virgin, depicted as the crowned Queen of Heaven, stands close to a draped prie-dieu, her hand resting on a book. The rays descending from heaven contain the Holy Ghost (in the form of a tiny figure rather than as a dove). The Trinity, which occurs on the south side of the tomb, serves as another reference to the redemption achieved for mankind through Christ's sacrifice. The function of the tomb as an Easter Sepulchre is again suggested by this motif. The dedication of the church to the Virgin Mary provided an added motive for the depiction of the Annunciation.[15]

Both holy figures and human relatives are employed as 'weepers', to provide the deceased with the spiritual power of both heavenly and heraldic supporters. The deceased and his wife appear both as recumbent effigies and as kneeling donors, praying to the Virgin and the Trinity. The double depiction of the donors is frequently encountered in earlier English alabaster tomb sculpture.

---

[14] A particular example of the type of Northern French Annunciation seen on these tombs is the Annunciation by Julian Notary, from his 1504 Chronicle of England. See R. Plomer, English Printers' Ornaments pl. p. 153.

[15] The chantries in the Rudhall chapel were dedicated to the 'Blessed Virgin Mary, St. and Martyr'. J. Duncumb, op. cit., p. 123.

The robust effigies of the donor and his wife are fine examples of the work of the alabaster sculptor. William Rudhall wears the dress of his profession, a Sergeant-at-Law. His cap is that of a King's Bencher, which he became in 1522.[16] Ann Rudhall wears a pedimental headdress of the 1540s. William's head rests on his helm, a reminder of his status as a knight. The attributes of the housekeeper of a substantial household: a purse and a sheathed knife attached to the girdle, are the ornaments of his wife. The portrayal of St. Anne on the tomb chest may have been a tribute by the patroness to her name-saint. Little remains of the inscription but 'hic jacent corpora...'. Duncomb's History, unfortunately, does not mention the existence of the inscription, which might have furnished valuable evidence towards dating the monument more accurately.

The career of William Rudhall was a distinguished one. As well as being a Justice of Assizes for the Oxford Circuit and the Midlands, he also acted as Judge for the North West. The peak of his career was his appointment as Attorney General to Prince Arthur. He would have received even greater preferment if his young master had survived. Rudhall possessed considerable estates, and it is likely that he represented the county in Parliament.[17]

---

[16] Ibid., p. 153.

[17] Ibid., p. 153.

Eye, Herefordshire.

Also in Herefordshire is another tomb from the same workshop. The donors, Sir Richard Cornewall and his wife, Jane Milborne, were related by marriage to the Rudhalls.[18] The tomb of Sir Richard Cornewall is found on the north side of the high altar of the church of Saints Peter and Paul at Eye in Herefordshire (fig. 200). The tomb is pressed into an extremely dark corner of the church. It is almost impossible to obtain photographs of the tomb chest, since the south side is overshadowed by the back of a fixed pew about eighteen inches away from the surface of the relief decorating the tomb. On the west side there are only about three feet of clear space before another pew blocks access to the view. The moulded plinth and capping is of the same type as is found on the tomb at Ross. In common with the Rudhall tomb, the Annunciation is again depicted, this time on the longer south side (fig. 201).

Incorporated in the scene are, to the left, the kneeling and praying figures of a woman and a girl in Tudor dress. Scrolls issue from their mouths and these figures kneel behind the Angel Gabriel. The wing of the Angel Annunciate offers a distinctive stylistic trait of the sculptor: a rolled-over edge. Long trailing sleeves indicate the superior status of this Angel compared to the smaller angels on other parts of the tomb. The pot of lilies to the Angel's right, with its elongated stem and

---

[18] R.C.H.M. of East Herefordshire, vol. II, p. 160.

conical blooms issuing from a single stalk to represent the Trinity, is almost identical to the one at Ross. Rays of light stream down from the ribbed clouds of heaven to the left of the Virgin. In the stream of light descending to the Virgin's belly is, in this case, the dove of the Trinity. The hands of the Virgin are missing. Damage in the area of the head makes it difficult to determine whether the Virgin is crowned, although a halo is visible. The sleeve of her gown encloses her arm from shoulder to elbow and curls underneath the lower arm. The prie-dieu before which she stands is elaborately draped with a fringed cloth. Her book lies open in front of her hands. The hair is long and loose, after the style of the northern French/Flemish type of Madonna already mentioned. Behind and to the right of the Virgin kneels an adult male, armoured and wearing a chain of office around his neck. Flanking him are the kneeling figures of three boys, dressed in tunics and short cloaks, with banderoles above their heads. The Cornewall family is represented adoring the Annunciation.

At the west end of the tomb chest, below the heads of the recumbent effigies of Sir Richard and his wife, are two clothed angels, supporting a broad coat-of-arms on a shield. Pilasters ornamented with delicately carved Renaissance motifs of candelabra, urns and floral patterns mark the corners of the west end of the tomb chest. The pilaster furthest away from the wall on this face has either been badly damaged, or was never completed, since large chunks appear to have been chiselled out

of the edge. The adjoining pilaster on the south side is only half of a full vertical section. The pilaster on the other end of the south side is missing. All this suggests that the tomb was dismantled and reassembled at a later date. Another incongruity in the tomb chest may indicate that originally another face of the tomb was visible: the base of the large shield at the west end lacks a large triangular section in the centre. To replace this lost piece of the coat-of-arms, a similarly shaped segment - a fragment of what appears to be a section of drapery around a knee - has been inserted. Since all the kneeling figures wearing long robes that are visible in the reliefs are complete in this area of the body, we must conclude that other kneeling figures elsewhere on the tomb chest, at the other end, for example, have been lost, and that these are the only remaining fragments. This type of kneeling figure does occur at both ends of the other tombs in the group. There is, unfortunately, no surviving documentary source to prove whether the tomb was ever moved.

The effigies of the deceased couple are stylistically very similar to the effigies at Ross-on-Wye. The alabaster is again of a creamy hue with reddish-brown streaks. The darkness of the church and the grime on the stone make it difficult to be sure whether the effigies were ever painted and gilded. The effigy of Sir Richard is dressed in plate armour and a heraldic tabard, his head resting on his helm. Sir Richard died in 1540, ten years after the death of William Rudhall. Lady Jane is attired in a costume of the 1540s, a period when the curved hood was

fashionable.[19] Her gown, cloak and headdress are sufficiently similar to those worn by the kneeling figure below to identify them as the same person. Sir Richard wears a chain, as does the kneeling image below. Thus there are two images of each of the deceased, one as a recumbent effigy and one as a priant.

The effigies of Sir Richard Cornewall and William Rudhall share the same facial type: long faces with grooves running from the nostrils down to the corners of the mouth. The nostrils are slightly upturned. Both the male and the female figures are characterized by stiff, tubular, parallel folds of drapery. The cloaks of the females are swirled around the lower part of the gown just below knee-level. Their sleeves are composed of very regularly fluted, robust folds, with a freer ruff at the wrist. These drapery characteristics are repeated in all the effigies in the group. A naturalistic treatment of certain elements, such as the face and details of the costume, is combined with a rather wooden monumentality in the figure.

The tomb at Eye dates from a slightly later period than that at Ross-on-Wye. This may account for the more modern Renaissance motifs on the pilasters, which do not occur on the Rudhall tomb. Only a few traces of the inscription remain around the edge of the tomb. All the coats-of-arms are almost completely worn away.

---

[19] The French hood came into fashion in England around 1530, but it probably did not become an item in the dress of the wives of country gentlemen until later. See C.W. & P. Cunnington, A Handbook of English Costume in the Sixteenth Century, London, 1954, p. 74.

There is no other key to the dating of the work apart from the stylistic variations of the decorative work.[20] The familial relationship between these two Herefordshire families could explain the choice of the same sculptor. William Rudhall's career brought him to London frequently. His close connection with the Prince of Wales would have allowed him access to the court circle during the reign of Henry VIII. Rudhall may have become interested in the new styles through his London and court connections. (stop

Bottesford, Leicestershire.

More documents exist to aid the study of the tomb of Sir Thomas Manners, first Earl of Rutland, and his second wife, Eleanor Paston, whose tomb is situated to the west and in front of the high altar of the church of St. Mary in Bottesford, Leicestershire (fig. 202). This was the first of the Manners' tombs to be constructed in the church at Bottesford. Previously Belvoir Priory had provided the family with a mausoleum.

The tomb is of Derbyshire alabaster, elaborately painted and gilded. Much of the original paint remains. Of particular interest is the stencilled motif work on the cloak of the countess. The effigies are in fairly good condition, with much surface detail still intact. The Earl wears the robes and decorations of the Order of the Garter, including the Great George. He is also dressed in full plate armour and a military

[20] Duncumb makes no mention of the inscription on this tomb.

tabard. His coronet denotes his rank. His head rests on his helm, Cap of Maintenance and the family peacock crest. The costumes are extremely detailed: the gown of Eleanor Manners is covered with a short cape and an ermine-trimmed mantle. Around her neck is an unusual necklace of four chains from which a heart-shaped locket is suspended. The effigies are closely related to others in the group, though the ones at Bottesford seem even more monumental and elaborate, as might be expected for such important donors. The countess's sleeves, and the way that the mantle is draped, are treated in the same manner as is the drapery of the other female effigies. Eleanor Manners wears the same type of reticulated cap as that worn by Lady Cornewall at Eye.

The Household Accounts of the Earl of Rutland give exact information about the authorship of the Bottesford tombs, which helps to set the other tombs in context. In the entry for 1539 is written:

> Payd to Richard Parker the alabaster man in p'te payment of xxli. for makyng a tombe of alabaster for my lorde and my ladye to be sett in Botelsford accordyng to the effect of an indenture therof made...vjii. xiijs iiijd.[21]

The sides of the tomb chest are undecorated but for sculpted reliefs of figures, shields and pilasters. At the foot of the two effigies are two female figures with their hands clasped in prayer. Below the effigy of the Earl are five standing male figures in armour and tabards, and also one female figure (fig.

---

[21] V. Manners, 'The Tombs at Bottesford, Leicestershire', The Art Journal, vol. LXV, 1903, pp. 272-73.

203). Each is in a slightly varied pose, though all are praying. At the side of the tomb chest below Eleanor Paston are female figures. Each costume is individualized through some detail, such as the type of sleeve or the accessories. Some of their robes have trains, which emphasize the variety of the figures' poses. These figures may represent the children or relatives of the deceased couple. At the head of the tomb is a solitary kneeling figure, praying at a prie-dieu supporting an open book on a cloth. The figure also wears a chain, probably representing the Order of the Garter. Some writers have suggested that this figure is a portrait of the eldest son of the Earl.[22] This son, the 2nd Earl, who died in 1563, is buried nearby and commemorated by a later tomb. It seems more likely that the kneeling figure is meant to represent the 1st Earl as a priant. On other tombs in the group we have remarked that the donor is portrayed more than once. Particularly because Thomas Manners had the tomb constructed during his own lifetime it is more natural that he, rather than his heir, should be depicted in an act of supplication for the redemption of his soul. His son was commemorated by the later and equally splendid monument, and he was not responsible for the erection of his father's monument. An inscription in black letter runs from the north-west corner of the tomb counter-clockwise:

---

[22] Ibid., p. 273, '...and at the west end is the delightful little figure of their eldest son in armour kneeling before a prie-dieu'.

> Here lyeth the body of Thomas Manners, Erle of Rutland, lord of Hamelake, Trusbut, and Belyer, and Knyght of the most honorable Order of the Garter, who deceased the xxth daye of September at iii of the clock at aftornoone, Anno Dni 1543; and the body of the Lady Elianor countisse his wyf, daughter of Sir William Paston, of Norfolk, Knyght, who deceased the...day of...Anno Dni 15.. whose soules Jhu pardon. Amen.[23]

The countess outlived Sir Thomas to die in 1550, and was buried in Shoreditch, not at Bottesford.[24]

Thomas Manners was a shrewd career courtier who adapted to survive the changes in state religion during his lifetime. He benefited materially from his support of the King in the divorce of Katherine of Aragon by receiving grants of monastic and other lands. He supported both the coronation and trial of Anne Boleyn, and acted as Lord Chamberlain to Anne of Cleves (Protestant) and Catherine Howard (Catholic) and died in favour with the Crown. Thomas attended the Field of the Cloth of Gold and accompanied Henry VIII to France in 1532. His last major activity in an official capacity was his part in the ravaging of Scottish villages with the Duke of Norfolk during the war of 1543. In 1542 he had become Constable of Nottingham Castle. The illness which preceded his death occurred at Newark-on-Trent.[25]

Fenny Drayton, Leicestershire.

---

[23] Ibid., p. 273.

[24] Ibid., p. 273.

[25] D.N.B., vol. 12, p. 941.

An earlier tomb in Leicestershire may also have come from Richard Parker's workshop. Nicholas Purefoy and his wife Jane Vincent are commemorated by an alabaster tomb in the south aisle of the church of St. Nicholas in Fenny Drayton (fig. 204). Instead of sculpted recumbent effigies, the patrons are portrayed on a more archaic effigial slab, in costume of the 1540s. Whether this incised stone was commissioned because it was cheaper than a sculpted alabaster effigy, or whether it was preferred, is not known. Sir Nicholas is shown in full armour.

Only two sides of the tomb chest are visible today. Sculpted reliefs decorate these two free sides of the alabaster tomb. The tomb shows signs of damage: the inner edge of the pilaster at the free end of the west face is missing, while the panel at the north end is cracked, suggesting that the tomb may have been dismantled and reassembled in the past.[26] The panel at the north end contains a sculpted relief of an armorial shield, supported at either side by a winged and clothed angel. Round-arched niches on the longer west side enclose figures: four males in different Tudor costumes; one female (fig. 205); and in the central double arcade, holding the edges of the family coat-of-arms, two angel supporters. Delicately wrought Renaissance pilasters terminate each end of the two panels. The pattern of the left pilaster at the south side is repeated on the west side. The female figure on the extreme right of the group must have been better protected

[26] This may account for the position of the tomb in the south aisle of the church, unlike the other tombs, which are generally found on the north side of the high altar.

than the accompanying ones, since details of her dress, for example, the slashed and knotted sleeves, are not abraded. Traces of red pigment on her over-gown are clearly visible. On the other figures the remains of coloured pigmentation are very slight. The two figures on the far right of the group are stylistically very different. They appear to be of inferior quality and may be from the hand of an assistant, or be later restorations.

It is known that Nicholas Purefoy had several children: George, Ralph, Nicholas and Alice are named in the family documents.[27] It is probable that the figures in the arcading of the tomb chest are meant to represent his children. Purefoy owned lands in Middlesex, Warwickshire and Derbyshire.[28] His involvement with Derbyshire may have facilitated his interest in a sculptor and a supply of alabaster from that area. The alabaster is of the rich creamy-coloured variety with yellowish brown streaks. The remains of a piscina close to the south end of the tomb suggest that this was the site of a former altar.[29]

Kinlet, Shropshire.

---

[27] J. Nichols, The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicestershire, London, 1795-1815, vol. IV, p. 593 for the pedigree of Purefoy, Harleian MS 1049 fo. 12.

[28] Ibid., p. 593.

[29] Rev. R. E. Reynolds, A Short Guide to Fenny Drayton Church n.d., typewritten, p. 2.

At Kinlet in Shropshire is the tomb of Sir John Blount and his wife, Katherine Peshall, heir of Sir Hugh Peshall. Only the will of Katherine survives, dated 1540.[30] Sir John died in 1531. The tomb, again of Derbyshire alabaster, is on the north side of the high altar (fig. 206). The effigies are very finely carved.

The tomb chest is arcaded with elaborate flattened Tudor arches. The arches are actually formed by the reliefs of the dolphins carrying balls in their open mouths. In photographs of the tomb these dolphin arches look merely like archaic scrolls. The inclusion of Renaissance motifs, like the dolphin suggests a later date for the tomb. In the arches on the south side of the tomb chest are three male figures in armour (fig. 207), bareheaded and carrying swords and daggers, a coat-of-arms below each one; a central shield bearing full arms; to the right, two more standing males. On the north side are two groups of three females, scrolls above their heads, on either side of a central armorial shield. These figures are probably representations of the deceased couple and their children. Of their many offspring we have the names of three sons, George, William and Henry, and daughters Rose, Albera, Agnes, Isabel and Elizabeth.[31] The second figure in the middle of the three females on the right of the central shield may be a second portrait of Sir John's wife, Katherine. This figure has a sorrowful countenance and the female

[30] Will of Katherine Peshall, 30 Alenger 28.

[31] Rev. W.G.D. Fletcher, 'Notes on Kinlet', Shropshire Archaeological Society, 3rd series, vol. VIII, 1908, pp. 83-157, p. 96.

to her right gestures to her with her right hand (fig. 208). The costumes and poses of the figures are all slightly varied, producing non-specific portraiture of the members of the family. The south side of the tomb faces the wall and this has protected the surface of the relief. Even traces of the inscriptions on the banderoles around the females' heads are discernible, though only one word, 'Amen', is fully legible. The remains of a delicate sunburst in shallow relief on the central shield are still visible. The coats-of-arms were also in shallow relief. Traces of red, black and gold pigment remain all over the tomb: the male figures were set off against a black background. Decorative Renaissance pilasters, the same size as those at Fenny Drayton, are at each corner of the tomb chest.[32] These recurring similarities in the measurements of different components of the tombs make the attribution of the tombs to the same workshop even more certain. At the head of the tomb is a coat-of-arms. The panel at the foot appears to be unfinished, showing the remains of rough chisel marks and two hollowed spaces.

Interesting family connections link the donors of the tomb to others in the group. The Blounts were related by marriage to Elianor Cornewall, an ancestor of Richard Cornewall of Eye. Elizabeth Blount, the donor's daughter, was doubly famous: first, for her marriages, initially to Gilbert Lord Talbot, and later to Edward Clinton, Lord Clinton and Say; second, for her alliance

---

[32] The pilasters measure 2" x 3" at Fenny Drayton and Wroxeter. All the tombs share very similar measurements.

with Henry VIII as his mistress and the mother of his beloved illegitimate son, Henry Fitzroy, later created Earl of Nottingham and Duke of Richmond.[33] The Blounts obviously had close contact with the court and wielded considerable power through the influence of their daughter on the King.

Stowe-by-Chartley, Staffordshire.

The tomb at Kinlet is stylistically close to the tomb of Sir Walter Devereux and his wife at Stowe-by-Chartley (fig. 209), where Sir Walter was buried in 1537. The Renaissance pilasters are almost identical to the ones on the Bromley tomb, to be discussed later. The strange scroll-like motif of the flattened Tudor arcading on the sides of the tomb chest is very similar to the type of arcading on the tomb at Kinlet. The arches rest on whimsical half-formed columns. In the arcades are pairs of figures in Tudor dress. The French hoods the females are wearing helps to give an approximate date for the tomb, c.1540. Again, the relief is flattened and shallow. It is undoubtedly from the same workshop as the other tombs.

Clifton Campville, Staffordshire.

One of the tombs in this group is considerably more elaborate than the others. This is the monument of Sir John Vernon and his wife, Ellyn Montgomery, in the Lady Chapel of St. Andrew's,

---

[33] T. Harwood, Survey of Staffordshire, containing the Antiquities of that County (by S. Erdeswick), London, 1820, p. 54.

Clifton Campville, in Staffordshire (fig. 210). Surprisingly, the decorative work on this alabaster tomb is not influenced by Renaissance style, although Sir John died in 1545. It is not known when the tomb was erected. Stylistically it looks earlier than 1545, and may date from the decade earlier.

Inside the rounded arches which decorate the sides of the tomb chest are, on the north side, below Sir John's effigy, two seated hooded ecclesiastical figures holding scrolls and books (fig. 211). They are bearded, which suggests that they are not monks in orders. These figures are set on either side of a wider arch enclosing two angels in feathered tights who support a shield displaying the coats-of-arms of the deceased. At the foot end of the tomb are three figures with similar scholarly and ecclesiastical attributes, possibly representing fathers of the church. On the south side are two more seated ecclesiastical figures and two angels. In the panel at the head of the tomb is a relief of two secular kneeling figures (fig. 212). These appear to represent Sir John, kneeling at a prie-dieu, and his wife, facing him and also kneeling. That the kneeling donor figures do not pray to a central holy figure or group, as the donors on the Sussex tombs do, may suggest a later date for this work, in response to the Reformation Injunctions against idolatrous images. By portraying the donors kneeling alone before holy books, personal piety and the layman's right to peruse the scriptures without the mediation of the clergy, a Protestant tenet, are emphasized. Scrolls issue from their mouths, though the messages on these scrolls have been lost.

Around the top of the plinth below the effigies (fig. 213) runs a full inscription.[34] At the base of the tomb chest is an unusual relief frieze of animals, flowers, faces and masks, including a gryphon, a hound and a grotesque mask. This type of imagery does not recur on any of the other tombs in the group. There are also some distinctive motifs on certain pilasters, such as the third pilaster at the foot of the tomb, which includes a motif of knots and a lamp, and the second pilaster on the side, which is marked by a buckle or garter. It is possible that these motifs are some type of mason's mark or identification signature.

The effigies of Sir John and Lady Ellyn are very fine and are stylistically similar to the other effigies in the group. From the inscription on the east end of the tomb we learn that Sir John was a member of the King's Council of Wales, and custos rotulorum of the county of Derbyshire.[35] This aspect of Sir John's career may provide a connection between the donor and the source of the alabaster and the sculptor. Clifton Campville is geographically not far from Fenny Drayton, although they are in different counties.

Wroxeter, Shropshire.

---

[34] S. Shaw, The History and Antiquities of Staffordshire London 1798-1801, vol. I, p. 136.

[35] Major R.G. Reed, The Church and Manor of Clifton Campville n.d., p. 5.

The latest tomb in the group is that of Sir Thomas Bromley, Lord Chief Justice, and his wife Isabel Lyster. The tomb is in the semi-derelict church at Wroxeter, in Shropshire. Like Thomas Manners, Thomas Bromley retained his political offices during the reigns of both the Protestant and Catholic Tudor monarchs. He was a member of the Regency Council of Edward VI, but was still favoured by Queen Mary when she came to power.[36] Bromley was reader at the Inner Temple in 1532 and from 1540, like William Rudhall, he was a Sergeant-at-Law. Although Rudhall died in 1530, it is still possible that the two men were brought together through their professions and court connections.

The tomb, again of Derbyshire alabaster, is situated on the north side of the high altar (fig. 214). Thomas Bromley died on 15 May 1555. His will, written in 1550, reveals no specific plans for his tomb:

> body shall be buried where it shall please Almighty God that I shall pass out of this transitory lyfe to be buried in the parishe churche where I shall decease and that it is to be done without any funeral pomp.[37]

Since there seems to be no mention of his wife in the will, presumably she was already dead. Sir Thomas probably commissioned the tomb between 1550 and his death in 1555. Bromley's daughter Margaret and her husband may have been responsible for the completion of the monument. Her own tomb, with her husband

---

[36] H.E. Forrest, Some old Shropshire Houses and their Owners, Shrewsbury, 1924, p. 136.

[37] Will of Thomas Bromley, 10 January 1550.

Richard Newport, lies across the other side of the aisle.[38]

The effigies of the Bromleys are particularly fine, and are superior in quality to most of the other effigies. This tomb chest was most directly influenced by the tomb of Henry VII. Like the royal tomb, the long side of the chest consists of three panels, divided by Renaissance pilasters. These are very much like the pilasters on the tombs at Stowe-by-Chartley and Fenny Drayton. Circular scrolls surround the shields to the left and right of the central panel. These derive from the medallions on Henry VII's tomb chest. The motifs they contain are reminiscent of the ones at Fenny Drayton. In the centre of the side below the effigy of Sir Thomas is the figure of his daughter Margaret, in costume of the 1550s, with a scroll behind her head. The tiny locket and three-chain necklace that Margaret wears is the same as that found on the effigy of the Countess of Rutland at Bottesford.

At the head and foot of the tomb chest are panels containing reliefs of two clothed angels supporting shields of coats-of-arms. The tomb rests against the wall on the other long side, which means that only three sides are visible. Mailed clenched fists are a recurring motif in the corners of the individual panels and around the plinth at the base.

---

[38] H.E. Forrest, op. cit., pp. 136-37.

The Workshop of Richard Parker

It would appear, from the superior quality of these tombs, that at this time there was a workshop in the area of Burton-on-Trent headed by an alabaster carver of imagination and superior talent who was prepared to adapt his traditional skills and resources to the challenge of new forms and the demands of new patrons. That sculptor was Richard Parker. The existence of the Household Accounts of the Duke of Rutland permit the naming of the artist responsible for the tombs at Bottesford, and through stylistic similarities with the other tombs in the group, Parker and his workshop may be credited with the other tombs. There may be other tombs that come from Parker's workshop.[39]

Other Tomb Designs Influenced by the Tomb of Henry VII

Three other tombs from this period were also obviously influenced by the work of Torrigiano and the other Italian sculptors in England, but they were not from the Midlands workshop.[40]

---

[39] The Babington monument (c.1540) at Kingston-on-Soar, Nottinghamshire, is also of alabaster, with carvings of very high quality that include tiny areas of Renaissance decoration (for example a minute pilaster in the relief of the Last Judgement), but otherwise it is quite unlike the tombs in this group. Other writers have attributed later tombs (for example the Andrewes tomb at Charwelton) to the workshop of Parker who died in 1571. See K.A. Esdaile, English Church Monuments 1510 to 1840, London, 1946, p. 52.

[40] The tomb of Henry Fitzroy, the Earl of Richmond, who died in 1536, was probably begun in the late 1530s at Thetford in Norfolk, but was moved to Framlingham in Suffolk and finished and reassembled in the late 1550s when the tombs of the Dukes

Tickhill, Yorkshire.

The tomb of Sir Thomas Fitzwilliam (died 1497) and his wife Lady Lucy (died 23 April 1534) is situated in the parish church of Tickhill in Yorkshire.[41] The condition of the tomb is very poor, two sides having been completely lost. The effigies, though mutilated (fig. 215), are obviously of good quality work, and were originally painted and gilded, like the Midlands group. Renaissance influence is evident in the tomb chest: the long sides consisting of three panels, topped by shell-shaped niches, and divided by Renaissance pilasters. The moulding is also classically inspired, and putti support the coats-of-arms.

The second husband of Lady Lucy was Sir Anthony Browne of Sussex (died 1506). This connects the two tombs very firmly. P. Biver suggests that the tombs were erected 'during the second widowhood' of Lady Lucy, c.1506-34.[42] The tomb must date from the latter part of this period, from the style of the tomb chest, although the effigies look older. What remains of the effigies (the faces and hands are particularly mutilated) is finely carved

of Norfolk were in progress. In this respect the tomb belongs to the period outside the scope of this study. See L. Stone and H. Colvin, 'The Howard tombs at Framlingham', The Archaeological Journal, vol. CXXII, 1965, pp. 159-81.

[41] Formerly, it stood in the Austin friary, Tickhill, but was moved to the parish church after the friary was dissolved in 1537, according to J. Leland, The Itinerary of John Leland, ed. L. Toulmin Smith, London, 1909-11, vol. I, p. 24.

[42] P. Biver, 'On the Tombs at Tickhill, Yorkshire, and Battle, Sussex', Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, vol. XX, 1908, pp. 279-84.

though stiff, and the costumes date from the end of the fifteenth century. The sculptor may have deliberately archaized the effigies if the tomb had been commissioned many years after the death of Sir Thomas, by Lady Lucy. The surviving south side of the tomb chest is simply decorated in Renaissance style: two pilasters divide the tomb chest into three compartments, each enclosing an armorial shield with the arms of Montague, Monthermer, Neville, Claret and Fitzwilliam. Above each compartment is a shell-headed panel with a moulding of egg-and-dart work. Putti support the coat-of-arms in the plain east side of the tomb chest and the bust of a putto is enclosed in the shell-headed panel above. The west end contains another shield. The north end is concealed.

Battle, Sussex.

The tomb at Battle is in a much better condition. It is located on the north side of the chancel of Battle church, and commemorates the son of Lady Lucy, Sir Anthony Browne, who died in 1548, and his wife Alice (fig. 216). The tomb is a more fully worked-out Renaissance design with classical motifs of high quality in the reliefs on the tomb chest. The long sides of the tomb chest consist of three panels, with shell-headed niches separated by Italianate pilasters. At the centre of each shell niche is a putto head. The central panel of each of the three is a coat-of-arms, within the Order of the Garter roundel, supported by naked putti. The two flanking shields are enclosed by scrolls

in a circle, similar to the type at Wroxeter. Some of the painting and gilding remains. Around the base is a frieze of animal and floral reliefs (fig. 217).

The inscription indicates that the tomb was erected after 1540, when Lady Alice died, and before 1547.[43] The two angels support the Order of the Garter, for which honour he was selected on 23 April 1539 and installed on 9 May 1540.[44] This means that the tomb must have been designed at least as late as the time of his selection in 1539. The date of Sir Anthony's death (1548) has not been added to the inscription. The tomb must have been almost complete by his death.

Sir Anthony Browne had a long and distinguished career at the Court of Henry VIII. He had been knighted at Morlaix in Brittany, in 1524.[45] Sir Anthony had acted as an ambassador to Francis I of France, taking the insignia of the Order of the Garter for his the King's investiture in 1527.[46] He was also one of the executors of the will of Henry VIII.

---

[43] Will of Sir Anthony Browne, P.C.C. Coode fol. 10, 22 April 1547, Sussex Record Society, vol. XL, 1935, p. 17, 'And my bodie to be buried...in the Parishe churche of Battell in the Countie of Sussex within the tombe where my late wife whose soule god pardone lieth buried...I will that myne executoures shall bestowe Twentie poundes sterling about the fynisshing of my tombe at Battell if I chance not to fynishe the same in my lifetime.'

[44] J. Blore, The Sepulchral Antiquities of Great Britain, London 1826, pp. 2-3.

[45] R. Holinshed, op. cit., p. 874. He had been knighted with amongst others, Sir Richard Cornewall of Eye.

[46] J. Blore, op. cit., p. 2.

The tomb is more Italianate than those in the Midlands group, but it is undocumented, and it is not possible to attribute it conclusively to one of the Italian sculptors left in England after the departure of Torrigiano. It seems likely that Sir Anthony commissioned both the Tickhill and Battle tombs, or used the sculptor employed by Lady Lucy. Both of the tombs reveal the influence of the tombs by Torrigiano, most particularly in the high tomb chest, the Renaissance pilasters and the armorial shields enclosed by the Garter and garlands. The frieze running around the bottom of the tomb chest includes classical 'antique' motifs, such as several classical heads in profile, one with a plumed headdress, one with a helm, and one crowned, a horse skull, a bull, a running antelope, gryphons, a putto head, and arabesque and scroll work. The tombs are obviously the work of a sculptor with some knowledge of classical Renaissance imagery but the reliefs are not of the highest quality. The quality of the carving in different areas of the tomb varies greatly - the frieze on one side of the tomb is superior to the other side. There are also some later restorations in parts of the tomb. The strange type of pilaster found on the Browne tomb is reminiscent of the type found in northern French sculpture of the Franco-Italian school. The reliefs are flattened, making the work appear more primitive than that of first-rate sculptors like Torrigiano and Benedetto da Rovezzano. That Sir Anthony did, however, employ a skilful sculptor, who was obviously familiar with the work at Hampton Court for Cardinal Wolsey, for the

sculptural decoration of his own home, Cowdray House, is apparent from the sculpted relief of his arms over the doorway of the north wall (fig. 218). The interior walls of the Great Hall at Cowdray were also covered with large paintings in oil on stucco representing three incidents in the war with France in 1544, the threatened invasion of Portsmouth by the French, and the coronation of King Edward VI in 1547.[47] No trace of the paintings remained after the fire of 1793.[48] It is, therefore, impossible to attribute the paintings to any artist. Nevertheless, the evidence confirms that Sir Anthony was interested in patronizing artists who worked in the new Renaissance style.

Bodmin, Cornwall.

The tomb of Prior Thomas Vyvyan, who died, according to the inscription on the tomb, in 1533[49] is located in the parish

[47] Sir Anthony had participated in the siege of Boulogne in 1544, and was present at the coronation as Master of the King's Horse. The panels were of the type made fashionable by Henry VIII to commemorate his exploits in France, such as The Embarkation of Henry VIII for Boulogne at Hampton Court. A full description of the panels was made by Sir Joseph Ayloffe, 'An Account of some ancient English Historical Paintings at Cowdry in Sussex', Archaeologia, vol. III, 1778, pp. 239-72. Ayloffe attributed them to 'Theodore Barnardi', making an Italian out of Lambert Barnard.

[48] Samuel Hieronymus Grimm made some drawings of the paintings. Prints made from the drawings and two of the original drawings are in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries.

[49] All the sources for the tomb indicate that this is the correct date for the date of Vyvyan's death. E.S. Gilbert, An Historical Survey of the County of Cornwall, London, 1820 vol. II, p. 316, also mentions a small memorial of John Vivian (died 1545), a brother of the Prior; Sir J. Maclean, The Parochial and Family History of the Deanery of Trigg Minor London, 1879, vol. I. p. 89. However, a 'Thomas Vyvian was

church of Bodmin, St. Petroc, in Cornwall (figs. 219 & 220). It was originally before the high altar of the priory, but was moved around 1539.[50] The tomb is of Catacluse marble.[51] The tomb chest is made up of panels consisting of Renaissance garlands enclosing seated figures of the four Evangelists and the arms of the bishopric of Megara, the arms of the priory of Bodmin, the arms of England, France and Ireland (on the panel at the head of the effigy), and the arms of the Vyvyans at the foot. The garlands were obviously directly inspired by the royal tomb chest. They also recall the Jannys tomb at Norwich, but are more sophisticated. In the spandrels of the panels are putto heads and wings. Clothed angels, similar to those on the tomb of Henry VII, supported the shields at the four corners of the top of the tomb chest. They are much damaged. The inscription around the ledge reads:

> Hic tumulatus venerabilis Pater,/Thomas Vivian, Megararensis Episcopus,/ hujus domus Prior,/ qui obiit tertio die Juni,/ anno Dom, 1533,/ cujus animae

---

recorded as Principal of Hatt Hall, Oxford in 1545, according to T.D. Hardy, ed., Fasti Ecclesia Anglicane, Oxford, 1954, vol. III, p. 583. This is difficult to explain. Either this was a relative of the Prior, or he was still alive by this date and the other sources are incorrect.

[50] According to Sir J. Maclean, op. cit., vol. I, p. 89. See also J. Leland, Itinerary, vol. II, fo. 77, refers to the tomb, 'ther lay buried before the high altare in a high tumbe of very darkesche grey marble, one Thomas Viviane, prior of Bodmyn, and suffragane Megarentes Episcopatus. He dyed not long sins'.

[51] See Baron Basset, ed., Carew's Survey of Cornwall, London, 1811, bk. 2, p. 19. Sir Richard Vyvyan built stables at Trelowarren with stone 'drawn on or near Goonhilly Downs of a dark gray, inclining to a blue, which will polish like marble, and is (I believe) a very good lime stone'.

proprietur Deus. Amen.[52]

The Prior was also consecrated Bishop of Megara, in order for him to act as suffragan to Bishop Oldham.[53] Prior Vyvyan built the rectory house at Withiel, his mansion house of Ryalton, and built or repaired many local churches. The local stone was used to imitate the marble of the tomb of Henry VII, and the tomb may come from a local workshop.[54]

Conclusions

The alabaster tombs from the workshop of Richard Parker exhibit the direct influence of specific formal and iconographical innovations introduced in the royal tombs by Pietro Torrigiano. These include:

1) A high, free-standing tomb chest.

2) Corner pilasters composed of a variation on a Corinthian capital surmounting panels of reliefs including Renaissance motifs, such as urns, floral arabesques and candelabra on a free-standing tomb chest.

---

[52] According to Sir J. Maclean, op. cit., p. 77.

[53] Sir J. Maclean, op. cit., vol. I, p. 133.

[54] The exterior of the Greneway aisle at Tiverton, Devon the Greneway chantry and the Lane chantry at Cullompton c.1526 are examples of the work of the local school.

3) Medallions enclosing either coats-of-arms or figures, both secular and religious, in relief.

4) Renaissance decorative work in areas other than the pilasters.

5) Putti, as opposed to clothed angels, as supporters for shields bearing traditional armorial devices on some of the tombs.

These innovations were assimilated by Parker and other English sculptors through the use of the traditional English medium of alabaster. Certain stylistic and iconographic conventions from earlier English alabaster tomb sculpture were retained in conjunction with the innovations. For example, the tombs were painted and gilded, as was the practice for contemporary alabaster tomb sculpture. The relief sculptures of kneeling donors and their children flanking a central holy figure in a panel of the tomb chest derive from an earlier tradition. The Annunciation certainly appeared on earlier tombs. The substitution of an heraldic or a devotional centrepiece, a coat-of-arms or a prie-dieu, instead of a questionable 'idolatrous' image, was brought about as a result of the doctrinal controversy re-opened during the Reformation.[55]

[55] S.A. Jeavons, 'The Church Monuments of Derbyshire: the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, Part 1', The Derbyshire Archaeological Journal, vol. LXXXIV, 1964, pp. 52-80, p. 57 n.9. Also see K.A. Esdaile, 'On the Inter-Action of England and the Low Countries Sculpture in the Sixteenth Century', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. VI, 1943, pp. 80-88, p. 84 on Richard Parker.

The effigies found on most of the tombs in the group do not seem to have been radically influenced by those Torrigiano executed for the royal tombs, although they do exhibit a robust naturalism that differentiates them from the rather uninspired 'formula' effigies of most other contemporary English alabaster tombs.

The three tombs not from the workshop of Richard Parker were all commissioned by important patrons with an interest in the new styles. These tombs were also obviously influenced by the work of Torrigiano, but also suggest that the sculptors responsible were aware of the newer developments in the work of Italians like Benedetto da Rovezzano and Giovanni da Maiano at Hampton Court and elsewhere. The tombs at Tickhill and Battle may be the work of a sculptor who had been involved with the Italian projects at Hampton Court. The Vyvyan tomb is, however, of much cruder workmanship than the tombs at Tickhill and Battle, and appears to be the work of a provincial workshop.

The liturgical and philosophical upheavals brought about by the Reformation in England affected the outlook of the generation that had witnessed the transition from orthodox Roman Catholicism to the new and evolving Anglican doctrines espoused by Henry VIII. Confusion, if not fear, about the controversy over 'idolatrous' images must have caused many to hesitate about the choice of iconographic programme for the decoration of their tombs. The problem of idolatrous images will be discussed more

fully later in this chapter. The classical Italian Renaissance elements of the tomb of Henry VII constituted a more discreet form of decoration than less ambiguously religious imagery. (stop

The Project for the Tomb of Henry VIII

Henry VIII was so anxious at the beginning of his reign to declare himself the equal of the other great European rulers through his patronage of Renaissance artists that at the age of twenty-seven he turned his thoughts to his funerary monument. The tomb of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon was the modest, although splendid, commission assigned to Pietro Torrigiano by a contract of 1518.[56] It is likely that no work was ever actually commenced by Torrigiano on the proposed tomb. Just over ten years later, in 1529, the tomb was re-commissioned as a more grandiose plan with the acquisition of the elements of the unfinished tomb of Cardinal Wolsey, and the services of Benedetto da Rovezzano. This sculptor had been responsible for the tombs of Piero Soderini in the church of the Carmine, Florence, and of San Giovanni Gualberto in Santa Trinita, Florence. This latter tomb was also an ambitious project. Benedetto was thus aware of the later developments in Florentine art, and was accustomed to the

[56] 'Transcript of a Draft of an Indenture of Covenants for the erecting of a Tomb tot the Memory of King Henry the Eighth, and Queen Katherine his Wife; found amongst the Papers of Cardinal Wolsey, in the Chapter House at Westminster', Archaeologia, vol. XVI, pp. 84-88. The tomb of black and white touchstone was to cost £2,000 and was to resemble the tomb of Henry VII but 'grettir by the iiijth parte'.

responsibilities of a major project. With this sculptor in charge of the commission, Henry VIII could have been confident that his tomb would have been appropriately magnificent and stylish. During the prosperous 1530s, elements of the tomb were indeed completed by the group of Italian artists and English assistants headed by Benedetto and Giovanni da Maiano. However, Henry's interest in the immense project waned as his European wars drained his financial resources, and the completion of the tomb was his legacy to each of his children in turn, the partially constructed tomb being brought finally to a rather sad dissolution in the next century.[57]

On 30 December 1546 Henry VIII made his will, leaving the following instructions for his burial and tomb:

> that our bodie be buried and enterred in the quire of our College of Windsor midway between the Stalles and the high Altar; and ther to be made and set...an honourable tombe for our bones to rest in, which is well onward and almost made therefore already, with a fair grate about it which we will also the bones of our true and loving wife Queen Jane be put alsoe, and that there be provided...a convenyent aulter, honorablie prepared and aparelled with all manner of things requisite and necessarie for dailie masses there to be said.[58]

---

[57] See A. Higgins, 'On the Work of the Florentine Sculptors in England', The Archaeological Journal, 2nd series, CI, 1894, pp. 164-91 and Appendix III, on the work of Benedetto da Rovezzano for the King's tomb and the destruction of what had been completed by 1645.

[58] T. Rymer, op. cit., vol. XV, p. 117.

The King's body was buried in the choir of St. George's, Windsor, in the vault containing the remains of Jane Seymour.[59] At Windsor, an enormous hearse, consisting of thirteen great pillars weighing an estimated four thousand pounds, was placed over his remains.[60]

According to Speed, Henry was buried:

> at Windsore, under a most costly Tombe, begun in Copper and guilt, but never finished, in the inclosures of whose Grates is curiously cast this inscription: HENRICUS OCTAVUS REX ANGLIAE, FRANCIAE, DOMINUS HIBERNIAE, FIDEI DEFENSOR.[61]

From this statement originates the controversy over the form of the projected tomb of Henry VIII, and the appearance of the parts of the tomb monument that were indeed finished, only to be dismantled and sold by order of the Long Parliament in March 1645.[62]

Taking into account the conflicting research and conclusions of other writers on the subject of the projected tomb of Henry VIII, it appears that Henry's tomb was to have been an enlarged and modified version of the monument Benedetto da Rovezzano had been creating for Cardinal Wolsey between 1524-29. The tomb would probably have consisted of a free-standing, black touchstone sarcophagus, standing on a pedestal that rested on a two-tiered

---

[59] J. Pote, The History and Antiquities of Windsor Castle..., Eton, 1749, pp. 55-59.

[60] F. Sandford, op. cit., p. 493.

[61] J. Speed, op. cit., p. 796.

[62] A. Higgins, op. cit., Appendix IX.

base. The base was to be decorated with a frieze of gilt and marble panels, of two sizes. Around the base were arranged tall columns with gilded bronze capitals, supporting gilded bronze figures four-and-a-half feet high. Alternating with these columns were tall bronze candlesticks. Through this vertical frieze the sarcophagus would have been visible. The base and pedestal incorporated many smaller figures as well as relief panels. The whole monument was to be enclosed by a bronze grate with doors.[63]

The tomb described by Speed was truly monumental: the dimensions of its base were fifteen feet by twenty; the total height was twenty-eight feet; it featured two pillars of the church, fifteen feet apart, a triumphal arch surmounted by an equestrian statue of the King, as well as the recumbent effigies of the royal couple on two black touchstone tombs, multiple historiated reliefs and over one hundred and thirty other figures.[64]

---

[63] This description incorporates the research of A. Higgins op. cit., especially pp. 189-90 and Appendices IV, V VI and VII, and M. Mitchell, 'Works of Art from Rome for Henry VIII Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXXIV 1971, p. 192.

[64] J. Speed, op. cit., pp. 796-97, 'Description of a Model of a Tomb for Henry VIII'. Of this model Higgins, op. cit. pp. 185-86, argues that 'this monstrous scheme' could not have been conceived by any Italian, and must have been the idea of a an Englishman or a Flemish artist. Furthermore he concluded, on a practical note, that this monument would not have fitted anywhere in St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

Speed's description has been connected with the model Baccio Bandinelli was supposed to have made for Pope Leo X, originally as an honorific monument for King Henry VIII in the 1520s, and only later modified, by the addition of the recumbent effigies, to become a funerary monument.[65] The similarites between the two descriptions are undeniable. The model may have arrived in England at a later date. Unlike Mitchell, I do not completely discount the possibility that, as Vasari reported, Bandinelli later gave the model to Benedetto da Rovezzano.[66] Speed and his contemporaries were convinced, in the absence of Benedetto's own model, that this must be the plan for the unfinished tomb.

Since Benedetto da Rovezzano had made his own estimates of the very considerable cost of gilding the King's tomb, it does not seem likely that Henry would have contemplated an even more expensive undertaking, as the Crown's finances were reaching a crisis point. As Sandford remarked, 'some of this glorious pile was erected'.[67] However, it is ironic and, for the purposes of this study, disappointing that the Tudor who had begun his reign with such enormous ambitions as a patron of the arts and as a humanist should have left no memorial to commemorate himself.

---

[65] Suggested by M. Mitchell, op. cit., pp. 192-96.

[66] G. Vasari, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 144, '[Baccio Bandinelli] fece ancora un bellissimo modello di legno, e le figure di cera, per una sepoltura al re d'Inghilterra; la quale ne sorti poi l'effetto da Baccio, ma fu dato a Benedetto da Rovezzano scultore, che la fece di metallo.'

[67] F. Sandford, op. cit., p. 496

Edward VI included a provision in his will for 'the King my father's tomb to be made upp at (blank)'.[68] The young King's support of strict iconoclastic injunctions regarding religious imagery would have clashed with the complex and iconographically controversial programme of the tomb of his father. As the author of a treatise against idolatry, it seems unlikely that Edward could have approved of and continued the project as it had originally been conceived.[69]

England in the 1540s

From the 1540s through the reign of Elizabeth, the rapid changes in religion and foreign policy initiated by the Tudors created a less harmonious relationship between England and the rest of Europe than had been customary during the earlier years of the reign of Henry VIII. At times this even prevented the entry of foreign merchants and artists into England. Italian artists felt less comfortable in Protestant England, where the increasingly nationalist propaganda against the Pope cast Italian art in a somewhat unpatriotic light and Italians encountered anti-Italian English chauvinism.

---

[68] J. Nichols, ed., The Literary Remains of King Edward VI New York, 1964, from the original edition of the Roxburghe Society, London 1857, vol. II, p. 576.

[69] Edward VI was the author of a treatise entitled, 'A Collection of Passages of Scripture against Idolatry', MS Trinity College, Cambridge R 7.31. The treatise was addressed to the Duke of Somerset.

The reign of Henry VIII was clouded in the last decade by the consequences of Henry's reckless policy-making: war on two fronts, with Scotland and France; economic hardship, and the bankruptcy of the Crown's finances; and hostility in Europe and at home to the break with Rome. The most obvious evidence of the economic and political stresses of the later years of the reign of Henry VIII on royal patronage is the fate of the monumental tomb project.

The establishment of the Anglican church had encouraged foreign Protestants to claim Henry, unwisely, as their protector. Meanwhile, Henry was still persecuting heretics in England whilst attempting to maintain a conservative religious settlement. In contrast to the King, Thomas Cromwell was seeking a Protestant alliance, to be sealed by the marriage of Henry to Anne of Cleves, to prevent the political isolation of England. Art was put in the service of the government's anti-Papal propaganda campaign.[70]

The treatment of foreigners improved, though briefly, as a result of Cromwell's influence. In February 1539 a proclamation was issued by which foreign merchants were to be taxed at the same rate as their English counterparts.[71] The disastrous

---

[70] See S. Anglo, 'An early Tudor Programme for Plays and other Demonstrations against the Pope'. Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XX, 1957, pp. 176-79; R. Strong, 'Edward VI and the Pope', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXIII, 1960, pp. 311-13.

[71] Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, eds., Tudor Royal Proclamations, New Haven and London, 1964-69, vol. 1, pp.

marriage to the Princess of Cleves was annulled almost immediately and the King took as his next bride Katherine Howard, the tool of the Catholic party in his Council.

In September 1540 an Act of Parliament imposing much stricter restraints on the powers of foreigners was passed: by this Act leases of both homes and business property to foreigners were made void.[72] Leniency was recommended in a later proclamation to the 'many aliens and strangers, as well denizens as not denizens, being artificers or handicraftsmen remaining dwelling and abiding within this realm of England...' until the following Easter.[73] On 16 April 1541 alien artisans were to register with the Lord Chancellor to be made denizens by April 24; servants were to make their registration by Midsummer.[74] Four hundred and twenty-one aliens complied with this order to be made denizen that year, compared to only sixteen in 1540 and ninety-one in 1542.[75]

309-305, 'Taxing Foreign Merchants at the same Rate as English', (Westminster, 26 February 1539, 30 Henry VIII), no. 189, pp. 281-83.

[72] Act of 32 Henry VIII c. 16, 1540, SR 3, 765.

[73] T.R.P., vol. 1, 'Suspending Statutes against Foreigners', (Walden 1 September 1540, 32 Henry VIII), no. 195, pp. 289-91.

[74] T.R.P., vol. I, 'Ordering Alien Artisans to register', no. 199, pp. 295-96. (Westminster, 16 April 1541, 32 Henry VIII), London, Journals (MSS), 14, 253v.

[75] W. Page, ed., Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England 1509-1603, Publications of the Huguenot Society of London, vol. VIII, 1893, p.lii.

Religious considerations did contribute to the government's actions toward aliens. Although national economic pressures influenced the policies of the government, Henry was encountering serious opposition to his Oath of Supremacy. England was on the brink of war and some of his most reliable supporters were challenging his authority by refusing to take the Oath. Henry had already executed two most loyal Englishmen, Sir Thomas More and John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. Henry refused to believe that their spiritual allegiance to the Church of Rome did not threaten his temporal authority. The King seemed to need to prove his control by enforcing his authority on all sections of society. He was also losing control of his attempt to prevent the Anglican Reformation from moving towards radical Protestantism.

War with France in 1543 led to a proclamation in June 1544 ordering alien Frenchmen to leave England or to be deported within twenty days.[76] This proclamation was repeated in July of the same year to stress the seriousness of the measure. To be made denizen was a statement of loyalty to the English Crown.[77] In July 1543 a search for French goods had been ordered.[78] One thousand eight hundred and sixty-two Frenchmen and one thousand one hundred and three others chose to become denizen rather than

---

[76] T.R.P., vol. 1, 'Ordering Alien French to Register', no. 233, pp. 336-37, (Westminster, 2 June 1544), BM MS 567, 45678.

[77] T.R.P., vol. 1, 'Ordering all French to become Denizens or leave the Realm', no. 234, pp. 336-37, (Westminster 19 July 1544, 36 Henry VIII), BM MS Harl 442, 161.

[78] W. Page, op. cit., p. xxv.

leave.[79]

Government Expenditure, 1542-47

From 1542 until the end of the reign of Henry VIII, war with France and Scotland cost England the enormous sum of £2,134,748 1s 0d.[80] Henry's debts had been accumulating rapidly to foreign creditors and in the summer of 1546 £94,000 was finally gathered together by the King to appease the Fuggers of Augsburg. Italian and English merchants took the money to Flanders, where an agreement was reached with the Fuggers to accept £92,180 of the total £152,180 payable on 15 August 1546. The remainder of the debt was deferred, at an increased cost to the King, for six months. The Crown's finances were at a nadir. During the summer of 1546 the preparations of the Emperor for war with Germany meant that trade in Flanders ceased. This severely affected English merchants, who were unable to sell cloth to pay off their exchanges that summer. Also Italian bankers in Flanders refused the debased currency of the King. The date of the final payment of the debt to the Fuggers slipped past in this situation of impasse. Not until September and October did the Italians co-operate and, along with the Fuggers, agree to receive payments. The crisis had been temporarily overcome, but the prestige of the English Crown was somewhat tarnished by this

[79] Ibid., p. lii.

[80] F.C. Dietz, English Government Finance, University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Urbana, 1920, vol. IX, p. 147, n. 12, on expenditure.

financial humiliation.

The Changing Attitude towards Foreign Artists

The 1540s were a period of economic hardship and political gloom for England and there was a distinct change in the attitude of the King towards foreign artists, who had been so welcome at his court at the beginning of his reign.[81]

Some artists responded realistically to the new needs of the age. The following letter, from an Italian artist named Giovanbattista to Sir Edmund Harvel, reveals how certain artists adapted their list of accomplishments, in times of war, in the pursuit of patronage:

> 'The reported liberality of your King and his recognition of men of genius (virtuosi), especially Italians, has moved us three, viz. Mastro Giovanbattista, painter of Ravenna, with two other companions to serve him. I offer to make artificial fires of divers sorts to offend the enemy in vessels of terracotta of several sorts to throw (tirare) with the hands; likewise "pastelli" of fire which are thrown with the hands to burn ships' decks and other woodwork at sea; and pikes and darts, arrows with fires and guns (schioppi) inside that offend the enemy with great force and loss. Item, several round shields and armpieces (rotelle et imbracciadore) with guns inside that fire (tirano) upon the enemy and pierce any armour. Powder, again, in several forms, one that makes no report (?) (che non fa schioppo) which serves very well for ambuscades and is fired at the enemy without being heard from a distance; "passa come l'altre polvere fine". Item, certain balls with guns inside which are thrown with the hand and pierce the enemy,

---

[81] The only project that continued with the King's full support was the new palace at Nonsuch, where many foreign artists continued to work. See J. Dent, The Quest for Nonsuch, London, 1962, and M. Biddle, 'Nonsuch Palace 1959-60', Surrey Archaeological Collections, vol. LVIII, 1961, pp. 1-20.

> and inside every ball are four guns. With other secrets and virtues which I reserve to myself to be able to succeed better when I shall be in his Majesty's presence.' Has also a wife, adorned with all womanly virtues who can play the lute and sing, read and write, so as to teach girls (putte). Has not money enough to take them to England and provide necessaries. Venice 19 March '44.[82]

This is reminiscent of the so-called Leonardo letter to Ludovico Sforza, in which Leonardo da Vinci emphasized his talents as an engineer and a scientist rather than his traditional artistic skills, in order to win the patronage of a bellicose ruler.[83]

Although several Italians, including Toto del Nunziata, and other foreign artists remained in the service of the King during the last years of his reign, in spite of the less welcoming atmosphere at court, there are strong indications that Henry was, by this point, much less enthusiastic about the influx of foreign artists. It was common practice for them to solicit introductions to the English court from court officials abroad. In June 1545 Sir William Paget wrote to Lord Cobham, after the arrival in England of yet another Italian artist seeking employment at court:

> Having been the occasion of the coming over of so many with which all here are wearied, you continue sending them over, whom we will as fast send back again. This man I wot not how to bestow. If you can find any place for him there, in the name of God, do as you think

---

[82] Printed in L&P, vol. 19, pt. 1 (1544), pp. 119-20.

[83] Codex Atlanticus 391 r-a, c.1482. Translated in Edward MacCurdy, The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci, New York, 1939, pp. 1152-53. The controversy over the authorship of the manuscript 'uno dei punti controversi della biografica e della paleografia vinciana...' discussed by G. Calvi, I Manoscritti di Leonardo da Vinci, Bologna, 1925, pp. 65-72.

> good. P.S. My Lord, I beseech you send over no more strangers, and move the rest there to send none, for the King is not content.[84]

The Reign of Edward VI

The reform of religion was accelerated during the reign of Edward VI. Foreign Protestants were encouraged by the policies of the Edwardian government to seek refuge in England. The great reformer, Bucer, died in Cambridge during Edward's reign.[85]

There is evidence to suggest that during the reign of Edward VI international relations improved slightly after the hostility and warfare of the last years of Henry VIII. A gesture of conciliation was made towards the French, in particular, by a proclamation of 26 October 1547. French prisoners were to be released and the French were assured:

> that they shall have free gate amiably to converse, traffic and do their trade and merchandise with our said subjects as with their good friends and allies.[86]

---

[84] R.W. Carden, 'The Italian Artists in England during the sixteenth Century', Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London, 2nd series, vol. XXIV, 1911-12, p. 203.

[85] Three thousand people attended the memorial service for the reformer Bucer, in 1551, which included a sermon preached by Dr. Matthew Parker. See W. K. Jordan, ed., The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI, Cornell, 1966, p. 53-54.

[86] T.R.P., vol. 1, 'Ordering the Release of French Prisoners and Prizes', (Westminster, 26 October 1547, 1 Edward VI), no. 291 pp. 405-06.

The Reform of Religion: some Effects on Tomb Sculpture

The admonition of Bishop Latimer to Convocation in 1536 against idolatry prompted a definition of the abuse of images by Convocation as follows:

> That images, as well as of the crucifix as of other saints, are to be put out of the church, and the reliques of saints in no wise to be reverences; and that it is against God's commandment that Christian men should make curtesy or reverence to the image of Our Saviour.[87]

The English reformers continued to support more radical doctrines during the reign of Henry VIII, in order to purge the church of idolatrous practices. Henry continued to support their actions in order to strip the church of its material wealth for his own benefit. The shrines of the saints became the chief objects of religious iconoclasm in the late 1530s.[88] Iconoclasm proved extremely hard to regulate and control, once official sanction and example had been provided for the populace.[89] The effects of these acts of official iconoclasm caused deep concern both amongst conservatives and amongst the reformers themselves, about the possible consequences of the destruction of the

---

[87] Quoted by J. Phillips, The Reformation of Images and the Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1560, Berkeley, 1973, p. 53.

[88] See J. Wall, The Shrines of the British Saints, London, 1905, pp. 236-241. See Keith Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic, New York 1971, pp. 75, 235, 604.

[89] S. Anglo, op. cit., p. 273, cites an episode in 1538, when the Bishop of Rochester made an example of the 'fake' Rood of Grace from Boxley, preaching against it, and had it smashed up before handing it over to 'the rude people and boyes to break up and consign to the flames'.

material symbols of both ecclesiastical and temporal power. As Bishop Gardiner wrote:

> For the destruction of images containeth an enterprise to subvert religion, and the state of the world with it, and especially the nobility, who, by images, set forth and spread abroad, to be red of all people their lineage and parentage, with remembrance of their state and acts...[90]

Royal and noble tombs were perfect examples of works of art that combined religious imagery with heraldic devices and inscriptions to identify the power and rank of the deceased for posterity.

Even the most zealous Protestant advisers of the King were alarmed by the spectre of popular rebellion being ignited by violent acts against such symbols of authority. In response to this fear, an Act of 3-4 Edward VI condoned the destruction of images, but with this safeguard:

> Provided always that this act or any thing therein contained shall not estend to any Image or Picture sett or graven upon any tomb in any church - only for a Monument of any King, Prince or Noblemen or other dead person which hath not been commonly reputed or taken for a saint.[91]

This legislation encapsulates the transference of power and authority from the Church of Rome to the state Church of England, headed by the monarch, and extending to the protection of the King's servants, the nobility who had sworn the Oath of Allegiance. No shrine of any saint could now be venerated. The

---

[90] J. A. Muller, ed., Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction New York, 1926, pp. 272-76.

[91] Act of 3-4 Edward VI c.10, recorded in J. Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. II, i, pp. 288-90.

destruction of any work of art that suggested such idolatrous worship of a symbol of Papal authority was ordered, but a tomb could still incorporate imagery otherwise forbidden and act as a protective vehicle for such imagery. The wording of this Act is slightly ambiguous: it is implied that the tomb of any person is covered by the proviso, but the naming of the upper levels of society suggests that these might be the only types of patrons who would presume to incorporate such imagery on their tombs. It was also assumed that any true servant of the King would not retain what was now considered 'idolatrous' imagery on his tomb. However, those who chose to ignore the Act did: 'idolatrous' images continued to appear on tombs during Edward's reign, and iconoclasts continued to damage 'protected' images.

The preambles of wills give some indication of the stated religious beliefs of those members of society who were most likely to give directions for their funeral and burial.[92] A study of the change in religious beliefs, suggested by surviving testamentary preambles, in the county of Kent during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries revealed that between 1536

---

[92] P. Clark, English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution: Religion, Politics and Society in Kent, 1500-1640, Woking, 1977, pp. 58-59, warns of the factors that must be taken into account when using the preambles of wills to assess the religious beliefs of testators. Wills were made only by individuals who owned substantial possessions; in most dioceses, the records of wills are incomplete. Another important consideration is that wills were often written for testators by the local clergy, who might have imposed their own religious beliefs on the testators. In addition to Clark's points, it is important to bear in mind that testators did not always reveal their true religious beliefs if they feared that they might draw attention to serious unorthodoxy.

and 1539 there was evidence of a slight increase in reformed beliefs, followed by a revival in conservatism until about 1544. From about 1545 until the accession of Queen Mary in 1553 the reformed religion was evidently increasing in popularity, according to declarations of religious faith expressed in these preambles.[93] The wills of the Brudenell family of Deene in Northamptonshire illustrate the changes in beliefs that occurred between 1532 and 1549 in one prominent county family. Sir Robert Brudenell, a well-known Justice of the Peace who was held in high regard by Henry VII, Henry VIII and Cardinal Wolsey, died in 1531, and left directions for 'pictures' of him and his two wives to be placed on his tomb 'after the custom of other like graved stones, used for a remembrance only, for our souls to be prayed for'. Although he left money for the payment of three priests to sing masses at the three altars (of Jesus, our Lady of Pity and 'afore the Blessed Trinity') in the parish church of Deene, in the will of his wife, Dame Philippa, who died just over a year later, there are many more bequests to religious foundations, especially for masses to be said for her soul in the churches of Edlesborough, Chesham in Buckinghamshire, the church of the Blessed Trinity in London, Amersham, and the four orders of friars in Stamford.[94] At Dame Philippa's funeral procession her coffin was followed by sixteen poor men and preceded by priests. According to her will, the torches were to be placed 'about the

---

[93] P. Clark, op. cit., pp. 58-61; 72-76.

[94] Will of Philippa Brudenell, dated 25 March 1532 (P.C.C. 16 Thower).

Holy Cross and Crucifix of the image of our Blessed Saviour Jesu, and not about my hearse or dead body which is but foul carrion and worms' meal'. The will of Dame Philippa's son, Sir Thomas Brudenell, who died on 11 March 1549, contrasts sharply with that of his mother, who was obviously a devout Catholic. Thomas directed that if he died at home in Deene, his

> ..carcase to be buried within the parish church...without all solemnity of blacks, lights, or torches, or such other ceremonies more pompous and vain than necessary, and much more superstitious than Catholic...without any black mourners, or such superstitious and wicked ceremonies as hath been used in funerals, which show by their outrageous mourning rather an evident mistrust of their friend deceased, than that all all we Christians should rejoice in the death of our friends, whereby we enter the gates of eternal life dying in the faith of Christ.[95]

He also forbade the use of the dirge and requiem masses at his funeral, requesting instead two sermons on the Epistle to the Thessalonians. It is interesting to note that it was not until 1586 that a brass to commemorate Sir Thomas and his wife, Elizabeth, was put over the grave by their second son, also Sir Thomas. The religious controversy of the reign on Edward VI must have caused confusion over the orthodoxy of traditional images on tomb sculpture.

---

[95] Will of Sir Thomas Brudenell, P.C.C. 35 Populwell.

Postscript

Queen Mary attempted to reverse all the iconoclastic measures introduced by both Henry VIII and Edward VI by a statute of 1553, which repealed the Edwardian settlement and forbade the defacing and spoiling of altars, crosses, crucifixes, rood lofts, screens, images (including tombs) and vestments, etc.[96] She even began the restoration of the shrine of Edward the Confessor through Archbishop Feckenham at Westminster Abbey.[97]

Finally, although it occurs after the period this thesis covers, it is relevant to note the early legislation of Elizabeth I on the iconoclastic controversy. The Queen issued a proclamation in 1560 that went far beyond the scope of Edward's intentions:

> Her majesty chargeth and commandeth all manner of persons hereafter to forbear the breaking or defacing of any parcel of any monument, or tomb, or grave, or other inscription and memory of any person deceased being in any manner of place, or to break any image of Kings, princes, or noble estates of this realm, or of any other that have been in times past erected and set up for the only memory of them to posterity in common churches and not for any religious honor, or to break down or deface any image in glass windows in any church without consent of the ordinary.[98]

---

[96] State Records, Act of 1 Mary c.2 1553.

[97] See W.R. Lethaby, Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen, New York, 1906, p. 322 and J. Perkins, Westminster Abbey its Worship and its Ornaments, London, 1938, vol. I, p. 55 and vol. II, pp. 78-89.

[98] T.R.P., vol. II, 'Prohibiting Destruction of Church Monuments', (Windsor, 19 September 1560, 2 Elizabeth I), no. 469, pp. 146-48.

This proclamation is extremely important since it declared the protection of the tomb and the imagery on it 'of any person deceased', and inversely, the proclamation permitted any type of religious imagery on a tomb. A statue of a saint might be legitimately defaced in isolation, but in the context of a tomb, such iconoclasm was strictly forbidden, 'of any parcel of any monument'. The proclamation even made a provision for past iconoclasts, 'if they be still living', to repair damage done.[99]

It seems clear that although there was concern about vandalism, 'to the offense of all noble and gentle hearts', the chief reason for the new attitude towards iconoclasm of the specified images was the the fear of:

> ...the extinguishing of the honorable and good memory of sundry virtuous and noble persons deceased; but also the true understanding of divers families of this realm (who have descended of the blood of the same persons deceased) is thereby so darkened as the true course of their inheritance may be hereafter interrupted contrary to justice,...besides many other offenses hereof do ensue to the slander of such...[100]

The Elizabethan government was determined to halt the spread of social unrest that had been unleashed by the Reformation and the rapid changes in religion and government that had occurred during the previous twenty years. It feared that the attacks on the symbols of authority might develop into more serious acts of rebellion. The Elizabethan proclamation thus confirmed the significance of the Tudor tomb as a symbol of great power whose

---

[99] Ibid., p. 147.

[100] T.R.P., vol. II 'Prohibiting Destruction of Church Monuments', March 29 1560, no. 469, pp. 146-47.

form was carefully protected.

CONCLUSION

Although the influence of the work of Pietro Torrigiano on English tomb sculpture has been assessed by many writers on the early Renaissance period as negligible, the royal tombs he created in Westminster Abbey were indeed gradually reflected in the form of English tombs in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. In the tomb of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, with its high tomb chest, its use of black and white marble Renaissance decorative work, naturalistic gilded effigies and gilded copper reliefs in Renaissance roundels, the sculptor produced a fine eclectic monument that made visual references to some of the finest contemporary Italian, French and Burgundian funerary monuments and other sculpture. Yet Torrigiano had modified his style to accommodate English traditions, elements of which were manifested in the tombs and other sculptural works in Westminster Abbey. The influence of this environment, and the collaboration with English and Flemish artists on the tomb of the Lady Margaret Beaufort and later on the tomb of Henry VII and his consort, caused Torrigiano to create Italianate works that proved acceptable to the taste of English patrons and could be imitated

by English-trained sculptors. These two achievements attest to the extent to which the Florentine artist had altered his native style to suit his foreign patrons. Perhaps if Torrigiano had introduced more specifically Florentine stylistic innovations in his English works they might have generated a more dramatic response from the succeeding generation of English sculptors, rather than the very slight modification of the traditional English tomb that his anglicized royal tombs initiated.

To innovate in such an environment was not an easy task. The The tomb of the Lady Margaret Beaufort was the first tomb in England by a native Italian of the generation of Michelangelo. That this tomb referred so directly to contemporary Burgundian funerary sculpture rather than to developments in Italian sculpture is hardly surprising, considering the substantial influence that Burgundian art and culture had on the English court in the later Yorkist and early Tudor period. The tomb of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York presented more French and Italian innovations on a still fairly conventional English model. The Tudor royal tombs in the context of Henry VII's chapel constituted a programme that was the equal in skill and beauty to other contemporary royal funerary chapels, such as the Capilla Real of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella in Granada, or that of the Valois Kings of France in St. Denis, Paris, or of the Emperor Maximilian in Innsbruck.

The East Anglian monuments reveal the influence of the Franco-Italian school of sculpture that originated at Gaillon in Normandy and spread through northern France and the Low Countries in the first quarter of the century before reaching England in the form of applied Renaissance decorative work on existing English architectural forms. The decorative work was most readily adopted by English patrons as applied terracotta or stone panels and embellishments to windows on English Renaissance mansions in the South and East of England. It was also made popular in contemporary ecclesiastical and secular carved woodwork, though this was often imported wholesale from the Netherlands. The East Anglian tombs are rare examples of the attempt to create funerary monuments that depended wholly on fully fledged classical Renaissance funerary imagery, with few concessions to English traditions. Even the material that they were manufactured from, terracotta, was unfamiliar to the English eye, except from the foreign works created by Italians for the King and prominent courtiers. With the exception of the stone effigies at Layer Marney, the tombs were without effigies. It was not the Italian terracotta portrait sculpture produced in England at the time that was influential on these monuments, but rather the fashionable decorative work of the northern French source already mentioned, of the type that was commissioned for Hampton Court Greenwich and Hanworth. The scarcity of native workers who were skilled in the making of terracotta as compared to the strong tradition of English stonecarvers makes it hardly surprising that these tombs had little influence on later works.

The Sussex tombs studied in chapter IV provide a useful illustration of one of the chief means of tranferring new and foreign images to English artists from the continent. In an age when few English artists, with noted exceptions, actually made the trip across the Channel to experience at first-hand Renaissance sculpture, the use of early French and, later, English devotional engravings and woodcuts as models for sculpted reliefs helps to explain the hybrid and flattened images that were produced. The development of the sculpted reliefs of the donors themselves has been traced from earlier monumental brasses that were popular in England between 1490 and 1510. For a brief period the Sussex tombs showed a new development in the evolution of the type, to be superceded once more by monumental brasses, in the second half of the sixteenth century.[1] The brasses of this later era portrayed the donors making their devotions to a secular centrepiece, such as the royal arms, rather than to the Christological image connected with the Resurrection that appeared in the tombs studied in chapter IV. In one respect, however, these tombs with their sculpted reliefs of kneeling donors foreshadow a whole group of Elizabethan and later tombs where the donor figure becomes a free-standing statue, though still often placed in a wall niche, as in these earlier tombs.

The limited use of early engravings and woodcuts from Europe in the first half of the sixteenth century was succeeded by the widespread availability of continental pattern books after 1557.

---

[1] See J. Bertram. op. cit., p. 121.

The pattern books of Cornelius Floris, engraved by Hieronymous Cock, available from this year, and soon followed by the publication of the works of Vredeman de Vries, were to be tremendously influential on English sculptors.

The tombs studied in chapter V represent a subtle assimilation by English sculptors in the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII of the Italianate update of the English free-standing altar tomb with effigies that Pietro Torrigiano's royal tombs had provided in the second decade of the sixteenth century. This type of tomb itself achieved great popularity with the English alabasterers during the early Elizabethan period. The Renaissance motifs Torrigiano introduced were, however, distorted in the course of this assimilation as the sculptors began to draw from their own later variations on the original themes.

That foreign innovations, particularly Italianate, did not have a deeper impact on English tomb sculpture in the first half of the sixteenth century is not really surprising. The presence of Torrigiano and the other Italian sculptors in England, and the erection of the Tudor royal tombs was, of course, an auspicious beginning; Henry VIII's commission for a Renaissance funerary monument for himself, even more so. The promise of a sustained movement was also evident in the development of a foreign merchant community actively interested in assisting artists facilitating commissions and supplying materials. In some local workshops, such as the one headed by Richard Parker, sculptors

and craftsmen were adopting, and adapting to, the new techniques and decorative motifs, though admittedly with little understanding of the original sources of these innovations. Yet, in spite of all these propitious developments, a new school of Anglo-Italian sculptors failed to establish itself in England, whereas in France there had been a much more lasting assimilation of Italian and French styles in the early sixteenth century.

The abandonment of the Italian tomb project of Henry VIII paralleled the decline of Italian influence on English art. Given the kinds of political, economic and, most particularly, religious upheavals that shook English society in the 1530s and 1540s, it is not surprising that there was a hiatus in the evolution of English tomb sculpture. Although a few Italian artists remained in England through this time of transition, England did not provide foreign artists with an actively nurturing environment. English traditions were strongly upheld in the workshops of English masons. During the reign of Elizabeth, Flemish and Dutch refugee sculptors, with their experience of Mannerist sculpture, took sanctuary in England, settled and intermarried with the families of English masons. It was in this way that the course of English tomb sculpture would be redirected during the second half of the sixteenth century, but this redirection lies outside the scope of this study, with the historians of Elizabethan tomb sculpture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Certain works used throughout have been cited in individual chapter bibliographies.

1. Primary Sources and Published Documents

Astle, T., The Will of Henry VII, London, 1775.

Bacon, F., The Life and Reign of King Henry VII, ed. F.J. Levy, Indianapolis, c.1972.

BM Additional MS 36389. J. Buckler drawings.

BM MS Burrell 5672-5675. H. Grimm drawings.

BM Harley MS 297 fo. 28-30, 'A plot for the tomb of Henry VII, afterwards misliked by Henry VIII.'

BM Cotton MS Augustus II, fol. i, 'A design for Henry VI's tomb.'

Brewer, J. S., et al., eds., Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547, 21 vols., in 35 parts, London, H.M.S.O., 1862-1910; Addenda, 1 vol. in 2 parts, London, H.M.S.O., 1929, 1932.

Britton, J., ed., 'Contract for the altar of 1516 by Pietro Torrigiano,' Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain, vol. II, London, 1807-26.

Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Edward VI, 1547-1553, ed. R. Lemon, London, 1856.

Calendar of State Papers Foreign: Edward VI, 1547-1553, various eds., London, 1861.

Calendar of State Venetian, 1202-1554, vols. 1-5, ed. H. Rawdon Brown, London, 1864-73.

Cook, G.H., ed., Letters to Cromwell and others on the Suppression of the Monasteries, London, 1965.

'Design for a Monument to King Edward VI' (Bodleian Library Oxford, Gough Maps 45, no. 637).

Giustiniani, S., Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII, June 12 1515 to July 26, 1519, ed. H. Rawdon Brown, London, 1854.

Hall, E., Union of the two noble and illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke, London, 1548.

Holinshed, R., Chronicle of England, Scotland and Ireland, London, 1577.

Hughes, P.L., and J.F. Larkin, eds., Tudor Royal Proclamations, New Haven and London, 1969.

Jordan, W., ed., The Rutland Papers, (Camden Society), London, 1842.

Jordan, W.K., ed., The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI, Ithaca, 1966.

Leland, J., The Itinerary of John Leland, in or about the Years 1535-1543, parts I-IX in 5 vols., ed. L. Toulmin Smith, London, 1907-11.

Machyn, H., The Diary of Henry Machyn...1550-63, ed. J.G. Nichols, London, 1848.

Nichols, J.G., ed., The Literary Remains of King Edward VI, 2 vols., London, 1857.

Nichols, J., ed., A Collection of all the Wills of the Kings and Queens of England...from the reign of William the Conqueror to that of Henry VII, London, 1780.

P.C.C. (Proceedings of the Court of Consistory), various.

A Relation of the Island of England, c.1500, ed. and trans. C.A. Sneyd, Camden Society, London, 1847.

Rymer, T., Foedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunque generis acta publica..., 20 vols., London, 1703-35.

Scott, R.S., 'On the Contracts for the tomb of the Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, Mother of King Henry VII, and the Foundress of the Colleges of Christ and St. John in Cambridge', Archaeologia, 2nd series, vol. XVI, 66, April 1915, pp. 365-72.

Testamenta Eboracensia: Publications of the Surtees Society, 1836-1902 (various).

'Transcript of a Draft of an Indenture for Covenants for the erecting of a Tomb to the Memory of King Henry VIII and Queen Katherine his Wife; found amongst the Papers of Cardinal Wolsey, in the Chapter House at Westminster', Archaeologia, vol. XVI, 1809, pp. 84-88.

Vertue, G., Notebooks, published in the Walpole Society, 1930-55, vols. XVIII-XXX.

2. Secondary Sources and Reference Works:

a. Art Historical

Auerbach, E., Tudor Artists, London, 1954.

Blunt, A., Art and Architecture in France 1500-1700, Harmondsworth, 1953.

Burger, F., Geschichte des florentinischen Grabmals, Strassburg, 1904.

Carden, R.W., 'The Italian Artists in England during the Sixteenth Century', Proceedings of the Antiquaries of London, 2nd series, vol. XXIV, 1911-12, pp. 171-204.

Chambers, D.S., Patrons and Artists in the Italian Renaissance, London, 1970.

Cohen, K.R., Metamorphosis of a Death Symbol: The Transi Tomb in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Berkeley, 1973.

Crosby, S.M., L'Abbaye Royale de Saint-Denis, Paris, 1953.

Crossley, F.H., English Church Monuments A.D. 1150-1550 - an Introduction to the Study of Tombs & Effigies of the Mediaeval Period, London, 1921.

David, H., De Sluter à Sambin, 2 vols., Paris, 1932.

Davies, G.S., The Renascence Tombs of Rome, London, 1910.

Esdaile, K.A. English Church Monuments: 1510-1840, London, 1946.

Gardner, A., Alabaster Tombs of the Pre-Reformation Period in England, Cambridge, 1940.

Gomez-Moreno, M., La escultura del Renacimiento en España, Florence, 1931.

Hernadez Perera, J., Escultores florentinos en España, Madrid, 1957.

Longhurst, M.H., Notes on Italian Monuments of the twelfth to sixteenth Centuries, London, 1964, 2 volumes.

Müller, T., Sculpture in the Netherlands, Germany, France and Spain: 1400-1500, London and Bungay, 1966.

Panofsky, E., Tomb Sculpture, London, 1964.

Pevsner, N., ed., The Buildings of England, 41 vols., Harmondsworth, 1951-74.

Planiscig, L., Venezianische Bildhauer der Renaissance, Vienna, 1921.

Pope-Hennessy, J., assisted by R.W. Lightbown, Catalogue of Italian Sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum, 3 vols., London, 1964.

----------, An Introduction to Italian Sculpture, 3 vols., 2nd ed., London-New York, 1971.

----------, The Portrait in the Renaissance, Princeton, 1966.

----------, 'The Tombs and Monuments', in Westminster Abbey, London, 1972.

Pradel, P., Michel Colombe, le dernier imagier gothique, Paris, 1953.

Prior, E.S. and A. Gardner, Medieval Figure Sculpture in England, Cambridge, 1912.

Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions in England, 39 vols., H.M. Stationery Office, 1910-81.

s'Jacob, H., Idealism and Realism, Leyden, 1954.

Stone, L., Sculpture in Britain in the Middle Ages, London and Bungay, 1955.

Stothard, C.A., The Monumental Effigies of Great Britain, London, 1817.

Strong, R., Hans Holbein and Henry VIII, London, 1967.

Summerson, J.N., Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830, Harmondsworth, 1969.

Vasari, Giorgio, Le vite de'più eccelenti pittori, scultori ed architettori italiani, ed., G. Milanesi, 9 vols., 2nd ed., Florence, 1909.

Victoria History of the Counties of England, ed. W. Page, et al., London, 1906- .

Vitry, P., Michel Colombe et la sculpture française de son temps, Paris, 1901.

----------, and G. Brière, Documents de sculpture française, 2 vols., Paris, 1911.

Weever, J., Ancient Funeral Monuments within the United Monarchie of Great Britaine and Ireland..., London, 1631.

Whinney, M., Sculpture in Britain, 1530-1830, Harmondsworth, 1966.

Wittkower, R., Sculpture: Processes and Principles, New York, 1977.

b. Historical Background

Anglo, S., Spectacle and Pageantry in Tudor England, Oxford, 1969.

Ariès, P., Images of Man and Death, trans. J. Lloyd, Cambridge, Mass., 1985.

Clark, P., English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution: Religion, Politics and Society in Kent, 1500-1640, Woking, 1977.

Colvin, H.M., The History of the King's Works, 3 vols., London, 1963-82.

Coulton, G.G., Art and the Reformation, Cambridge, 1953.

Dickens, A.G., The English Reformation, London, 1964.

Dietz, F.C., English Government Finance, University of Illinois Studies in the Social Science, IX, Urbana, 1920.

Duncan-Jones, A.S., 'The Burial of the Dead', in Liturgical Worship: A Companion to the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion, ed., W.K. Lowther Clarke, London, 1954.

Elton, G.R., England under the Tudors, London, 1955.

Erlande-Brandenburg, A., Le roi est mort: étude sur les funérailles, les sépultures et les tombeaux des rois de France jusqu'à la fin du 13e siècle, Geneva, c.1975.

Fisher, Frederick J., 'Commercial Trends in Sixteenth Century England', in Economic History Review, original series, 10, 1939-40, pp. 95-117.

Giesey, R.E., The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France, Geneva, 1960.

Gough, R., Sepulchral Monuments in Great Britain...from the Norman Conquest to the Seventeenth Century, 2 vols., ed. J. Nichols, London, 1786-96.

Howard, C., The English Traveller in the Renaissance, New York, 1914.

Kantorowicz, E.H., The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology, Princeton, 1957.

McFarlane, K.B., The Nobility of Later Medieval England, Oxford, 1973.

Mathew, D., Catholicism in England, 1535-1935, London, 1955.

----------, The Courtiers of Henry VIII, London, 1970.

Rowell, G., The Liturgy of Christian Burial, London, 1977.

Sandford, F., A Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England, London, 1707 ed.

Scarisbrick, J.J., Henry VIII, Berkeley, 1968.

Thomas, K.V., Religion and the Decline of Magic, New York, 1971.

Wood-Legh, K.L., Perpetual Chantries in Britain, Cambridge, 1965.

Chapter I

Beard, C., 'Torrigiano or da Maiano?', The Connoisseur, vol. LXXXVI, 1929, pp. 83-86.

Bond, F., Westminster Abbey, Oxford, 1909.

Britton, J., The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain, 5 vols., London, 1809-35.

Chambers, D.S., Cardinal Bainbridge and the Court of Rome, Oxford, 1965.

Cochin, C., 'Un lien artistique entre l'Italie, le Flandre et l'Angleterre, Pietro Torrigiano en Flandre', Revue de l'art ancien et moderne, vol. XXXVI, 1914, pp. 172-82.

Cook, T.A., 'The Bronze Medallion in Henry VII's Chapel', Monthly Review, 1903, pp. 89-91.

Cooper, J., 'Henry VII's Last Years Reconsidered', Past and Present, vol. XXVI, 1959, pp. 110-12.

Corrozet, P., Les antiquitez, croniques et singularitez de Paris, Paris, 1588.

Darr, A.P., 'The Sculptures of Torrigiano: the Westminster Abbey Tombs', The Connoisseur, CC, 1979, pp. 117-84.

----------, 'The English Works of Pietro Torrigiano', Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1979.

Dow, H.J., 'The Italian Portrait Busts of Henry VIII', Art Bulletin, XLI, 1960, pp. 291-94.

Duprè dal Poggetto, M.G. Ciardi, 'Pietro Torrigiano e le sue opere italiane', Commentari, vol. XXII, 1971, pp. 305-25.

Ellis, H., History of Shoreditch, London, 1798.

Elton, G.R., 'Henry VII: Rapacity and Remorse', Historical Journal, vol. I, 1958, pp. 21-39.

Ettlinger, L.D., 'Pollaiuolo's Tomb of Pope Sixtus IV', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XVI, 1955, pp. 239-74.

Félibien, M., L'Histoire de l'abbaye de St. Denis, Paris, 1706.

Ferrajoli, A., 'Un testamento...inedito di Pietro Torrigiano', Bolletino d'Arte, vol. IX, 1915, pp. 181-92.

Ford, E., History of Enfield, Enfield, 1873.

Grossman, F., 'Holbein, Torrigiano and a Bust of Dean Colet', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XIII, 1950, pp. 202-36.

Harrison, M., 'A Life of St. Edward at Fécamp in Normandy', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXVI, 1963, pp. 255-63.

Higgins, A., 'On the Work of the Florentine Sculptors in England', The Archaeological Journal, vol. LI, 1894, pp. 129-220.

Hope, W.H. St. John, 'On the Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England', Archaeologia, vol. LX, 1907, pp. 517-70.

----------, 'The Funeral, Monument and Chantry Chapel of Henry V', Archaeologia, 2nd series, vol. LXV, February 1914, pp. 361-80.

----------, Windsor Castle, London, 1913.

Howgrave-Graham, R.P., 'Royal Portraits in Effigy: Some New Discoveries in Westminster Abbey', Journal of the Royal Society of the Arts, 29 May, 1953, 469-71.

----------, 'The Earlier Royal Funeral Effigies', Archaeologia, vol. XCVIII, 1961, pp. 159-69.

Hugo, Rev. T., 'The Last Twenty Years of Halliwell Priory', unpublished lecture, BM Additional MS 30295.

Hymans, H.S., Guide à Bruges et ses environs, Brussels, 1900.

Janson, H.W., The Sculpture of Donatello, Princeton, 1957.

Justi, C., 'Pietro Torrigiano', Jahrbuch der preuszischen Kunstsammlungen, vol. XXVII, 1906, pp. 249-81.

Kennett, W., A Complete History of England, London, 1709-19.

Lesuer, P., 'Sur le séjour de G. Mazzoni en France', Bulletin de l'histoire de l'art française, 1939, pp. 188-92.

Lethaby, W.R., Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen - A Study of Medieval Buildings, London, 1906.

MacMichael, N.H., ed., Westminster Abbey Official Guide, London, 1977.

Meyer, B. Hochstetler, 'The Tomb of Henry VII of England', The Art Bulletin, vol. LVII, 1976, pp. 358-67.

----------, 'The Tomb of Louis XII and Anne of Brittany', Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1973.

Micklethwaite, J.T., 'Notes on the Imagery of Henry VII's Chapel, Westminster', Archaeologia, vol. XLVIII, 1883, pp. 361-80.

de Montaigion, A., 'Sur le tombeau le Charles VIII par Guido Mazzoni', Archives de l'art française, I, 1851-52, pp. 129-32.

Milanesi, G., ed., Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese 3 vols., Siena, 1854-55.

Müntz, E., Les arts à la cour des Papes Innocent VIII, Alexandre VI et Pié III, 1485-1503, Paris, 1898.

Neale, J.P. and W. Brayley, The History and antiquities of the Abbey Church of Westminster, 2 vols., London, 1818-23.

Pinchart, M. Alexandre, 'Notices sur Pierre de Beckere', Bulletins de l'académie, 2nd series, vol. XVIII.

Plenderleith, H.J. and H. Maryon, 'The Royal Bronze Effigies in Westminster Abbey', Antiquaries Journal, vol. XXXIX, 1959, 87-90.

Reynolds, E.E., The Life of St. John Fisher, Wheathampstead, 1972.

Seymour, C., The Sculpture of Verrocchio, Greenwich, Conn., 1971.

Speed, J., The History of Great Britain, London, 1613.

Stanley, J., Memorials of Westminster Abbey, London, 1869.

Tanner, L.E., 'Some Representations of St. Edward the Confessor in Westminster Abbey and elsewhere', Journal of the British Archaelogical Association, 3rd series, vol. XV, 1952, pp. 1-12.

---------- and J.G. O'Neilly, 'The Shrine of St. Edward the Confessor', Archaeologia, vol. C, 1966, pp. 129-54.

Valentiner, W.R., 'Michelangelo's Statuettes of the Piccolomini Altar in Siena', Art Quarterly, vol. V, 1942, pp. 3-44.

van Hoote, J.A., De geschiedenis van Brugge, Lannoo, 1982.

Verdon, T.C., 'The Art of Guido Mazzoni', Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1975.

Vernarecci, A., 'Il Torrigiano pittore fiorentino a Fossombrone', Rivista Misena, vol. VIII, 1893, pp. 52-53.

Wall, J., Shrines of the British Saints, London, 1975.

Wilkie, W.E., The Cardinal Protectors of England: Rome and the Tudors before the Reformation, Cambridge, 1974.

Chapter II

Bearwood, A., 'Alien Merchants and the English Crown in the later Fourteenth Century', Economic History Review, vol. II, 1929-30, pp. 229-60.

Bond, A.G., 'Extracts from the Liberate Rolls, relative to the Loans supplied by Italian Merchants to the Kings of England in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', Archaeologia, vol. XXVIII, pp. 207-326.

Corrigan, B., 'Sir Thomas More: Personage and Symbol', in Studies in the Continental Background of Renaissance English Literature: Essays presented to John L. Lievsay, eds. D.B.J. Randall and G.W. Williams, North Carolina, 1977, pp. 91-108.

Cunningham, W., Alien Immigrants to England, London, 1891.

Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, eds. A. Pavan et al., vols. 1-30., Rome, 1960- .

Einstein, L., The Italian Renaissance in England, New York and London, 1902.

Grunzweig, A., ed., Correspondance de la filiale de Bruges des Médicis, Brussels, 1931.

Holmes, M., 'Evil May-Day, 1517: the Story of a Riot', History Today, vol. XV, no. 9, Sept. 1965, pp. 642-50.

Kingsford, C.L., ed., Two London Chronicles, from the Collections of John Stowe, (Camden Miscellany, xii) London, 1910.

Klapisch-Zuber, C., Les maîtres du marbre carrare, 1300-1600, Paris, 1969.

Page, W., ed., Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England 1509-1603, Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London, VIII, 1893.

Ruddock, A.A., Southampton Merchants and Shipping, 1270-1600, Southampton, 1951.

Whitwell, R.J., 'Italian Bankers and the English Crown', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, n.s., vol. XVII, 1903, pp. 175-233.

Chapter III

Baggs, A.P., 'Sixteenth-century Terra-cotta Tombs in East Anglia', The Archaeological Journal, vol. CXXV, 1968, pp. 296-301.

de Beaurepaire, C., 'Les architectes de Rouen dans la première moitié du XVIe siècle', Bulletin de la société des amis des monuments rouennais, 1904, pp. 119-53.

Beloe, E.M., 'Oxborough', Norfolk Archaeological Society Journal, vol. XIII, 1896, pp. 343-57.

Blomfield, R., A History of Renaissance Architecture in England, 1500-1800, 2 volumes, London, 1897.

Blomefield, F., The History and Antiquities of Norfolk, 11 volumes, London, 1805-16.

Blunt, A., 'L'Influence française sur l'architecture et la sculpture décorative en Angleterre pendant la première moitié du XVIe siècle', Revue de l'art, vol. IV, 1969, pp. 17-29.

Borg, A., et al. eds., Medieval Sculpture from Norwich Cathedral, exhibition catalogue, Norwich, 1968.

Bottineau-Fuchs, Y., 'La décoration des tombeaux des cardinaux d'Amboise à la cathédrale de Rouen: Arnoult de Nimègue ou Nicholas Castille', Gazette des beaux-arts, C, 1982, pp. 191-200.

Brunskill, R. and A. Clifton-Taylor, English Brickwork, London, 1977.

Cellini, B., The Autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini, ed. and trans. A. Symonds, New York, 1927.

Chancellor, F., The Ancient Sepulchral Monuments of Essex, Colchester, 1846.

Chancellor, F., 'Layer Marney church', T.E.A.S., n.s., vol. XIV, p. 65.

Chirol, E., Un premier foyer de la renaissance: le château de Gaillon, Rouen/Paris, 1952.

---------- and J. Bailly, Les clôtures de Fécamp, Paris, 1950.

Clifton-Taylor, A., The Pattern of English Building, 2nd ed., London 1972.

Deville, A., Comptes des dépenses de château de Gaillon, Paris, 1850.

Dow, H.J., 'John Hudde and the English Renaissance', Renaissance News, vol. XVIII, 1965, pp. 289-94.

Dugdale, W., History of St. Paul's Cathedral in London, London, 1657 ed.

----------, Monasticon Anglicanum, London, 1722-23 ed.

Eeles, F.C., 'The black effigies at Layer Marney re-examined', T.E.A.S., n.s., vol. XXII, p. 272.

Ganz, P., The Paintings of Hans Holbein, London, 1956.

Gotch, J.A., Early Renaissance Architecture in England, London, 1914.

Grace, M., ed., 'Records of the Guild of St. George, Norwich, 1389-1547', Norfolk Record Society, vol. IX, 1937.

Harrison, F., Annals of an Old Manor House, Sutton Place, Guilford, London, 1893.

Hayward, C.F., 'Architectural notes on Layer Marney Hall and on the parish church adjoining', T.E.A.S., vol. III, p. 10.

Herval, R., Caen, Caen/Paris, 1935.

Holbein and the Court of Henry VIII, exhibition catalogue, The Queen's Gallery, London, 1978-79.

Holland, H., Monumenta Sepulchraria Sancti Pauli, London, 1614 ed.

Huard, G., La paroisse et l'église de Saint-Pierre de Caen, (Mémoires des antiquaires de Normandie, vol. 35).

Kestell-Floyer, J., 'English Brick Buildings: Henry VII-VIII', Archaeological Journal, vol. 80, 1923, pp. 291-304.

Knight, J., The Life of Dean Colet, London, 1724.

Lafond, J., 'A. de la Pointe, peintre at verrier de Nimègue et les autres étrangers à Rouen aux XVe-XVIe siècles', Bulletin de la société des amis des monuments rouennais, 1911, pp. 141-79.

Lanfry, G., E. Chirol, and J. Bailly, Le tombeau des cardinaux d'Amboise, Rouen, 1959, p. 16.

Le Coste-Messelière, 'Les médaillons historiques de Gaillon', Revue des arts, vol. VII, 1957, pp. 65-70.

Magenta, C., La Certosa di Pavia, Milan, 1897.

Marquet de Vasselet, J.J., 'Les boisseries de Gaillon au musée de Cluny', Bulletin Monumental, 1927, pp. 321-69.

McGill, Rev. G.H., 'Oxborough Hall', Norfolk Archaeological Society Journal, vol. IV, 1855, pp. 271-84.

Mitchell, Arnold B., 'The Tomb of Lord Henry Marney, Layer Marney Church, Essex: Sketches at and near Layer Marney', The Builder, vol. LV, 1888, pp. 41, 47.

Morant, P., History and Antiquities of the County of Essex, London, 1768.

Oxborough Hall, National Trust, 1977.

Petit, Rev. J.L., 'Tong Church, Salop.', Shropshire Archaeological Society, vol. V, 1882, pp. 299-388.

Purcell, D., 'Sixteenth-century Terra-cotta in East Anglia', Transactions of the Society for Studies in the Conservation of Historic Buildings, vol. I, 1973, pp. 1-5.

Remington, C., 'A Portrait Bust of an English Ecclesiastic of the Sixteenth Century', Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Fine Art, vol. XXXI, 1936, pp. 223-29.

La renaissance à Rouen, exhibition catalogue, Musée des Beaux-Arts de Rouen, 1980-81.

Stow, J., ed. and J. Strype, Survey of London and Westminster, London, 1720.

Suckling, A., History and Antiquities of the County of Suffolk, London, 1846-48.

Thurlow, A.G.G., The Church of St. George, Colegate, a redundant Church, n.d.

Trapp, J.B. and H.B. Herbruggen, The King's Good Servant: Sir Thomas More 1477-1535, National Portrait Gallery, London, 1977-78.

Chapter IV

Andre, J. Lewis, 'Female Head-dress exemplified by Sussex Brasses', S.A.C., vol. XLII, 1899, pp. 1-18.

----------, 'Slinfold', S.A.C., vol. XL, 1896, pp. 51-52.

Ayloffe, Sir J., 'An Account of some ancient English Historical Paintings at Cowdry, Sussex', Archaeologia, vol. III, 1778, pp. 239-72.

Bernheimer, R., Wild Men in the Middle Ages: A Study in Art, Sentiment, and Demonology, New York, 1979.

Bertram, J., Lost Brasses, North Pomfret, Vermont, 1976.

Blaaux, W.H., 'Sussex Monasteries at the Time of their Suppression', S.A.C., vol. VII, 1865.

Bonnell, K., 'The Eastery Sepulchrum in its Relations to the Architecture of the High Altar', PMLA, vol. XXXI, 1916, pp. 664-712.

Brooks, N.C., 'The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy', University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, 1921, pp. 139-247.

Burges, W., 'The Tomb and Helm of Thomas LaWarre', Archaeological Journal, 1885, vol. XXXVI, pp. 78-87.

Campbell Dodgson, C., 'English Devotional Woodcuts of the late Fifteenth Century with special Reference to those in the Bodleian Library', The Walpole Society, vol. XVII, 1928-29, pp. 95-108.

Christensen, C.C., Art and the Reformation in Germany, Athens, Ohio, 1979.

Clarke, W.K., Chichester Cathedral: its History and Art, Chichester, 1957.

Codrington, Rev., 'Ancient Coats-of-Arms in Chichester Cathedral', S.A.C., vol. XLVIII, 1905, pp. 138-44.

Croft-Murray, E., 'Lambert Barnard: An early Renaissance Painter', The Archaeological Journal, vol. XIII, 1956, pp. 108-25.

Dallaway, J. and E. Cartwright, A History of the West Division of Sussex, 2 vols., London, 1815-30.

Davidson-Houston, C.E.D., 'Sussex Monumental Erasses', Part IV, S.A.C., vol. LXXIX, 1938, pp. 74-131.

Field, R., Catalogue of Fifteenth Century Woodcuts and Metalcuts in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Washington, D.C., 1965.

Godfrey, W.H., 'West Wittering - the Ernley Tombs', Sussex Notes and Queries, vol. VI, 1937, pp. 120-21.

Hans Holbein's Dance of Death and Bible Woodcuts, New York, 1947.

Harrison, F. and O.H. Leeney, 'The Church of St. Mary, Broadwater', S.A.C., vol. LXXIV, 1933, pp. 88-130.

Heales, A., 'The Easter Sepulchre', Archaeologia, vol. 42, 1869, pp. 263-308.

Heron-Allen E., Selsey Bill, London, 1911.

Hills, G.M., 'West-Hampnett Church, chiefly in reference to its Roman Remains', S.A.C., vol. XXII, 1869, pp. 33-43.

Hodnett, J., The English Woodcut, 1480-1535, London, 1923.

Hope, W.H. St. J., 'Boxgrove Church and Monastery', S.A.C., vol. XLIII, 1899, pp. 158-66.

Horsfield, T.W., The History and Antiquities of the County of Sussex, 2 vols., Lewes, 1835.

Lambarde, F., 'Coats of Arms in Sussex Churches', S.A.C., vol. LXXIV, 1853, pp. 181-209.

Malory, T., Morte d'Arthur in T. Vinaver, ed., The Works of Sir Thomas Malory, Oxford, 1947.

Maude, A.H., The Story of Petworth Parish Church, n.p., n.d.

McKerrow, R.B. and F.S. Ferguson, Printers' and Publishers' Devices in England and Scotland, 1485-1640, London, 1932.

Mosse, H.R., Effigies of Sussex, 1250-1600, Cambridge and Hove, 1930.

Norris, M., Monumental Brasses, 2 vols., London, 1978.

Philibert Feasey, P.H., 'The Easter Sepulchre', The Ecclesiastical Review, vol. XXXII, 1905, pp. 337-355.

Plomer, H.R., English Printers' Ornaments, London, 1924.

----------, Wynkyn de Worde and his Contemporaries from the Death of Caxton to 1535, London, 1925.

Popham, E. Round and about Boxgrove Priory, Chichester, 1934.

Rénouard, P., Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVIe siècle, Paris, 1964- .

Rice, R.G., ed., 'Transcripts of Sussex Wills', Sussex Record Society, vols. XLI-XLVII, 1935-1938.

Sheingorn, P., 'The Sepulchrum Domini: A Study in Art and Liturgy', in Studies in Iconology, vol. IV, 1978, pp. 37-60.

Shestack, A., Fifteenth Century Engravings of Northern Europe from the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Washington, D.C., 1967.

Souchal, G., 'Un grand peintre français de la fin du XVe siècle: le maître de la Chasse à la Licorne', Revue de l'art, vol. 22, 1973, p. 29, n. 29.

Steer, F.W., 'Richard Sherborne, Bishop of Chichester: Some Aspects of his Life Reconsidered', Winchester Papers, vol. XVI, 1956, pp. 108-25.

----------, 'The Heraldic Ceiling at the Bishop's Palace, Chichester', Chichester Papers, vol. X, 1958.

Stone, P.G., Architectural Antiquities of the Isle of Wight, London, 1891.

Thirion, J., 'Perrier et la diffusion des modèles antiques, le meuble du musée fabre', Revue du Louvre, no. 21, 1971, pp. 141-56.

Turner, Rev. E., 'The Priory of Boxgrove', S.A.C., vol. XV, 1863, pp. 83-122.

Willis, T.G., Records of Chichester, Chichester, 1928.

Worsley, H.A.M., Godshill Church and Its Churchyard, Newport, 1927.

Chapter V

Anglo, S., 'An early Tudor Programme for Plays and other Demonstrations against the Pope', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXIII, 1957, pp. 176-79.

Biddle, M., 'Nonsuch Palace, 1959-1960', Surrey Archaeological Collections, vol. LVIII, 1961, pp. 1-20.

Biver, P., 'The Tickhill and Battle Monuments', Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, vol. XX.

Chitty, C.W., 'Aliens in England in the Sixteenth Century', Race, vol. VIII, no. 2, 1966, pp. 129-45.

Cranage, D.H.S., An Architectural Account of the Churches of Shropshire, 2 vols., Wellington, 1894-1912.

Davies, D.W., Dutch Influences on English Culture, 1558-1625, Ithaca, N.Y., 1964.

Dent, J., The Quest for Nonsuch, London, 1962.

Duncomb, J., Collections towards the History and Antiquities of the County of Herefordshire, 3 volumes, London, 1804-1882.

Esdaile, K.A., 'The Inter-Action of English and Low Country Sculpture in the Sixteenth Century', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. VI, 1943, pp. 80-88.

----------, 'The Part Played by Refugee Sculptors', Proceedings of the Huguenot Society, vol. XVIII, 1949, pp. 254-262.

----------, 'Sculpture and Sculptors in Yorkshire', Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, vol. XXXV, 1943, pp. 362-379.

Eyton, R.W., Antiquities of Shropshire, 12 vols., London, 1854-60.

Fletcher, Rev. W.G.D., 'Notes on Kinlet', Shropshire Archaeological Society, 3rd series, vol. VIII, 1908, pp. 83-157.

Forrest, H.E., Some old Shropshire Houses and their Owners, Shrewsbury, 1924.

Harwood, T., Survey of Staffordshire, containing the Antiquities of that County (by S. Erdeswick), London, 1820.

Jeavons, S.A., 'The Church Monuments of Derbyshire: the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, Part 1', The Derbyshire Archaeological Journal, vol. LXXXIV, 1964, pp. 52-80.

Mann, J.G., 'English Church Monuments, 1536-1625', The Walpole Society, vol. XX, 1932/3, pp. 95-108.

Manners, V., 'The Tombs at Bottesford, Leicestershire', The Art Journal, vol. LXV, 1903, pp. 269-74.

McClean, J., Parochial and Family History of the Deanery of Trigg Minor, 3 vols., London, 1873-79.

Mitchell, M., 'Works of Art from Rome for Henry VIII', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXXIV, 1971, pp. 178-203.

Nichols, J., History and Antiquities of the County of Leicestershire, London, 1795-1815.

Phillips, J., The Reformation of Images: The Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660, London, 1973.

Polwhele, R., History of Cornwall, 2 volumes, London, 1816.

Pote, J., History and Antiquities of Windsor Castle, Eton, 1749.

Reed, Major R.G., The Church and Manor of Clifton Campville, n.d.

Reynolds, Rev. R.E., A Short Guide to Fenny Drayton Church, n.d.

Shaw, S., History and Antiquities of Staffordshire, 3 vols., London, 1798-1801.

Stone, L. and H. Colvin, 'The Howard Tombs at Framlingham', Archaeological Journal, vol. CXXII, 1945, pp. 159-71.

Strong, R., 'Edward VI and the Pope', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXIII, 1960, pp. 311-13.

Strype, J., ed., Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols., London, 1721-33.

Wake, Joan, The Brudenells of Deene, London, 1953.