

There is another indent in the middle of the chancel, which may have been that of his brother. A third fine brass near the vestry door, under a canopy, represented a widow or a nun, as the matrix shows, and may have been the figure of Catherine, daughter of Michael, 3rd Earl, who was Abbess of Barking.

Of the College formerly in the churchyard, there are now, I believe, no remains whatever.

C. R. MANNING.

FRAMLINGHAM CHURCH.

ORIGINATING in a jocular challenge, this essay can make but few pretensions to critical correctness. In composing it, the course has been followed which seemed to me best suited to realize the objects of a local archæological association. All sorts of questions have been raised, with the view of showing that there was matter deserving of further investigation. While expressing my thanks to my friend Mr. Phipson, whose acquaintance with ecclesiastical architecture is so well known, for his aid in fixing dates and measurements, I must absolve him from any participation in the more speculative matters in which I have embodied the results of my own necessarily limited reflections and researches. My time has since been so variously occupied, that many points on which I had intended to make further enquiries, must now be left for other and more competent investigators. It was particularly gratifying to me to find that on one of the questions raised, Mr. Edwards, of Framlingham, though taking an independent course of enquiry, had arrived at the same conclusion.

A CHURCH has doubtless existed at Framlingham, and probably on the same spot, from a very early date, but there are no visible remains of an older structure than the present building, which is relatively of a late period. It is situated on an eminence, and commands from its lofty tower an extensive view of the surrounding scenery, of which again it forms a picturesque feature.

The Tower, 96 feet high and 28 square, is constructed of flint and rubble, with stone dressings. It was begun probably about the middle of the 15th century, and Loder* gives various extracts from wills, shewing that it was still in gradual course of erection from 1479 to 1534. It has angle buttresses terminating in lions sedant. At its base are various geometrical ornaments of flint and stone, very common in Suffolk and Norfolk churches; among which in the centre of the south face, is an escutcheon, having on a bend three fishes (supposed by Green to be the arms of Thos. Whiting, auditor of accounts at the Castle from 1428 to 1479). On the first stage of the N.W. buttress, are the arms of Mowbray in a multifoil, which were also repeated (though now defaced) on the second stage of the S.W. buttress. Just on a line with the ridge of the roof of the church, on the S.E. buttress, are two shields; I. *Mowbray*, a lion rampant, and II. a bend engrailed.

The windows and the door (which has figures of the patron saint, St. Michael and the Dragon in the spandrils of the arch) are late Perpendicular.

The windows of the north and south aisles vary in design. The north chancel aisle windows are as a series the best, presenting good specimens of Decorated forms, executed in a late Perpendicular period, a peculiarity believed to characterize exclusively the churches of the eastern counties. The easternmost window of the south chancel aisle is a fair example of its kind, having the depth and richness imparted by a second order of mouldings and by embattled tracery.

* History of Framlingham, p. 291.

Of this, the three other windows are bad copies, omitting the best features. The windows of the south nave aisle are late Perpendicular, squareheaded, with a distant resemblance to the floral forms of an earlier age; those of the opposite aisle are late, poor in design, and bad in execution. The six-light east window is a very fair example of the gothic prevailing in the last century. The clerestory has on each side, five three light Perpendicular windows, with shield-like ornaments between, on two of which are the monograms M. and I.H.S. It was still in course of renewal about 1520, since at that date John Maggs leaves five marks to the new clerestory.*

Under a buttress is the chancel door, and on the opposite side is a similar doorway, which has been filled up.

Entering the church at the west end through a modernized porch, with Perpendicular roof, we have before us the lofty and elegantly proportioned nave, with an excellent timber roof of chesnut, adorned with fan-tracery, springing from moulded stone brackets, and lighted by the windows of the clerestory. From the bottom mouldings of the latter rise at intervals, slender shafts with plain moulded capitals for statues; and having angels at their bases. The arches themselves spring from eight octagonal shafts and four demi-shafts. The width is 22 feet, and the height 44 feet, including the aisles, which have modern flat plaster ceilings: the entire width is 49 feet.

Near the western end of the north aisle, is a Decorated niche in the wall with monograms of Christ and the Virgin. Not far from it is an octagonal font, on the basin of which, the emblems of the evangelists alternate with those of the passion, and on the supporting shaft are figures of a man with a club, † and lions enrich the angles. The basement consists of steps, on the uppermost of which, Loder ‡ says there was formerly "in large ancient characters," the inscription; *Orate pro animabus Johannis Plomer, et Margerie uxoris eius, qui istum fontem fieri faciebunt.*

* Loder, p. 292.

† John the Baptist?

‡ Loder p. 293, who also mentions an equally ancient top, which has disappeared.

The nave and aisles are divided from the chancel and its aisles, by a chancel arch and piers, with two side arches, all having perpendicular shafts and mouldings on their faces. The ceilings are plain plastered; and the divisional arches are supported on six whole and two demi-piers, with attached shafts and mouldings. "The stone work" says Loder, "was built by Thomas Duke of Norfolk, towards the latter end of the reign of King Henry VIII, and the whole finished by Edward VI, in the first year of his reign and covered with lead, who at the same time repaired the church also."

The chancel is of the same width with the nave, and 37 feet high; but its aisles are much wider, so that the total width amounts to $68\frac{1}{2}$ feet.

It is singular that the nave and chancel should be so nearly of a *length*, the usual proportion being about a third of the one to the other. It is further noteworthy that the height of the nave, should be exactly double its width.

The general effect of this singular arrangement is very good; and one cannot help fancying that when, in the words of the survey made in 1549,* by order of Edward VI, "*y^e chancelle of the said church, with y^e aisles of the same, was plucked down by y^e said late Duke (not as actually dead but attainted) of Norff., and is not as yet all-builed up again,*" they were, in the rebuilding, extended in length as well as in breadth: for had not this part of the structure been prolonged as well as widened, a form like that of the tau cross would have resulted, producing a most disagreeable impression, instead of that air of spaciousness which is now presented from all parts of the building.

There was in the last century† a handsome antique carved pulpit, adorned with arms properly emblazoned; this has disappeared, together with all but one of the helms and crests, whose naked supports now disfigure instead of enriching the chancel.

* Green's Framlingham large and small 8vo. † Loder.

The organ, the altar, and the present pulpit being alike incongruous with the style of the edifice are merely mentioned. In Loder* may be seen a list of the six bells, with their inscriptions.

We now approach the monuments, to three of which, from their historical interest, I wish to draw the special attention of the members of the Archæological Institute: the others tell their own story, and are described in Mr. Green's meritorious work.

1st. The Duke of Norfolk's tomb on the south side of the altar.

This tomb is of freestone, having a raised moulded base: on which are pilasters, with fourteen niches between, containing figures, and surmounted by mouldings and a plain square top, on which recline the effigies of the 3rd Howard, but 2nd of the revived Dukes of Norfolk, and one of his wives. There are four candelabra-like detached ornaments at the angles, on which rest shields with arms, supported by lions sitting on the tomb. The niched figures seem to be the following:—At the *west end*, 1, St. Peter. 2, Aaron, as representing the 1st priest of the old law. 3, St. Paul. On the *north side*, 4, St. Matthias. 5, St. Jude. 6, St. Simon. 7, St. Philip. On the *east end*, 8, St. John. 9, ? St. Simeon, as representing the close of the old law ("Now lettest thou thy servant," &c). 10, St. Thomas. On the *south side*, 11, St. Matthew. 12, St. James the great. 13, St. James the less. 14, St. Andrew. The whole tomb seems to belong to a style approaching more to the later period of Elizabeth or beginning of James, than to the early part of Henry VIIIth's reign.

That the Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, who lies on the top of the monument is the same as was imprisoned by Henry VIII and released by Mary, there is no doubt from the well known inscription on the collar of "*Gracia Dei sum quod sum*," said to have been worn in remembrance of his narrow escape from death; but the question arises, who is

* P. 292.

the lady lying on his right side? The evidence seems to me to be in favour of his second wife Elizabeth, daughter of Edward Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, and mother of Henry, Earl of Surrey, Thomas Viscount Bindon, and Mary, wife of Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond. My reasons are briefly these:—

I. Anne, daughter of Edward IV, the Duke's first wife* (whose children never reached maturity), herself died young, 1508, and was probably interred in Lambeth chapel by her husband, who survived her 46 years, and we know expressed no wish to have her effigy placed on his own tomb.

II. The figure on the tomb is too old for this lady, being that of a stately woman of full middle life, having even wrinkles in the forehead, and corresponding exactly with the age of the second wife Elizabeth. The features also indicate the haughty jealous woman, who could write to the Council about the Duke, and speak so scornfully of "Bess Holland."

III. The ruff round the neck, as a point of costume, belongs rather to the period of Mary than to the commencement of Henry VIIIth's reign. It was probably introduced to hide scrofulous marks, like the stiff collar of a later period.

IV. Though separated from her husband, the second wife was unsullied in her honor, and when the grave had closed on him she loved but too well, or she would not have been jealous, and her own time came four years afterwards, 1558, it was doubtless her wish (a true woman's), that her effigy should be laid by the side of her husband's; a wish too that would be readily seconded by both branches of her family.

V. This is the more probable, because the Duke, in his will dated July 18th, 1554, orders his body "to be buried in such place and order as shall be thought most convenient to his executors:" thus leaving the matter of the monument

* See Lodge and other authorities.

entirely to their discretion; taking no interest where he should be laid, or who should lie by him, and not like his father, specifying which wife's effigy should accompany his.

VI. The position of the lady on the *right side* of the Duke has been assumed to indicate royal descent; but as both wives were alike in this respect, and even the Duke himself was entitled to royal quarterings, little value can attach to any inference from this source. In the course of enquiry as to the position of ladies on tombs, however, some points of general antiquarian interest arose, and as the results affect not merely the monument before us, but that of Lord Bardolph and his lady at Dennington as well as others, they are here introduced. Thinking that brasses were less liable to be tampered with than figures on monuments, I requested a lady to furnish me with a list of all the pairs in *Boutell's Brasses*, and in her own collection, specifying on which side the lady laid; to which some have been added from Parker, making in all, no less than 57 pairs; on analysing which I found:—

1st. That of the whole number there were 34 lying on the *left side*, and 23 on the *right*.

2nd. But a second inspection shewed the curious fact, that in 33 brasses of *knights* and their ladies, the lady is on the *left hand* in 12 cases only, but on the *right* in no less than 21.

3rd. Of the 24 brasses of *civilians*, the lady laid on the *left side* in 17 cases, and on the *right side* but in 7.

It has therefore been too generally assumed from the practice of later times, that the lady should lie on the *left hand*.

The whole subject, which I believe has not been treated of before, it is clear requires a more extended investigation, though even in the present stage of it two conclusions seem established.

1st. That in the knightly code some law prevailed as to the position of the lady, which remains to be discovered: it was clearly neither the position of the memorial nor

precedence. If any conclusion could be drawn from *one tomb*, that of the knight with two ladies, where the right hand is given to the lady on the right side, we might suspect *affection* had something to do with it in some cases.

2nd. That among *civilians* the *general rule* seems to have been in favour of the *left side* for the lady, and the exceptions but few, only seven in twenty-four promiscuous cases.

There is another question which affects both this and the neighbouring monument of Henry Fitzroy. Was the tomb before us first erected to the memory of this Duke's father, as asserted by Bloomfield in his *History of Norfolk*?

Against this we have the positive assertion of Martin, the standard authority as to Thetford,* who says (and he wrote some half century before Bloomfield) "that the tomb erected in Thetford Abbey was destroyed, and the *remains* only removed to Framlingham Church," and adds "that he had seen a beautifully painted copy of a tomb subsequently erected at Lambeth, to the memory of the Duke interred at Thetford, which was also destroyed:" and he speaks of this second, probably in some degree a copy of the first, as having a *brass* figure of the Duke.

Now it is to be noted that this Duke, in his very minute directions about his tomb—to cost 400 marks—speaks of it as "*devised* by us (no unusual occurrence in those days) Master Clerke, Master of the King's works at Cambridge and *Wassel*, Free Mason, of Bury, and *pictures* of us and Agnes our wife to be set thereupon." Now connecting† this word *picture* more with *brasses* than with sculpture, seeing that the Duke consulted also with two parties, one a gothic architect probably, engaged in King's College Chapel, the other evidently a Fleming, and probably the artist whose monogram W with crescent and star‡ executed several known local brasses; remembering also that it was positively stated on the memorial tablet§ that this Thetford tomb had an inscription, and coupling this with the visible

* History of Thetford.

† Duke's will, in Green.

‡ Oxford Society's Book.

§ Tablet set up recording the acts of the Duke at length.

fact that there is no inscription, and not a single place for one on the monument before us; the conclusion forces itself upon the mind, that the Thetford monument was altogether different in character to the one before us, which, as regards style, is much more consonant with that prevailing after 1554, the date of the death of the Duke whose effigy lies before us.

Is it not improbable also that the executors in the discretion left them would have removed the father's and mother's effigies, to make room for that of the son and one of his wives?

Camden, one of the first to notice these tombs, is perfectly silent about this removal from Thetford. Bloomfield is little to be relied on, for he speaks of twelve figures only, whereas there are fourteen niches, and fourteen figures round the tomb, and as will be seen directly, that author misdescribes the companion tomb of Fitzroy, to which we will next turn.

Fitzroy's tomb is of freestone, with fluted pilasters and arms of himself and lady between; it has also a raised base and moulded top, perfectly flat. At the angles are four figures, each supporting a shield with emblems of the passion. Sunk alto-relievo panels serve as a frieze. The subjects, exclusively from the old testament, are as follows:—At the *west end*, 1,—Nursing of Cain and Abel; Adam cultivating the ground. 2,—Cain and Abel sacrificing; Cain killing Abel.

On the *south side*, 1,—Ark; 2,—Noah drunk; 3,—Abraham and Angels; 4,—Lot escaping with daughters; Pillar of Salt.

At the *east end*, 1,—Abraham sacrificing Isaac; 2,—Israelites sacrificing to golden calf. These two seem significant of their position facing the altar.

On the *north side*, 1,—Birth of Eve; 2,—Giving the garden in charge to Adam and Eve; 3,—Temptation of Eve; 4,—Expulsion of Adam and Eve.

Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond, and natural son of Henry VIII, married Mary sister of Surry, his bosom

friend, and daughter of the Duke whose tomb has so long detained us. He and his wife, both dying young, were buried in Thetford Abbey, and their remains were removed to Framlingham; but the question arises, was the tomb before us, removed with them from Thetford Abbey?

Against this may be urged. I. That the monument appears to be of a later date than 1536, the date of Fitzroy's death. II. That it would have been difficult, in those days, to have taken down and re-erected the monument in the state in which we see it. III. Thetford Abbey was dissolved in 1540, so short a time after the Duke of Richmond's death, that when we bear in mind the length of time usually occupied in those days, in preparing elaborate monuments, it is highly improbable that it could have been ready for erection before the dissolution of the Abbey, and then of course, it was more likely to be reserved to cover the remains brought from Thetford, than to be taken there and put up, merely to be pulled down again. We know too that the Duke of Norfolk was aware of the intended dissolution, some time before it took place, since Martin* says, he sent a previous remonstrance to the king against that act.

To shew again the singular misrepresentation of Bloomfield, we have him describing in 1806, 12 mutilated figures on the top of Richmond's tomb, when the accurate Kirby by a beautiful engraving, shows that only the angle figures were to be seen in 1748. It is also clear from the very design of the monument, that there were never more than these four angle figures supporting emblems of the passion.

If we next turn to the handsome tomb† of the illustrious poet and soldier, the Earl of Surry, we find an inscription‡

* History of Thetford.

† See Loder's description of this tomb.

‡ HENRICO HOWARDO THOME SECVNDI
DVXIS | NORFOLCIE FILIO PRIMOGENITO
THOME TERTII | PATRI COMITI SVRRLE,
ET GEORGIANI ORDINIS | EQVITI AVRATO,
IMMATVRE ANNO SALVTIS | MDXLVI AB-

REPTO, ET FRANCISCÆ VXORI | RIVS FILLE
IOANNIS COMITIS OKONLE, HENRICVS |
HOWARDVS COMES NORTHAMPTONLE FILIVS
| SECVNDO-GENITVS HOC SVPREMVV PIE-
TATIS | IN PARENTES MONVMENTVM POSVIT.
| ANNO DOMINI 1614.

in which he is called "first born son of Thomas *second* Duke of Norfolk and father of Thomas the *third*."

Some degree of pity having been expressed for the ignorance of Griffith the steward, who superintended its erection under the order of the Earl of Northampton, Surry's second son, it may not be amiss to attempt to show that this steward was wiser in *his* generation than some of the "children of light" in *this*. The state of the facts is briefly this:—

John Howard, first of the Howards, Dukes of Norfolk, was killed fighting for Richard III at Bosworth, in 1485; his son was committed to the Tower; and Henry VIIth by special act of attainder, declared the Earldom of Surry and Dukedom of Norfolk extinct. The son, however, having given proofs of his loyalty, had the earldom renewed in his favour as early as 1489* but it was not till the 5th Hen. VIII, or from 1485 to 1513—a period of not less than 28 years, during which there was no Duke of Norfolk—that the extinct title was *recreated* in his favour in consequence of his heroic actions at Flodden Field; so that though the *second* of the *Howards* who enjoyed the title, he was virtually the *first* of a *new* line of *Dukes of Norfolk*. It was not in fact, an *interrupted* succession but a *new* creation.

In this sense, he was doubtless spoken of as the *first Duke* in his own time, and his successor as the *second Duke*. This monument itself is indeed a plain proof of the latter being called the *second*. Another special reason operating *then*, though of no force *now*, was the jealousy of the Tudors of any pretensions through a different line, which would cause a courtier-like ignoring of the *first* of the *Howards*, who had died fighting against this very dynasty. We know that Surry's father had prudently abstained on this account from using those quarterings in his arms, the wearing of which were subsequently the ostensible pretence for the heroic son's execution.

That venerable old Camden took this view is clear from his calling the tomb of Surry's father, in the same way as

* Rot : Parl : 4 Hen. VII, m. 1.

Griffith the steward, the tomb of the second Duke; defining that second Duke to be the one who was put into prison by Henry VIII. Loder also describes the tomb without suspecting there is any mistake in the inscription.

The whole controversy respecting this inscription, appears in a word to have arisen from a total obliviousness of the historical fact of the long *extinction of the Dukedom* on the death of the *first* Howard, and treating the title as one of *uninterrupted succession*.

I was not aware till after I had sketched out my ideas, of their importance in possibly staying the sacrilegious hand from executing the deed thus rashly and unthinkingly suggested:*

“To repair and to amend are terms to be considered as synonymous; the writer therefore fancies that were he invested with the power of repairing which belongs to a churchwarden, he should be induced at all hazards, to set a skilful artist at work to obliterate for ever the *secundi tertii*, and have substituted for them, what would in strict regard to the fact be really proper, and be well satisfied that the Mercers’ Company would never impeach the motive were it ever to come to their knowledge,” &c.

Who could, at first hearing, suppose that these are the words of that industrious and generally meritorious local antiquary Mr. Green, and that to gratify a passing crotchet he would thus tamper with the integrity of an inscription! What, my lord, ladies and gentlemen, would be the practical historical value of monumental records, if liable to be falsified whenever they appeared to be inconsistent with the crude ideas of local investigators?

T. SHAVE GOWING.

* Green’s Stranger’s Guide to Framlingham.