

**The Royal Funerary and Burial Ceremonies of Medieval English Kings,**

**1216-1509**

Anna M. Duch

Doctor of Philosophy

University of York  
History  
May 2016

### Abstract

When Ernst Kantorowicz published *The King's Two Bodies* in 1957, far greater importance was placed upon the body politic, the office of King, than on the body natural, the king as a man. In part, this thesis sets out to overturn this notion: the royal corpse was the central and most vital element of the royal funerary and burial ceremonies, and concern for the royal body and its soul lasted for centuries. Although the King always lived, the mortal king did not become inert or null upon death.

The English royal funeral has been understudied. The practical mechanics of English kings' funerals (including the preservation of the body, the role of the Church, and the events of the ceremonies) have not been laid out clearly. This thesis seeks to update the analysis of both individual kingly funerals and the overarching development of royal exequies over three centuries, from John in 1216 to Henry VII in 1509. It is my argument that the language used in the royal prescriptive funerary and burial texts permitted individual variation based on personal preferences, the unique circumstances of the death, and the requirements of the Church for a Christian burial. The royal prescriptive texts were elastic, enabling a wide variety of kings during the medieval period to be laid to rest fittingly and honorably, according to their station. These prescriptive texts did not cover commemoration, an omission that allowed flexibility in celebrating the legacy of a deceased king. In special cases, the living elected to rebury the dead, be it for practical reasons or to enhance the legacies of both parties. The ceremonies and the ensuing commemoration, combined with a pronounced preference for burial in England for members of the royal house, formed an English royal way of death.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Preface .....	6
Acknowledgements .....	7
Author's Declaration.....	8
<b>Chapter I: Introduction.....</b>	<b>9</b>
The Case of Edward IV .....	9
Historiographic Background.....	13
The Present Work and Its Purpose .....	17
Sources.....	21
An Outline of Contents.....	30
The Case of King John.....	33
<b>Chapter II: At the Hour of Death .....</b>	<b>38</b>
John.....	41
Henry III.....	43
Edward I .....	45
Edward II.....	46
Edward III .....	49
Richard II.....	51
Henry IV.....	54
Henry V .....	56
Henry VI.....	58
Edward IV.....	59
Edward V .....	61
Richard III .....	63
Henry VII .....	66
Conclusions .....	67
<b>Chapter III: By the Books .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<i>De Exequiis Regalibus</i> .....	72
The Personal Wills of Kings.....	85
The <i>Liber Regie Capelle</i> .....	95
<i>Articles Ordained by King Henry VII for the Regulation of His Household</i> .....	107
Conclusions .....	111

<b>Chapter IV: Disruption and Deviation.....</b>	<b>118</b>
Disruptive.....	121
Deviant?.....	133
Cultural Transmission.....	147
The Case of Edward II.....	156
Conclusions .....	164
<b>Chapter V: Location.....</b>	<b>168</b>
Westminster Abbey.....	169
Worcester Priory.....	184
Leicester Greyfriars and Chertsey Abbey.....	186
Gloucester Abbey and King's Langley.....	188
Canterbury Cathedral.....	191
St. George's Chapel, Windsor .....	193
England .....	196
Conclusions .....	202
<b>Chapter VI: Status and Agency in Commemoration.....</b>	<b>206</b>
The Care of the Living .....	210
Anniversaries .....	217
Tombs.....	230
Conclusions .....	250
<b>Chapter VII: Reburial and Translation.....</b>	<b>253</b>
The Necessity of Reburial.....	255
BL Harley MS 6466, ff. 33r-34v .....	260
The Case of Richard II .....	264
The Case of Henry VI .....	271
The Case of Richard III.....	280
Conclusions .....	288
<b>Chapter VIII: The Last Things .....</b>	<b>291</b>
The Case of Edward V.....	291
Outbound: Beyond the Thesis .....	298
The Conclusion.....	300

Appendix One: Liturgical Source Information.....	311
Appendix Two: Comparison of Vespers, Office of the Dead .....	315
Appendix Three: Comparison of Matins, Office of the Dead.....	316
Appendix Four: Comparison of Lauds, Office of the Dead .....	318
Appendix Five: Comparison of the Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary .....	319
Appendix Six: Comparison of the Mass of the Trinity.....	321
Appendix Seven: Comparison of Requiem Mass.....	322
Appendix Eight: Appendix Eight: Dates of Death and Burial .....	323
Appendix Nine: Initial Burial Sites and Agency, 1216-1509.....	324
Appendix Ten: Miracles of Henry VI in Circulation Prior to the Battle of Bosworth .....	325
List of Abbreviations .....	326
Bibliography .....	328

“And you may say to her, indeed, that if she was right to grieve for the death of her sister, she should have started mourning the hour that her sister was first married [...] for from that moment, one should have considered her to be dead and lost.”

-- Edward I to Brother Henry, Queen  
Margaret's confessor, on how to sweetly  
comfort Margaret after her sister's death,  
19 May 1305

## Acknowledgements

In September 2012, at the beginning of my final year as a master's student, I attended *Orbit*, a special event for the Fort Worth Symphony Orchestra. Along with a more famous piece by Strauss, the orchestra played John Adams' "Short Ride in a Fast Machine." How fitting that title was for the academic maelstrom that followed!

First, I must thank my supervisor, Professor Mark Ormrod, for his guidance, profound patience, and wisdom in all things. Even from the earliest days of our correspondence, I have appreciated his kindness. I must also thank Mrs. Caroline Kenman, not only for her professional assistance, but also for her friendliness and warmth.

In the Department of History at the University of York, I thank Professor John Cooper and Professor Sarah Rees Jones for their input. I also thank the Department for giving me the opportunity to participate in the Post Graduates Who Teach programme. I thank the Centre for Medieval Studies community at large for their support, especially Dr. Michele Campopiano, Dr. Laura Crombie, Gillian Galloway, Brittany Snowcroft, Chris Linsley, Jeff Berry, Erika Graham-Goering, and particularly Elizabeth Biggs.

This thesis would not be possible without the people at the various archives. I thank Dr. David Morrison at Worcester Cathedral; Dr. Paul Dryburgh and the staff at the National Archives; Gary Brannan at the Borthwick Institute for Archives at the University of York; the staff at St. George's Chapel, Windsor; Miss Christine Reynolds, Assistant Keeper of Muniments at Westminster Abbey; and the staff at the British Library. I apologize to anyone I may have missed on this list.

There are a number of people in the academic community that have offered me advice and insight, and others that have allowed me to contribute in some small way to their own projects. I would like to thank Professor Elizabeth A.R. Brown, Professor Chris Given-Wilson, Professor Douglas Biggs, Professor Gwilym Dodd, Dr. Elena Woodacre, Dr. Armin Dietz, Dr. Joel Burden, Dr. Lucinda Dean, Dr. Becky Holdorph, and Emma Levitt. Again, I apologize for any omission.

Although several thousand miles have consistently separated us for the last seven years, I thank my family for their support in this endeavour; I came from nowhere strange. Lastly, I thank my favourite souvenir from Texas, Luke Truxal. It's true. All of it.

### Author's Declaration

I declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work, and I am the sole author. Some elements have been presented as conference papers, but these have not been published. This work has not been previously presented for an award at this or any other University. All sources are acknowledged as References.



## Chapter I: Introduction

### *The Case of Edward IV*

Edward IV's tomb vault, shared with his queen, Elizabeth Woodville, was found by workers and then opened 14 March 1789 in the presence of Messrs Carliol, Emlyn, and Lind, members of the Society of Antiquaries.<sup>1</sup> Within living memory, in 1774, Edward I's tomb had been opened, revealing a well-preserved monarch covered in resplendent medieval treasures.<sup>2</sup> What would be found with Edward IV?

The final journey of Edward IV's corpse had been well-documented. The nature of his death and deathbed speech had been dramatized by contemporary chroniclers.<sup>3</sup> There was an official account of his funerary and burial ceremonies. Various heralds, Garter knights, and other scribes made copies of this original manuscript, adding their personal knowledge to the narrative. Extant copies<sup>4</sup> of the English narrative include BL Additional MS 45131, f. 23 and ff. 27v-29v; BL Egerton MS 2642, ff. 181r-182v and 186v-188v; College of Arms MS I.7 ff. 7v-8v; College of Arms MS I. 3, f. 7v and ff. 8v-10v; College of Arms MS I.II ff. 84-86v; and an account published in the first volume of *Archaeologia*, derived from a manuscript owned by John Anstis, antiquary and Garter King of Arms.<sup>5</sup> The last may be a compilation of the details in the other five manuscripts listed above.<sup>6</sup> A French account, found in College of Arms MS Arundel 51, ff. 14-18, offers a second narrative of the same events.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Carliol, H. Emlyn, and J. Lind, "The Vault, Body, and Monument of Edward IV in St. George's Chapel at Windsor," *Vetusta Monumenta*, 3 (1790), 1-4, plates VII, VIII, and IX.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph Ayloffé, "An Account of the Body of King Edward the First, as It Appeared on Opening His Tomb in the Year 1774," *Archaeologia*, 3 (January 1775), 376-431.

<sup>3</sup> See Chapter II, 59-61.

<sup>4</sup> This list was partially compiled when the complete list in *The Royal Funerals of The House of York at Windsor* was encountered. A full description of these manuscripts and a collated version of the English narrative is found in Anne F. Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs with R.A. Griffiths, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York at Windsor* (London: Richard III Society, 2005), 32-40.

<sup>5</sup> "An Extract relating to the Burial of K. Edward IV. From a MS of the late Mr. Anstis, now in the Possession of Thomas Astle, Esquire," *Archaeologia*, 1 (1770), 348-355. See also Stuart Handley, "Anstis, John (1669-1744)," *ODNB*, accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/584.

<sup>6</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 32

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, 41-45 for transcription and translation.

The financial information related to Edward IV's funeral and burial is more limited, but still present. Thomas Bourchier, archbishop of Canterbury, had sequestered the royal goods, seals, and jewels due to the inaction of Edward IV's executors.<sup>8</sup> Later, he granted permission for those executors to have the goods valued and sold to pay £1,496 17s 2d for the costs of the funeral.<sup>9</sup>

Tucked away among the expenses of Richard III's coronation and the first eighteen months of his reign, in the records of the Lord Chamberlain, is a single folio outlining an account of "stuff remaining" after Edward IV's burial.<sup>10</sup> Many of the cloth items on the face of the folio may have been used at Edward IV's funeral and then returned to the Lord Chamberlain. Alternatively, they were items ordered in excess for the event. These included cloths of gold, coats of the king's arms, ermine and silk trimmings for clothing, and banners bearing the images of Our Lady, the Holy Trinity, and the arms of St. Edward the Confessor.<sup>11</sup> There are no values assigned to these items, but the quantity of each item and the amount of cloth in yards is provided; the cost to buy or create these items can be estimated using contemporary valuations of goods. Archbishop Bourchier's figure of £1,496 17s 2d seems very plausible upon viewing the vast amounts of rich cloth.

These items also correspond with the narrative descriptions in the English and French accounts and fulfil the demands of the royal prescriptive texts. These texts were compiled over the centuries and provided guidance and expectations for the suitable treatment of a deceased king. One of the texts, *De Exequiis Regalibus*, dictated the manner in which the dead king was to be embalmed, dressed, and arranged in his coffin. To confirm that all of this had occurred,

---

<sup>8</sup> *Registrum Thome Bourchier, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi AD 1454-1486*, edited by F.R.H. Du Boulay. Canterbury and York Society, 54 (Oxford: 1957), 52.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>10</sup> TNA LC 9/50/66r. This is published in *The Coronation of Richard III: The Extant Documents*, edited by Anne F. Sutton and P.W. Hammond (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1983), 140-141. The authors indicate that the flow of such sumptuous goods was constant; "after the burying of Edward IV there were 255 ½ yards of velvet in stock, a further 821 ¾ yards were bought within the account and a mere 66 yards remained at the end of the account," 70.

<sup>11</sup> The verse of the folio appears to be an inventory of a royal bedroom, including featherbeds, quilts, and pillows.

one would have to open the deceased king's coffin. In the case of Edward I, the state of the corpse and the coffin's contents aligned almost perfectly with *De Exequiis Regalibus*.<sup>12</sup> With so much documentation, there was likely hope and anticipation that Edward IV would appear in totality with his grave goods.

Unfortunately, Edward IV's remains were not as well embalmed as those of Edward I. In his report, Emlyn states that the king's lead coffin was compromised, in part because Elizabeth Woodville's coffin had been dropped on top of it at her funeral in 1492. Upon opening the king's casket, Emlyn observed that king's complete skeleton lay there, with some brown hair near its head and some by its neck,<sup>13</sup> likely the remains of a beard. The skeleton measured 6'3 ½". An early twentieth century edition of the *Guide to Windsor* states that "a perfect skeleton immersed in glutinous liquid" had been found.<sup>14</sup> Emlyn offers no detail as to whether the king wore any regalia or jewellery, though he does concur with the report of liquid at the foot of the coffin.<sup>15</sup>

The report of Carliol, Emlyn, and Lind does not mention workers raiding the casket. However, according to the *Guide to Windsor*, the coffin was ransacked by workers that same day. They supposedly took hair, teeth, fingers, fabric, and metal objects from the coffin itself.<sup>16</sup> The theft of the ring and fabric is very odd, as neither the antiquarian account nor the contemporary newspaper account from *The Daily Advertiser* mention their survival.<sup>17</sup>

There were other reports on Edward IV's vault opening that contradicted the report of Carliol, Emlyn, and Lind. *The Daily Advertiser* claimed that Edward's body had appeared

---

<sup>12</sup> See Chapter III, 83-84.

<sup>13</sup> Carliol, Emlyn, and Lind, "The Vault, Body, and Monument of Edward IV," 1-2.

<sup>14</sup> John T. Page, "The Effects of Opening a Coffin," *Notes and Queries*, s11-XII (311) (December 1915): 465-c-465.

<sup>15</sup> Carliol, Emlyn, and Lind, "The Vault, Body, and Monument of Edward IV," 2.

<sup>16</sup> Page, "The Effects of Opening a Coffin," 465-c-465. Page mentions the theft and sale of a leg bone, but without citable reference.

<sup>17</sup> *The Daily Advertiser*, 17 March 1789, quoted in Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 113. As part of *De Exequiis Regalibus* and in the manuscript accounts of Edward's death, a ring was to have been placed on the king's finger.

perfectly intact and that he had been dressed in very fine lace, none of which had decayed. Anne Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs corroborate this account with that of a verger, who stated that upon exposure to air, the corpse went to dust.<sup>18</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs allow for this account to be true, even though the antiquarian account does not mention it; they speculate Emlyn may have felt it unprofessional to mention the brief appearance of the king's image.

This is doubtful. Medieval embalming aimed to desiccate the corpse, using salt and spices in order to preserve it. The story would be possible if Edward IV's coffin had been in a dry environment. However, given that Edward's coffin was reported to have been saturated enough to have liquid pooling at its foot, it is simply not possible in this case. St. George's Chapel holds a contemporary diarist's account of being presented with Edward's hair and some wood, both of which were covered in a sticky brown substance, likely the liquid from the coffin.<sup>19</sup>

Beyond his height and hair colour, no physical features of Edward IV survived. His grave goods also did not survive, whether due to the same processes that consumed the corpse or due to unscrupulous workers. Edward IV's exhumation yielded little physical evidence to confirm the documentation of his exequies and his conformity to *De Exequiis Regalibus*. Such discrepancies encapsulate many of the problems faced by historians of death in general, and royal death in particular. The stories told about kings' deaths and burials do not always match up with the financial documentation or the physical evidence. Kings were public figures in medieval society. Much like modern celebrities, gossip and tabloid stories circulated about them during their lives and after their deaths. As seen above, there were even conflicting stories as to the state of Edward IV's corpse in 1789, three hundred years after his death. Both

---

<sup>18</sup> SGC XIX.76.9.

<sup>19</sup> SGC MSG/1. This entry is dated 1808, recording the events of March 1789; he received the items the day after Edward IV's tomb opening. SGC MSG/2 is a letter dated 28 November 1976 from E. Mildreda Fisher introducing the diary entry. She identified the diarist as her great-grandfather Maberly and sent the entry to St. George's Chapel, thinking it would be of some interest.

tales came from authorities: the press with its nascent journalistic integrity and antiquarians with their enthusiasm and knowledge of history. Both versions could not be correct.

### *Historiographical Background*

The history of death was primarily a hobbyist field prior to the twentieth century. Those that studied the field were not necessarily trained as historians but were fascinated by the physical items surrounding the dead, including physical remains, brasses, or containers. Without training, antiquarians tended to lack academic rigour and breadth in their investigations, limiting themselves to taking measurements and inventories with comparisons to one or two primary accounts.<sup>20</sup> While they collected a great deal of data, little to no analysis was performed. The history of death can reasonably be comparable to military history prior to the mid-twentieth century. Dismissed by professional historians as being too narrow or too shallow for worthwhile study, these history fields were kept active by devotees who researched and compiled information independently, though they may not have had the capacity to analyse what they had found.

Professionally trained researchers dabbled in these fields when they were immediately relevant to their pursuits. A prime example of this is W.H. St. John Hope.<sup>21</sup> An archaeologist by vocation, he was well-known for excavating medieval churches and writing the authoritative *Windsor Castle: An Architectural History Collected and Written by Command of Their Majesties Queen Victoria, King Edward VII and George V*. By extension, he also studied heraldry and wrote several articles on royal tombs, effigies used at funerals, and the construction of royal chantry chapels. His work in the history of royal death was a cut above his contemporaries, due in no small part to his professional training and his access to historical

---

<sup>20</sup> Rosemary Sweet, "Antiquarianism and history," *Making History: The Changing Face of the Profession in Britain*, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/resources/articles/antiquarianism.html>.

<sup>21</sup> A. H. Thompson, "Hope, Sir William Henry St. John (1854-1919)," rev. Bernard Nurse, *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/33975.

documents. He was able to analyse and reconcile the evidence both in physical and documentary form. However, even he had his limits. In 1910, he was present at the opening of Henry VI's tomb. On this occasion, he excitedly claimed he saw matted blood on the deceased king's skull.<sup>22</sup> Given that Henry VI had been buried in earth initially, this substance could have been the result of dirt, insect activity, animals, or plant life. Hope was not a forensic anthropologist or coroner, nor the surgeon in attendance. Others have made similar mistakes, judging evidence in a vacuum.

The dead king was a fleeting figure throughout the twentieth century. In his great work, *The King's Two Bodies*, Ernst Kantorowicz approached the politico-theological fiction of the king's body natural - the king - and body politic - the King -<sup>23</sup> as well as the immortality of the King as part of the dynasty and royal dignity.<sup>24</sup> Kantorowicz bolstered his study with English works: Norman Anonymus, John of Salisbury, Bracton, Plowden 1585, Shakespeare, Coke, James I, and Blackstone, among others. Though he employed French canonists, jurists, and narratives as well, Kantorowicz tended to centre his study on the English concept of the king's two bodies and only temporarily visited variations that manifested in other kingdoms such as France. When the inevitable confrontation between historian and royal corpse seemed at hand in the section labelled "Dignitas Non Moritur," Kantorowicz stepped away. He instead turned his attention to the research of his student, Ralph Giesey, and used the younger man's work on the French royal funeral ceremony to further his points.<sup>25</sup> Kantorowicz utilized the proclamation of Henry VI as heir to Charles VI at the latter's funeral in 1422, but he avoided dealing with the corpses of Henry VI's father and grandfather laid out in repose. Rather, Kantorowicz immediately moved on to discuss the use of coinage, the dress of French royal

---

<sup>22</sup> W.H. St John Hope, "The Discovery of the Remains of King Henry VI in St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle," *Archaeologia*, 62, no. 2 (1911), 537.

<sup>23</sup> Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 7-9. These terms will be used throughout this work in order to delineate the mortal, personal aspect of the king as man from the immortal, corporate office of the King.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid*, 316.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*, 410, n. 321.

officials at the funeral as representative of the immortality of the Crown, and the royal effigy in both England and France.<sup>26</sup> Kantorowicz lost interest in the king's body natural at its death, one of the most noticeable flaws in his work on the king's two bodies. Instead, he pursued the immortal aspects of kingship vested in the King.

Ralph Giesey's work, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*, therefore, holds a central place in the historiography of the dead royal body; Giesey dealt with the difficulties of preserving the royal corpse and all the ceremonies that surrounded it. However, the work was narrow in scope, focusing only upon four royal funerary ceremonies in Renaissance France.<sup>27</sup> Although the work drew upon the funerary ceremonies that came before its principal four, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony* sacrificed the breadth of development for the depth of its chosen period. Giesey analysed each moment of the four exequies, but he also had particular attachment to items; a significant portion of his work focused upon the effigy and its acquired human characteristics. The study remains one of the richest immersions into the world of royal death, though the range limited Giesey's ability to explore the gamut of interpretations and the interactions among the European courts.

It was not until the publication of Philippe Ariès' *L'Homme devant la mort* in 1978 (published in English as *The Hour of Our Death* in 1981) that a professional historian shifted the focus of the history of death away from objects and singular events and centred it on the attitudes toward death and the practices surrounding it across time. It was no longer about the kooky and macabre cabinet curiosities; rather, the history of death was reformed as a facet of social history. Much like his works on private life and childhood, Ariès' work on death has come under increasing scrutiny and criticism over the last four decades.<sup>28</sup> However, he was the

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, 419ff.

<sup>27</sup> Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Gèneve, France: Librairie E. Droz, 1960), 17, specifically François I in 1547, Henri II in 1559, Charles IX in 1574, and Henri IV in 1610.

<sup>28</sup> Michel Vovelle was one of Ariès's earliest critics and seems to have been overlooked in the Anglophone world, despite being Ariès's contemporary in producing essays on death in the 1970s. See Thomas Kselman, "Death in Historical Perspective," *Sociological Forum*, 2, no. 3 (Summer 1987), 591-597, for more information on these historians and their contrasting theories and approaches.

first to make a serious effort at studying these fields and demonstrating how relevant and useful these elements were to historians.

By the late 1980s, those who studied death had begun to draw on other fields such as anthropology,<sup>29</sup> art,<sup>30</sup> and literature<sup>31</sup> to further understand their topic. How a society coped with and explained death came to the forefront. Images of death and dying in art became resources that were used to interpret how a society viewed their dead and the afterlife. The manners of death – or the unknown details – in literature also provided clues as to how the author and his world viewed death. The most recent study of Anglo-Saxon kings by Nicole Marafioti focuses on the political messages produced by the funerals and disinterments,<sup>32</sup> while Matthias Range's work on post-Elizabethan royal and state funerals examines the documented music and visual ceremonial.<sup>33</sup> The symbolic language has become documentation by other means; the modern historians of death have used these alternative pieces of evidence to bolster their view of death in the past.

However, this approach has its own difficulties. By seeking death within a society through other fields, historians now have a tendency to shy away from practical elements of dealing with a corpse, funeral, and burial in the medieval period. Any discussion of the actual corpse is shunted into the still-emerging field of the history of medicine or the history of science. This is a rough fit, however. Medicine was practiced upon the living, save for the

---

<sup>29</sup> Richard Huntington and Peter Metcalf, *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979) is the inverse of Ariès' work, bringing history into anthropology. Forerunner to both strands is Marc Bloch, *The Royal Touch*, translated by J. E. Anderson (New York: Dorset Press, 1961), originally *Les Rois Thaumaturges* (1924).

<sup>30</sup> Paul Binski, *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996) also utilizes anthropological theory to further its points.

<sup>31</sup> Piero Camporesi, *The Incorruptible Flesh: Bodily Mutilation and Mortification in Religion and Folklore* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Danielle Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2008).

<sup>32</sup> Nicole Marafioti, *The King's Body* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014).

<sup>33</sup> Matthias Range, *British Royal and State Funerals: Music and Ceremonial Since Elizabeth I* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016).



dissection of cadavers at medical schools and under extreme circumstances.<sup>34</sup> The medieval preservation of a corpse for burial, while performed by a surgeon or apothecary, was not a medical matter. Embalming was a sign of high status during the medieval period. The typical noble or royal medieval corpse has no place in medicine or in science; he or she does belong to history, though there is residual stigma from the object-oriented approach of antiquarians.

### *The Present Work and Its Purpose*

The modern period has been able to separate the living from the dead more efficiently than any other time in history. In most first-world countries, finding a dead body outside the confines of a deathbed, hospital, or funeral home is an uncommon event. To see one in any state of decay suggests foul play or a person who had become lost to society. Modern society, which includes historians, has grown used to a world that makes it possible for a person never to see a dead body or personally deal with the arrangements for the deceased; funeral directors – also known as undertakers and morticians – are often hired to handle the entire funeral. The “death care” industry in the United States is estimated to produce upwards of \$16 billion per annum.<sup>35</sup>

The medieval world lacked such an industry. The final things were handled directly by the household of the deceased. It is remiss to bypass or gloss over the physical evidence, as alien as it now may be for modern historians to handle, both literally and metaphorically. However, the over-reliance on the physical evidence is a pitfall to be avoided; a professional

---

<sup>34</sup> For more information, see Katherine Park, *Secrets of Women: Gender, Generation, and the Origins of Human Dissection* (New York: Zone Books, 2006) and Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

<sup>35</sup> Paul M. Barrett, “Is Funeral Home Chain SCI’s Growth Coming at the Expense of Mourners?” *Bloomberg Business Week*, 24 October 2013, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-10-24/is-funeral-home-chain-scis-growth-coming-at-the-expense-of-mourners>; Anne Fisher, “Why Your Funeral Will Probably Be Run By a Woman,” *Fortune*, 20 August 2015, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://fortune.com/2015/08/20/funeral-directors-women/>.

approach, diversified source material, and deeper reading into the signs and symbols of death should be embraced.

The purpose of this thesis is to redirect attention back to what was centrepiece of the medieval English royal funeral: the body. The royal corpse, the dead body of the king, will be a constant companion to the reader; all things discussed here happened to him, because of him, and in relation to him. Where Kantorowicz lost interest, this thesis will pick up. When a king ceased to be, his final needs had to be handled before the kingdom as a unit could press forward. The government may have been able to function with an underage or absent heir, but the previous monarch still needed to be laid to rest. The reason for this, drawing on the concept of the king's two bodies, was so that the power vested in the previous sovereign's body natural could be transferred out of his corpse. The power did not have to go directly to the new king – it just had to be away from the dead vessel that could no longer wield power; the body politic had to continue to exist in an active body or bodies.<sup>36</sup> This facet of succession indicates the importance of the royal funeral during the medieval period: it freed the power of governance from death so those under the new king's rule could carry on. Coverage of this topic will not extend to the coronation of the new king. The coronation has received considerably more academic coverage than the royal funeral, and there have also been several comparative works on these two ceremonies.<sup>37</sup>

By returning focus to the corpse, the events of the royal funeral must also receive attention; they are understudied compared to those of the coronation. Moments or items have

---

<sup>36</sup> See Chapter II, 43-44, for the example of the absent Edward I.

<sup>37</sup> On the coronation itself, see Percy Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937); Bertie Wilkinson, *The Coronation in History* (London: Published for the Historical Association by G. Philip, 1953); Alice Hunt, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); *Three Coronation Orders*, edited by John Wickham Legg (London: Harrison and Sons, 1900). For comparative studies, see Paul Binski, "The *Liber Regalis*: Its Date and European Context," in *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*, edited by Dillian Gordon, Lisa Monnas, and Caroline Elan (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997), 233-246; Joel Burden, "Rituals of Royalty: Prescription, Politics and Practice in English Coronation and Royal Funeral Rituals, c.1327 to c.1485," (Doctoral thesis, University of York, 2000); Fitzroy Somerset, Lord Raglan, "Patterns in the Ritual of Coronations and Royal Funerals," *Folklore*, 64, no. 1 (March 1953), 257-270.

been given greater focus in the historiography, such as the effigy in the procession.<sup>38</sup> However, historians rarely have provided the reader with a clear sequence of events, following the royal corpse through the final ceremonies. In this way, this work will bear similarities to Giesey's *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*. A key difference, however, will be that the deep analysis of singular physical items will be absent. In its place will be the assessment of the whole sequence of events at royal exequies over the course of over three hundred years. Each activity during the funeral rites will be assessed within the context of the individual funeral, but also in the context of other kings' funerals. Chris Given-Wilson offers such an effort in "The Exequies of Edward III,"<sup>39</sup> but his analysis is isolated to the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Mark Duffy's *Royal Tombs of Medieval England* offers an even broader scope, but the principal focus of the work is on the tombs, their construction, and their art. In several smaller essays grouped by period, Duffy does address many ceremonial and traditional elements of the English royal funeral, but his analysis is understandably abbreviated, given the stated focus of his work.<sup>40</sup>

By understanding both the process of an individual king's funeral and the long-term development of funerary and burial rituals, the assessment of smaller, hyperfocused moments can be placed in their proper perspective and within an established context. The nature of this study is comparative and seeks to analyse the spectrum of royal exequies from King John's burial at Worcester in 1216 through Henry VII's at Westminster Abbey in 1509. This period has been chosen due to several factors. John was the first king to be buried in England since Stephen (d. 1154); all monarchs since then, save for James II and George I, have followed suit. This thesis terminates at Henry VII, because he was the last king of England to be in full

---

<sup>38</sup> For example, W.H. St. John Hope, *On the Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England with special references to those in the Abbey Church of Westminster* (London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1907); *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, edited by Anthony Harvey and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).

<sup>39</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, "The Exequies of Edward III and the Royal Funeral Ceremony in Late Medieval England," *English Historical Review*, 124, no. 507 (April 2009), 257-282.

<sup>40</sup> Mark Duffy, *Royal Tombs of Medieval England* (Stroud: Tempus Publishing, 2003).

communion with Rome. These specific strictures enable this thesis to cover the ground necessary without being bogged down in transitions of geography, religion, and the consequences thereof.

There have been intensive investigations into individual kings' funerals, but placing them all into the same context and space has not been attempted. Likewise, there has not been a comparison of royal medieval wills and other textual elements. Combining this broad sample with a renewed focus on the royal corpse will offer a new perspective on the royal funerary and burial ceremonies. It will also reveal that kings made a conscious effort to function in the same continuity as their predecessors. The kings of England strove for a unified identity as King through their rituals, and not just the coronation. Rather, the emulation of their predecessors and the instructions left for their successor pertaining to exequies and commemoration suggest an awareness of the continuing corporate legacy. In this manner, an English royal way of death was consciously formed and attached to the identity of "King of England."

Still, each royal body was an individual, both in life and in death. Given the diverse personalities, lives, deaths, and funerals of kings, the usability of any royal prescriptive texts must be called into question. The texts' elasticity and effectiveness have not been previously assessed. In order to judge these texts, specifically crafted for the royal and later the noble funeral, the influences that affected the exequies' structures must be ascertained. Additionally, the form of any stipulations impressed upon the structures should also be investigated. To what extent did religious, technical, and societal constraints temper the execution of the royal funeral? Conversely, the consequences of disregarding the opinion of society or the opinion of experts in a given field need to be evaluated.

As indicated above, the transfer of power represented by the royal funeral was an important moment, as it commented upon the legitimacy both of the old king and of the new one. However, when the king had abdicated or was not considered king at his death, this made

the funerary and burial rituals more complicated and difficult. What did one do with a king that was no longer king? His body could not lie above ground forever or easily be ignored. Through the establishment of a sequence of events, this thesis will determine what was performed under normative circumstances and for what purpose. By examining the source material from a king's funeral, the royal prescriptive texts, and contemporary reactions to the funeral, the visual and ritual elements of a normative English royal funeral can be established. Then, in comparison (not in opposition), the funerals that were non-compliant with the prescriptive texts will be assessed. In reconstructing the rationale of the royal house and the executors, one can better understand why a king was buried the way he was.

The royal funeral illustrated what were considered elements of kingship in medieval England. The interplay between the royal house and those outside of it had to relay the end of one king's reign, the beginning of the next, and the continuity between. The actions of the new king influenced the legacy, image, and reputation of the deceased monarch, as well as his own. The presentation and ritual activity surrounding the corpse were products of a society and its expectations. During the fifteenth century, French writers contrasted the "regicidal proclivities" of the English with French loyalty,<sup>41</sup> but their claims come off as flippant and ill-considered when one takes into account all the work it took to effectively deal with the king who was no longer king. The practical mechanics of the medieval royal funeral must receive attention.

### *Sources*

The sources for this long view reflect the range of influences in medieval England. There will be a review of the surviving chronicle accounts of royal exequies, particularly when there are various and dissenting views as to how the king died and was buried. Afterwards, narratives that describe the interaction between living kings and royal tombs will also be used to

---

<sup>41</sup> Craig Taylor, "Weep thou for me in France': French Views of the Deposition of Richard II," in *Fourteenth Century England III*, edited by W. M. Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell Press 2004), 211-212.

determine the nature of the relationship between the monarchs and their progenitors. Church chronicles in particular document whether a living king gave the burial church gifts because of the presence of deceased royal blood.

The accuracy of chronicle narratives varied widely, dependent upon political affiliation, distance from the court, and the writer and his community's relationship with the royal house. More objective evidence can be found in the records of the Exchequer and the royal household (held mainly in the National Archives) and other surviving financial documentation. The amount of money spent at a funeral mattered, as conspicuous consumption was an important form of self-identification by the later Middle Ages. An inexpensive funeral for one's station could imply that something was amiss. The items the money bought can give a general idea of what was seen at the funerals or on the deceased's body. However, these records may only be lists of objects and material values; they do not necessarily tell the reader how the items were used and invested with meaning. This is where a narrative source is useful in clarifying the financial records. Still, for example, if the narrator did not notice who or what carried four lavishly decorated shields, then their function may be lost to us, though we know that they were made at a significant cost to the Royal House for the funeral.

The manuscripts and publications associated with the Order of the Garter, principally produced during the Tudor period, have proven to be exceedingly useful to this study. The Knights of the Garter played a significant role in the royal funeral during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The manuscripts compiled by members of the Order and their heralds include not only eyewitness accounts of the exequies, but also the Garter's expenses pertaining to their involvement and illustrations of some of the heraldry and tombs of the deceased. At least one Garter King of Arms, Thomas Wriothesley, had an interest in collecting such information as far back as Henry V.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> This collection is spread across BL Additional MSS 45131, 45132, 45133, and 46354. BL Additional MS 45131 contains a vast collection of epitaphs and descriptions of the exequies of elites, including but not limited to

The evidence gathered by antiquarians that attended tomb openings can settle disagreements between financial accounts and narratives. If there was a lack of consensus as to how well a deceased king was treated, the contents of the casket would reveal not only how well the corpse was embalmed and prepared for burial, but also what riches were enclosed with him. These grave goods ranged from ornate clothing and jewellery to the symbols of monarchy (crown, sceptre, rod, and ring). Tomb openings also documented the arrangement of the king in his coffin, which can aid in determining the amount of care given to the corpse.

The royal prescriptive texts, having been mentioned briefly, must be discussed here as sources for the royal funerary and burial ceremonies; their content and utilization will be addressed in Chapter III. As said above, the texts provided guidance for the preparation and execution of a royal funeral. They were written throughout the span of time covered by this thesis, 1216-1509. The first, *De Exequiis Regalibus*, is a manuscript text describing the mortuary preparation for the king's remains, including their embalming and dressing. *De Exequiis Regalibus* appears in the illuminated manuscripts Westminster Abbey MS 37 *Litylinton Missal*, Westminster Abbey MS 38 *Liber Regalis*, and Pamplona MS 97, which all date to the late fourteenth century and portray liturgical activity at Westminster Abbey during the medieval period.

These three manuscripts are believed to have been created around the same time by a single group of scribes and illuminators working at Westminster Abbey. By the time of their creation, *De Exequiis Regalibus* was a unified part of the illuminated manuscript, falling right after the coronation ceremonies of a king alone, a queen alone, and a king and queen together. It was an established royal ceremony that was a planned part of the books. However, there is

---

Richard, duke of York, Edward IV, Elizabeth Woodville, Arthur Tudor, Elizabeth of York, and Henry VII. Wriothesley was the Garter King of Arms from 1505; it is likely that he had paid attention to previous exequies and collected the accounts thereof so as to assist him in his responsibilities related to the planning of royal ceremonies such as funerals and coronations. Robert Yorke, "Wriothesley, Sir Thomas (d. 1534)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/30075.

evidence that *De Exequiis Regalibus* is much younger than the coronation *ordines* that precede it. Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 425 is a “pontificale abbatiae Westmsteriensis” with parts dating to the thirteenth century. It is a manuscript without illumination with the contents of the aforementioned illuminated manuscripts. When John Wickham Legg compiled his *Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis* in 1891, he specifically noted in the introduction to the third volume that the mortuary rite for kings is not in the original body of this manuscript; it is in another hand, running over the remaining pages of the folio and onto a page pasted onto the inside back cover.<sup>43</sup> Rawlinson C 425 may have been the working copy used at the Abbey prior to the creation of the splendid illuminated manuscripts. This suggests that the royal mortuary text was recorded some time after the prescriptive coronation texts, but before the creation of the abovementioned illuminated manuscripts.<sup>44</sup>

This makes it difficult to pinpoint the time by which *De Exequiis Regalibus* was implemented at royal funerals. Due to the date and the appearance of the illuminations found in *Liber Regalis* and Pamplona MS 197, it has been speculated that *De Exequiis Regalibus* was initially created as an account of the preservation, dressing, and presentation of Edward III in 1377.<sup>45</sup> However, other kings prior to Edward III, including his father Edward II, grandfather Edward I, and great-grandfather Henry III, had elements of *De Exequiis Regalibus*.<sup>46</sup> They were all embalmed, dressed, and buried with symbols of their status, as dictated by the prescriptive text. Modified versions of *De Exequiis Regalibus* appear alongside the funeral narratives of Edward IV;<sup>47</sup> although the purpose of the text – embalming and dressing the king’s

---

<sup>43</sup> *Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, iii, edited by John Wickham Legg. Henry Bradshaw Society, 12. (Bury St. Edmunds: Boydell Press, 1999), ix.

<sup>44</sup> This would pre-empt Ralph Giesey’s suggestion that *De Exequiis Regalibus* was written for Jean II the Good of France, who died in English captivity in 1364. Giesey assumed that all elements of *Liber Regalis* had to be written at approximately the same time and that an effigy had to be mentioned if the *ordo* was referring to Edward II or Edward III. Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony*, 85.

<sup>45</sup> Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power, 1200-1400* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), 196. Percy Schramm first proposed this theory in *A History of the English Coronation*, 80.

<sup>46</sup> See Chapter III, 80; 82-84.

<sup>47</sup> See Chapter III, 80-82.



body appropriately – remained the same, details were added to reflect changes in the royal exequies.

*De Exequiis Regalibus* contained elements that had been established long before its creation; the text was not innovative. Likewise, the *Liber Regie Capelle* was written in the 1440s and contained elements that had already been present at Henry V's funeral in 1422. The *Liber Regie Capelle* governed the life and business of the Chapel Royal. The Chapel Royal was composed of the clergy and choristers that were in direct service to the king; they travelled with him whenever possible. Count Alvaro Vaz d'Almada, a nobleman at Henry VI's court, requested that the dean of the royal chapel, William Say, create a copy of the *Liber Regie Capelle* for the benefit of the Portuguese king, Alfonso V.<sup>48</sup> This was done c. 1449. The Vaz d'Almada family had the book as late as the eighteenth century before it came to the archives in Evora, Portugal. This copy remains extant, and its contents were published by the Henry Bradshaw Society.

The funerary section of *Liber Regie Capelle* contains a copy of *De Exequiis Regalibus* and extends the prescriptive narrative further to cover the religious rites to be used at the funeral of the king. Walter Ullman suggests that the book was kept private by the inner circle of the royal household, which included the Chapel Royal, precisely because of the inclusion of *De Exequiis Regalibus*' and other English ritual elements. The "secrets" within could have been misunderstood or misconstrued by outsiders, so the *Liber Regie Capelle* only circulated among a limited audience.<sup>49</sup> As such, it was meant for those who needed to know how a funeral of a king was to be conducted.<sup>50</sup>

The final royal prescriptive text is a section of the *Articles Ordained by King Henry VII for the Regulation of his Household 31 December 1494*, referred to as the Household Articles

---

<sup>48</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 10.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid*, 7.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid*.

hereafter for brevity. The opening phrase of the relevant section states, “[...] As for the burying of a Prince nighe of the blood royall,” and the text that follows applies to noble funerals as well as those of monarchs.<sup>51</sup> This text is concerned with the appearance and conduct of those in attendance at the funeral and during the procession, and it appears in several Tudor manuscripts in connection with the exequies of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Because of references to the king’s siblings, J.L. Laynesmith has suggested that much, if not all, of the text had been taken from ordinances written during the reign of Edward IV, known collectively as the *Ryalle Book*.<sup>52</sup> However, it is unknown from what date the book was used, nor is it immediately clear what items were original to Edward IV’s reign and what items were created for Henry VII. There is no complete extant copy of the *Ryalle Book*. As such, the Household Articles of 1494 represent the full accumulation of traditions and activities at a royal funeral between the creation of the *Liber Regie Capelle* and the reign of Henry VII.<sup>53</sup>

By 1503, Margaret Beaufort, Henry VII’s mother, had composed what could be considered an addendum to the funerary Household Article. The full title of the piece is “Order for Wearing Apparel: Ordinances and information of apparel for an primat or his estates houses of ladies and gentlemen for the time of mournings” with several manuscripts having the following added to the title: “the right high, mighty, and excellent princess Margaret Countess of Richmond, daughter and sole heir of that most noble prince John Duke of Somerset and mother to our most Dread Sovereign Lord, King Henry the Seventh.”<sup>54</sup> This

---

<sup>51</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 130-131.

<sup>52</sup> J.L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 72.

<sup>53</sup> Laynesmith states that the BL Harley MS 642, f. 222v-223r version of the Household Articles is incomplete. In her research, she prefers to rely on the MS published in *Antiquarian Repertory*, i, edited by Francis Grose and Thomas Astle (London: Edward Jeffrey, 1807), 296-341 (BL Additional MS 38174). It does contain additional content, but it is missing most of the royal funeral information. Thus, it is also incomplete. BL Harley MS 642 and its printing in *A Collection of Ordinances* will be used in this thesis, as well as the copy in BL Harley MS 6079, ff. 25v-26r; 31r ff. This precedes a rendition of Henry VII’s funeral, and the scribe is very clear in delineating what was prescribed, and what actually occurred.

<sup>54</sup> Transcription of BL Additional MS 45133, f. 141v, rendered in modern English; manuscripts containing this inscription have widely varying spellings and minor differences in word choice, but they all convey the same sentiment.

order outlines the proper clothing for women during the time of mourning, which included tippets, cloaks, and hoods. Several versions have additional information regarding the ranks of women and the inclusion of the barb, another piece of clothing. These additions are in the same style and with similar detail as the ones known to have been written by Beaufort in 1503. Michael Jones theorizes that these changes were made by Beaufort herself in or before 1507, as her household had commissioned the Garter Herald “[to make] a book to wear mourning clothes by” in that year.<sup>55</sup> The Household Articles and the Beaufort addenda define protocol that had previously been seen in Yorkist narratives of funerals.

The sources dated to the time of Henry VII emphasize the importance of the approach advocated by this thesis, of inward and outward comparison. The English royal house was above all others in the realm, but it was still firmly attached to the nobility as the top of a hierarchical structure. A reciprocal relationship between the nobility and the king was present both in life and in death, with traditions and symbols being transmitted between them. Although this work focuses upon the exequies and commemoration of kings, noble funerals and those of consorts and royal children will also be considered; each of these activities expressed the deceased’s relation to the king. Crucially, John Carmi Parsons has pointed out in his work on queens’ funerals<sup>56</sup> that the *Liber Regalis* directly states that the queen should be given the same honours as the king.<sup>57</sup> It would be remiss not to use this tool in deciphering the funerals of monarchs. The effort would also be incomplete if the study was completely insular. As such, comparisons of the royal houses of England, Scotland, and France will be made as deemed relevant.

---

<sup>55</sup> Michael K. Jones, and Malcolm G. Underwood, *The King’s Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 187. Jones judges the regulations in BL Additional MS 45133, f. 141v, to be the most original. BL Cotton Tiberius E VIII, ff. 161v-162r (old ff. 202v-203r), and BL Harley MS 1354, ff. 10v-13r, come later and include the section on barbs.

<sup>56</sup> John Carmi Parsons, “‘Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour’: The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500,” in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference at King’s College London April 1995*, edited by Anne Dugan (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), 317-337.

<sup>57</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 115; Parsons, “‘Never was a body,’” 317-318.

Perhaps the strongest critique of antiquarians is that their observations and judgments were made with only limited information from other fields. Since this work aims to bring together the antiquarians and the modern historians, it must be interdisciplinary in nature. There will be some elements of art history and literature utilized, but this analysis will branch out beyond these already well-trod paths.

The state of the liturgy in England during the period 1216-1509 must be examined. The Church in England experienced a proliferation of Uses or variants of the standard Roman rites during the medieval period. Several were regional, such as the Uses of Hereford and York. Others were more closely tied to specific orders, such as the Dominicans and Benedictines. The Use of Sarum (springing from Salisbury in the eleventh century) was the most commonly used variant in England by the sixteenth century. The Westminster Use was derived from the Sarum and Benedictine rites. Readings, responsorial psalms, verses, and other content, such as prayers, varied according to the Use and also the liturgical season. Appendices Two through Seven are collated *ordines* of the Office of the Dead and the votive masses for the deceased.<sup>58</sup> Appendix One contains a discussion of the religious texts and the rationale for their inclusion.<sup>59</sup>

Appendices Two through Seven illustrate the differences among Uses and the potential impact of the varying locations, dates of burial, and the processional routes on the liturgy. Kings that were buried at Westminster Abbey were logically subject to the Use of Westminster. However, this also means that kings *not* buried at Westminster had a funeral and burial that innately differed from their peers. If the king was buried in a different part of the country or with a different monastic order, more deviation was to be expected. Although the offices and masses would have followed the same structure, the readings, psalms, antiphons, and other content would have varied. These items would have also varied based upon what time of the

---

<sup>58</sup> See 315-322 of this work.

<sup>59</sup> See 311-314 of this work.

year the king had died and was to be buried; the Church operated on a rotating cycle of readings, prayers, and psalms. Thus, every royal funeral was different by virtue of the Church calendar and the variety of Uses in England during this period.

Just as the missals of a given Use will be compared with each other, contemporary medical manuals that detail the embalming of elite persons can be used to piece together the royal iteration of the process. Henri de Mondeville, the French royal physician and attendant embalmer for Philippe IV (d. 1314) and his son, Louis X (d. 1316), wrote the earliest extant surgical textbook, *Cyrurgia*, c. 1320.<sup>60</sup> In the compiled manuscript Wellcome Library MS 564, there is a Middle English translation of Mondeville's work, created by a London surgeon, c. 1392.<sup>61</sup> The more famous Guy de Chauliac later expanded upon Mondeville's methods his book, *Chirurgia Magna*.<sup>62</sup> Chauliac was affiliated with the Avignon papacy, serving as the popes' personal physician from 1342 until his death in 1368.<sup>63</sup> The earliest manuscripts of Chauliac in Middle English -- New York Academy of Medicine MS 12 and Bibliothèque Nationale MS Anglais 25 -- were completed by the first half of the fifteenth century, with the New York Academy of Medicine MS dated as early as 1425.<sup>64</sup> The works of Mondeville and Chauliac clearly crossed over the Channel prior to these dates and were translated from their original Latin. As such, their confirmed presence in England by the mid-fifteenth century makes them highly relevant to the cases at hand.

---

<sup>60</sup> Henri de Mondeville, *The Surgery of Master Henry de Mondeville, Surgeon of Philip the Fair, King of France, written from 1306 to 1320*, translated by Leonard Rosenman (XLibris Corporation, 2003). This is the version currently accepted by the *Journal of the American Medical Association*. This has been cross referenced with the French translation from which it is rendered: Henri de Mondeville, *Chirurgie de Maître Henri de Mondeville*, translated and edited by E. Nicaise (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer Baillière and Co., 1893). No transcription of the original Latin manuscript, Bibliothèque Nationale MS French 2030, has been published.

<sup>61</sup> The Wellcome Library, "Henri de Mondeville, *Chirurgia*, plus miscellaneous receipts," *The Wellcome Library Catalogue*, last accessed 7 May 2016, [http://search.wellcomelibrary.org/iii/encore/record/C\\_\\_Rb1973092?lang=eng](http://search.wellcomelibrary.org/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1973092?lang=eng).

<sup>62</sup> Guy de Chauliac, *The Chirurgie of Guy de Chauliac*, edited by Margaret S. Ogden. Early English Text Society, 265 (London: 1971).

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid*, 415.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid*, v-vi.

The second set of medical texts date from the early seventeenth century. Ambroise Paré was the royal physician to four French kings.<sup>65</sup> The earliest known publication of his works in England dates to 1634, forty-four years after Paré's death.<sup>66</sup> The last source in this category is Philbert Guybert's *The Charitable Physitian with the Charitable Apothecary*, its English publication dated 1639.<sup>67</sup> Although these medical references appear much later those of Mondeville and Chauliac, their contents show the evolution and continuing development of embalming. The methodology for embalming kings in the fifteenth and sixteenth century can be theorized as being somewhere between the techniques of Paré and Guybert and those of Mondeville and Chauliac.

### *An Outline of Contents*

The organization of this work is chronological as it relates to the events of the exequies. First, in Chapter II, the kings die; there can be no funeral without a body. This section addresses the simplicity of narrative for some kings, while analysing the multiplicity of stories for others. The evolution of a king's death narrative reflects posterity's opinion of him; what changed in the story mattered to the audience for which it was created. However, despite any doubts or concerns, English kings universally avoid spiritual peril; nearly all narratives point to the conclusion that there are no English kings in Hell.

After the deaths of kings, an intensive examination of the royal prescriptive texts, introduced above, commences in Chapter III. The external factors that would have affected the application of the prescriptive texts are discussed. Highlighted are examples of kings that appear to have been completely compliant with the prescriptive texts, based upon the narrative

---

<sup>65</sup> Henri II, François II, Charles, IX, and Henri III.

<sup>66</sup> Ambroise Paré, *The workes of that famous chirurgion Ambrose Parey translated out of Latine and compared with the French*, translated by Thomas Johnson (London: Thomas Johnson, 1634).

<sup>67</sup> Guybert, Philbert, *The charitable physitian: with the Charitable apothecary. Written in French by Philbert Guibert Esquire, and physitian regent in Paris: and by him after many severall editions, reviewed, corrected, amended, and augmented. And now faithfully translated into English, for the benefit of this kingdome by I.W.* (London: Thomas Harper, 1639).

descriptions of their funerals and any surviving documentary and physical evidence. The main point of this chapter is to establish the prescriptive texts' consistent use in royal funerals, their innate and purposeful elasticity, and the extent of compliance.

Chapter IV will be more example-driven, as it deals with the diverse interpretations of the prescriptive texts. When the texts were ignored, there were consequences, though the extent of these varied; not every deviation from the prescriptive texts resulted in disruption at the funeral. Here, the prescriptive texts are shown at their fullest elasticity; on very rare occasions, the texts failed to produce a successful funeral. The diversity of royal exequies can be seen in the prescriptive texts' adaptation over time in response to external stimuli.

After the completion of funeral rites, Chapter V will survey the burial sites of the kings of England. The arrangements were not always permanent, and this will be addressed later in Chapter VII. The phenomenon of what I term "body capital" is the focus of the fifth chapter. Until a location built up adequate capital (enough bodies), the burial sites of kings tended to be spread out. As more kings chose a given site as their permanent resting place, it became most attractive to other kings and nobles. That location tended to be the centre of royal funerary activity, but there were exceptions and efforts to build up capital at other locations. The significance of the broad location of England as a conscious choice by medieval kings will also be discussed. Despite fluctuations in land on the continent and at the Welsh and Scottish borders, kings from 1216 onward chose England as the resting place for themselves and their families.

In contrast to the matters discussed the first five chapters, Chapter VI will address the lack of official guidelines for medieval commemoration. These activities tended to be highly dependent upon the deceased, in both his own preparation for death and his bonds with his successor. This requires a change in tactic. Some of the evidence as to what occurred comes from the commentary left behind by chroniclers, who usually signalled their approval or

disapproval of the exequies and permanent monuments. Other evidence comes from financial records pertaining to expenditure for obits, anniversaries, and other such activity. Determining the agency of commemoration reveals that the relationships of the living and their opinion of a former king's status determined how a monarch was commemorated.

Chapter VII covers reburial, a unique event in medieval exequies. Since it was costly to disinter, transport, and reinter a corpse, this was an exclusive occasion for those of elite secular or ecclesiastical status, including kings and saints. Reburial incorporated all of elements previously enacted: the king's death, the king's funeral, the location of the king's initial burial, and his commemoration. This chapter will examine how those in charge of a reburial changed the legacy of a monarch. Additions were made to the king's death and funerary narrative: a renewed anniversary, a new location, and a new pattern of commemoration thereafter. Reburial was an editing device, used to fix and perfect a king and his relationship with the living; how this was received by posterity thereafter will be addressed.

The chronological range of this work is extensive, but necessarily so. Unlike previous efforts, this work attempts to trace the practical processes related to the royal exequies by observing its participants, its rituals, and the reactions over time, from 1216 to 1509. The limits imposed upon the ceremonies by the prescriptive texts, the Church, science, and society also have not been analysed; there is a tendency to isolate a given royal ceremony or to compare it limitedly. This investigation confronts each king, both as himself and in his office of King; the king's two bodies, as theorized by Ernst Kantorowicz, exist in the royal exequies, though not necessarily in the form originally constructed by Kantorowicz.

Reassessing the royal funerary and burial ceremonies of medieval England may result in significantly different, new interpretations of any given monarch. If he was treated differently



than traditionally thought, then his legacy and our interpretation of his successors' activities surrounding him dramatically change. We find this in the case of the restless King John.<sup>68</sup>

### *The Case of King John*

King John,<sup>69</sup> youngest son of Henry II, was interred in Worcester Priory (now cathedral) near St. Wulfstan's relics, by request of his will.<sup>70</sup> In 1218, the church was rededicated, and the relics of Sts. Wulfstan and Oswald were moved to new shrines.<sup>71</sup> In 1232, the Annals of Tewkesbury inform us that John was placed in a new sarcophagus in the presence of magnates and his son, Henry III.<sup>72</sup> While this does not directly say that John was moved within the church, it is plausible that that he was moved from wherever Wulfstan's relics had been in 1216 to his present location in the choir, which was closer to the medieval shrine of St. Wulfstan post-1218.<sup>73</sup> Here, he acquired the Purbeck tomb topper seen today.

Ute Engel has theorized that, due to the amount of money and supplies donated by Henry III and other elites for the works and fabric of the church, the Gothic choir of Worcester Priory was not actually complete yet.<sup>74</sup> By this theory, John's tomb was in the Romanesque choir that was torn down in the 1240s, and it (with him in it) was moved yet again to be placed in the Gothic choir we see today. Such a move was not recorded at Worcester, in chronicle narratives, or in government documentation; given Henry III's intense piety and

---

<sup>68</sup> My thanks to Dr. David Morrison, Worcester Cathedral Librarian and Archivist, for his assistance and discussing these materials with me.

<sup>69</sup> See Chapter II, 41-43 for his death narratives.

<sup>70</sup> Worcester Cathedral Muniments, B1693; Stephen D. Church, "King John's Testament and the Last Days of His Reign," *English Historical Review*, 125, no. 514 (June 2010), 516-518. As pointed out by John Croke, the description of John between two saints comes from the Dunstable Annals, written c. 1242. John may not have been between Oswald and Wulfstan from 1216 to 1232, but by 1242, he was. John Croke, "The Physical Setting of the Cult of St. Wulfstan," in *St. Wulfstan and His World*, edited by Julia S. Barrow and N.P. Brooks (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 211; "Annales Dunstaplia," *Annales Monastici*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1866), 48.

<sup>71</sup> Ute Engel, *Worcester Cathedral: An Architectural History*, translated by Hilary Heltay (Chichester: Phillimore and Co., 2007), 112.

<sup>72</sup> "Annales Theokesberia," *Annales Monastici*, i, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1865), 84.

<sup>73</sup> Croke, "The Physical Setting of the Cult of St. Wulfstan," 211.

<sup>74</sup> Engel, *Worcester Cathedral*, 114-117.

concern for both of his parents' graves,<sup>75</sup> he would have either attended the translation or sent money for the expressed occasion of his father's translation.

John's tomb is known to have been opened three times since 1232: in 1529 during the renovation of his tomb in order to better match that of Arthur Tudor,<sup>76</sup> in 1754 to look at the outside of his Purbeck coffin (John was not exposed),<sup>77</sup> and again in 1797.<sup>78</sup> According to Valentine Green's 1797 account, John was found with a sword with scabbard in his tomb and wearing a shroud, but there was no crown on his head. This led to speculation that he had been coifed as a monk in penitence for his sins.<sup>79</sup> The lack of other accoutrements of royalty in the tomb added to this supposition; the body was well-dressed in a red dalmatic, but there were no jewels or metal to be found. However, *De Exequiis Regalibus* explicitly mention a shroud or coif being placed on the king's head, and other kings are recorded to have had the same headgear, since they were anointed and crowned while wearing it.<sup>80</sup>

John's tomb was renovated by Henry VIII in 1529 so as to better match the tomb of Arthur Tudor, the king's brother, who was also buried at Worcester. At this time, John was laid out on display for the masses while his tomb was finished. John Bale was a former Carmelite friar and bishop of Ossory. He wrote a historical play about King John. University of London librarian J.H.P. Pafford noted that Bale's copy of *Annales Regnum Angliae* by

---

<sup>75</sup> Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Historiarum*, ii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 95 (London: 1890), 405; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, v, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 57 (London: 1880), 475. Isabella of Angouleme had originally been interred in the cemetery of Fontevraud, possibly as a sign of penitence. When Henry III visited in 1254, he was horrified and immediately ordered for her to be moved inside to lie alongside his grandparents, Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine, and his uncle, Richard I.

<sup>76</sup> J.H.P. Pafford, "King John's Tomb in Worcester Cathedral: An Account of Its Opening in 1529 by John Bale," *Transactions of the Worcester Archaeological Society*, 35 (1958), 58-60.

<sup>77</sup> David Park, *Worcester Cathedral Polychromy Survey 1997* (London: Courtauld Institute of Art, 1997), Item 18.

<sup>78</sup> Valentine Green, *An Account of the Discovery of the Body of King John, in the Cathedral Church of Worcester, July 17<sup>th</sup> 1797* (London: V. and R. Green, 1797).

<sup>79</sup> Green, *An Account*, 4.

<sup>80</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 65, believes it to be coronation coif; D.A. Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 435, also doubts that the coif was that of a monk. He remarks that the Great Wardrobe records the use of Edward II's coronation coif and clothes at his funeral; only the undergarments and the coif remained with Edward when he was actually buried. See also Hope, *On the Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England*, 15, who partly transcribes TNA E 361/3, r. 8/16. Duffy ascribes John's dishevelled appearance in 1797 to "Parliamentarians following the battle of Worcester in 1651," *Royal Tombs*, 64. I have found no corroborating evidence to suggest that the tomb was opened at that time.

Nicholas Trevet had been annotated with verses pertaining to the 1529 renovation. There had been a crown on John's head, a sword at his side, his right hand holding a rod, his left a sceptre, spurs on his feet, and a ring on his finger.<sup>81</sup>

Save for the sword and spurs, this list of grave goods corresponds to *De Exequiis Regalibus* and points to an unfortunate conclusion: during John's two-day display in 1529, his grave was robbed either by the masses or by the workers commissioned to renovate his tomb. As a result, Green and his companions could only see the shroud and the remains of a sword and scabbard. John's arm had been dislodged at some point, his ring missing and hand lost somewhere in the coffin;<sup>82</sup> one wonders if someone had been desperate to get that ring off the corpse's fingers before being caught. In 1957, the Cathedral regained possession of what was supposedly a bone from John's thumb. The Account Book from December 1957 states it to be John's thumb,<sup>83</sup> though its 1951 silver mount declares it a "replica."<sup>84</sup>

The Cathedral has another supposed bone from John's thumb in its safe, though it is described by Dr. David Morrison as being "too small" to be John's.<sup>85</sup> There are three bones to the human thumb, ascending upward: the metacarpal, which connects to the carpus bones of the wrist; the first phalanx of the thumb; and the second phalanx of the thumb, which is the tip of the digit. It is possible that this smaller bone in the safe could be the second phalanx, while the "replica" is the first phalanx. If John's ring was on his middle finger, as prescribed in *De Exequiis Regalibus*, we can imagine that finger curling around a rod or sceptre, with the thumb neatly crossing over in order to grip the item. We can then also imagine a person in panic grabbing at the ring and taking a few extra bones with him. Neither the bones nor a part of

---

<sup>81</sup> Pafford, "King John's Tomb in Worcester Cathedral," 59. Pafford also gave Worcester Cathedral a copy of his transcription of Corpus Christi College MS 152, f. 48b. The transcription is now part of the amalgamated Worcester Cathedral Additional MS 438, formerly MS 77B.

<sup>82</sup> Green, *An Account*, 4-5.

<sup>83</sup> Worcester Cathedral Muniments, Account Book 274/57, 107, entry dated 4 December 1957.

<sup>84</sup> Worcester Cathedral Muniments, Artefact 5D. Considering that this was a supposedly stolen item, the engraving may have been purposely misleading. These items were displayed along with teeth attributed to the corpse as part of the British Library's exhibition *Magna Carta: Law, Liberty, Legacy* in 2015.

<sup>85</sup> Conversation with the author, 17-18 December 2014 at Worcester Cathedral Library.

John's shroud (claimed to have been removed from the coffin and gifted to a Mr. Everill in 1865)<sup>86</sup> have been confirmed as belonging to the late king.

Ute Engel concludes that John had been robbed. However, she does not take the argument far enough. This robbery changes John's legacy. For the two centuries since the 1797 opening, scholars have interpreted John's plain burial in a "monk's cowl" as penitence and sorrow for his misdeeds in life. It is only in the last twenty years that D.A. Carpenter<sup>87</sup> and Mark Duffy<sup>88</sup> have considered that it was a coronation coif, but any suggestion of a purposeful robbery was left unsaid until Engel.<sup>89</sup> John's monk-like appearance in his tomb had been previously used to interpret him as a man and as a spiritual creature.

John was not penitent – at least not in the traditionally accepted way, if the 1529 report is accurate. He was buried as a king. There was no humility in that. Being buried near a saint, as he requested, was not necessarily penitent in nature either. Medieval Christians believed that saints offered holy protection from enemies both spiritual and physical. Given that England was subject to invasion from both France and Scotland in 1216, John, would have been concerned about his resting place being disturbed, but he was still the King. He was not masquerading as a monk to sneak past the perils of Purgatory, as theorized by Green.<sup>90</sup> How we speak of John is cardinaly changed by knowing what he intended to do, rather than what was seen in 1797.

John has no official government documentation accompanying his exequies and tomb monument. Physical evidence, chronicles, financial records for his commemoration by his son, and eyewitness accounts of tomb openings provide historians with their knowledge of John's end. Edward IV's case is the diametric opposite: the official documentation is extensive,

---

<sup>86</sup> Worcester Cathedral Muniments, Artefact 5A.

<sup>87</sup> Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III*, 435.

<sup>88</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 65.

<sup>89</sup> Engel, *Worcester Cathedral*, 209-210.

<sup>90</sup> Green, *An Account*, 4.

but no physical evidence survived. It is with restless John and his potentially revised legacy in mind that we enter Chapter II, his death being the first chronologically. John is also significant in that he was the first English king buried in England since Stephen (d. 1154) and the first Angevin to be buried away from Fontevraud. This information is nothing new. How this fits into the grand scheme of things – both for John and for the Plantagenet dynasty – is to be determined.

## Chapter II: At the Hour of Death

The major requirement of any medieval funeral was the dead body of the person concerned. The location of death, the cause of death, the state of the kingdom, and the preparedness of those around the king for his death influenced the final arrangements. Establishing the context of the royal funeral ceremony for each king is the goal of this chapter. This is crucial to understanding the function of the prescriptive texts of the royal funeral: they were meant to be a unifying, equalizing force. Although the kings described below experienced a wide variety of deaths, they were subject to rules and standards that normalized their obsequies. They were individual mortals, but they all belonged to the same identity, King of England. Thus, Chapter II must comment upon the kings' deaths. Because a king's legacy began at the moment of his death, this chapter must also consider the diversity and evolution of narratives. What posterity believed about a king's death often had impact upon post-funerary activities, such as commemoration and reburial.

The chronicle sources included in this chapter are not exhaustive. Many chronicles that have been vital to political, military, social, and ecumenical history do not appear here because the authors were not concerned with the details of royal deaths. Beyond a single line stating that the king had died at a particular place on a given day and was buried at a specific location, these sources offer little information. Save perhaps for Edward V and Henry VI, there is little debate upon the exact date of the king's death; running through the sources to argue the dates would be pedantic here.

Most English kings during the period of 1216-1509 have multiple, differentiated narratives concerning their deaths. The selected chronicles show variation and progression of the royal death narratives, from the time closest to a king's death (what contemporaries believed had happened) to those with retrospect (what posterity believed or wanted to believe). This reflects the various opinions of chroniclers as well as the development of the king's legacy

after death; the narrative may have changed if the present monarch cherished or despised his predecessor.

For kings that died under mysterious circumstances, the narrative variations increase to reflect the uncertainty of actual events. These variations also impacted the succeeding monarchs and their legacies. A pitiful death does not a martyr make, nor should it atone for misdeeds in life. Yet, there were motions toward canonising two out of the four kings that died under clandestine circumstances. Eamon Duffy encapsulates this, stating, “The victims of political struggles might become martyrs, and popular devotion to such ‘saints’ might be the vehicle for criticisms of or resistance to the political status quo.”<sup>1</sup>

This brings us to the concept that there are no English kings in Hell: they all died good deaths. As will be seen below, chroniclers made it a point to mention that the king received last rites and made a final confession. Alternatively, the king gave guidance and good advice to his successor, or the representative thereof, to further the welfare of the kingdom. However, even kings that had less sterling reputations in life managed to get past the gates of Heaven. In the case of a murdered king, the suddenness of death was a mitigating circumstance, chiefly for the lack of opportunity for a last confession.<sup>2</sup> Although the king may have been flawed in life, his murderers were even worse for committing regicide upon God’s anointed; save for the minor Edward III, all successors of usurped monarchs bore some stigma for their predecessor’s fate. Chroniclers also allocated various personal characteristics to kings that make them worthy of

---

<sup>1</sup> Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion of England, 1400-1580* (New York: Yale University Press, 1992), 164.

<sup>2</sup> David Crouch, “The Troubled Deathbeds of Henry I’s Servants: Death, Confession, and Secular Conduct in the Twelfth Century,” *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 34, no. 1 (Spring 2002), 28-29, n. 9, clarifies that confession prior to death was considered important by the twelfth century. However, confession’s status as a sacrament was not clearly established until Lateran IV in 1215 (Canon 21). Chris Daniell, *Death and Burial in Medieval England 1066-1550* (London: Routledge, 1997), 32, states that if death was so sudden that there was no priest nor a lay person to convey a confession, it was charitably assumed that the person had made peace with God prior to death. Daniell states that due to the Black Death, traditional deathbed activity was disrupted. Faith had to suffice if no confessor or layperson were available to take the dying person’s contrition; Daniell, *Death and Burial in Medieval England*, 189.

their title, even in misdeeds, be it their skill in battle, wit, courage, piety, or some other goodly trait.

There was no “regular” death for an English monarch. The kings of England died in widely varying circumstances and ages. Edward V is thought to have been about thirteen at his death, while Edward I was sixty-eight. John, Edward III, Henry V, and Edward IV left minor children. Of the thirteen kings of England from 1216 to 1509, only Henry III and Edward III died at royal residences, with some anticipation of their death due to previous illness and old age. Other kings also died of illness, but these were sudden events at a premature age.

The deaths of John, Edward I, Henry V, and Richard III all occurred on campaign, although Richard III was the only one to actually die in battle. Most importantly, their deaths were away from home and unanticipated, leading to variations in their funerary and burial ceremonies. Edward II, Richard II, Henry VI, and Edward V died or disappeared under mysterious circumstances. Their ceremonies and final resting places varied more than kings who died while in office. Their political afterlives were also extended; the return of the usurped king was always a threat to the sitting monarch, until the deaths were in some way reconciled, the deceased firmly placed in the grave. A restless predecessor posed a problem to the sitting monarch. The legality and legitimacy of being King while the previous king lived was precarious.

Although there were specific requirements observed for the death of a king, these items were tempered and nuanced to suit the context of each individual king’s death. The obsequies for a man that died quietly at home were very different from those offered for a man that died mysteriously, far from court, or unexpectedly. Yet all were suitable, as we shall see in Chapter IV. The following sections will discuss each king’s end and the importance writers placed upon their good deaths, whether by Christian virtue, kingly traits, or the efforts made to secure the



succession. This phenomenon directly led into efforts to normalize and unify each individual king's obsequies into a group of ceremonies that befitted the office of King.

### *John*

The earliest king addressed in this study, John, was not typical nor even prototypical in his death and arrangement of exequies. The main narrative of John's death can be found in Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora*. His passing was on the morrow of St. Luke, 19 October 1216, at the castle of Newark.<sup>3</sup> At the time, England was under invasion from the Scots from the north and the French, headed by Louis the Lion, from the east. In the week preceding his death, John's baggage train attempted to cut through the Wash, but everything was lost in a storm, including the Crown Jewels.<sup>4</sup> After staying at the monastery at Swineshead, John only made it as far as Newark Castle before he became too ill to continue.

Here, the narrative split. The suddenness of John's death was so remarkable that chroniclers felt the need to explain the king's demise. Several attributed it to poisoning, with the writers divided as to whether or not it was intentional. In several variations of the tale dating to the fourteenth century, when confronted with serving the bad King John dinner, a monk confided in his superior. Having agreed that they had to think of the greater good, the monk poisoned the wine or victuals and dined with King John, killing both of them.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> "Annales de Theokesberi," *Annales Monastici*, i, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1865), 63; "Annales de Waverlei," *Annales Monastici*, ii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1865), 286; "Annales Prioratus de Wigorniae," *Annales Monastici*, iv, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1865), 407.

<sup>4</sup> Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 57 (London: 1874), 667; Matthew Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, ii, edited by F. Madden. RS, 44 (London, 1866), 190.

<sup>5</sup> In *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough*, John attempted to seduce the sister of the abbot, yet the abbot and the monks were not moved to act against John until he overtly stated that he will raise the price of bread; the plan then proceeded as above with poisoned pears; Walter of Guisborough, *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough*, edited by Harry Rothwell, Camden Third Series, 89 (London: 1957), 155-156. The version found in *Eulogium (Historiarum sive Temporis): Chronicon ab Orbe Conditio Usque ad Annum Domini MCCCCLXVI a Monacho quodam Malmesburiensi Exaratum*, iii, edited by F.S. Haydon. RS, 9 (London: 1858), 109-110, involves the use of a frog from the monastery garden for the poison. Higden reports that John was poisoned with wine; Ranulph Higden, *Polychronicon, together with the English Translation of John Trevisa and of an unknown writer of the 15th century*, viii, edited by Joseph Rawson Lumby. RS, 41 (London: 1882), 196.

Other sources more contemporary to John's death believed that the poisoning was unintentional or self-inflicted. John may have already ill from the storm that turned the Wash crossing catastrophic.<sup>6</sup> According to Matthew Paris and Roger of Wendover, while staying at Swineshead, John's depression prompted him to eat fruit in excess, which worsened his physical condition.<sup>7</sup> Thomas Wykes in the thirteenth century and John Capgrave in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries only mentioned that John was poisoned at Swineshead – no other details were offered.<sup>8</sup>

Upon his arrival at Newark, the abbot of Croxton attended to the moribund John. The abbot administered confession and Communion before John died.<sup>9</sup> Later, the abbot would prepare John's body for burial.<sup>10</sup> The confession would normally be enough to save John's soul, but Matthew Paris added a deathbed scene in his *Historia Anglorum*, his later abridgement of *Chronica Majora*. In this, John repented of his sins, pleaded for more time on earth, and, when finally resigned that he would die, prayed for his son and successor, Henry.<sup>11</sup> The *Historia Anglorum* also records John's efforts to set up a regency and arrange the transfer of power to his minor son.<sup>12</sup>

John's exequies at Worcester were affected by political circumstances of the time. England was mired in civil war and being invaded by both Scotland and France, which effectively narrowed down where John could be deposited for the time being.<sup>13</sup> Until his tomb

---

<sup>6</sup> Ralph of Coggeshall *Chronicon Anglicanum*, *De expugnatione Terrae Sanctae libellus*; Thomas Agnellus *De morte et sepultura Henrici regis Angliae junioris*; *Gesta Fulconis filii Warini*; *Excerpta ex Otii imperialibus Gervasii Tilebutiensis*, edited by Joseph Stevenson. RS, 66 (London: 1875), 183-184.

<sup>7</sup> Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, ii, 191; Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ii, 668; Roger of Wendover, *Liber Que Dicitur Flores Historiarum*, ii, edited by Henry G. Hewlett. RS, 84 (London: 1887), 196.

<sup>8</sup> John Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, edited by Francis Charles Hingeston. RS, 1 (London: 1858), 148; Thomas Wykes, "Chronicon Thomas Wykes," *Annales Monastici*, iv, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1865), 59.

<sup>9</sup> Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ii, 668; Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, ii, 192; Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Historiarum*, ii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 95 (London: 1890), 161; Wendover, *Liber*, ii, 196.

<sup>10</sup> Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ii, 668.

<sup>11</sup> Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, ii, 192-193.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid*; see also Stephen Church, "King John's Testament and the Last Days of His Reign," *English Historical Review*, 125, no. 514 (June 2010), 1-10.

<sup>13</sup> For John's selection of Worcester, see Chapter V, 184-186.

was finalized in 1232, it was uncertain as to whether Henry III would leave his father at Worcester; he went as far to write to the Pope to request permission to translate his father to Beaulieu, John's great foundation, in 1228.<sup>14</sup> However, there is no evidence to suggest that John intended to be buried outside of England, such as at the Angevin burial church of Fontevraud.

Since John's death is the earliest among the selected kings, his death tale has had the most time to mature, the change in attitudes toward him more evident. Beginning with a simple death while on campaign, the story was enhanced in the 1250s by Matthew Paris. This may have been due in part to please Henry III, but one must keep in mind that Henry visited St. Albans frequently. According to Paris himself, Henry gave him information and met with him at events during the 1240s and 1250s;<sup>15</sup> John's final arrangements may have been one of those items discussed with Paris during the compiling and editing of the *Historia Anglorum* from the larger *Chronica Majora*.<sup>16</sup>

The tale changed during the fourteenth century to emphasize John's villainy and the bravery of the monks. By the fifteenth century, the monks' roles as heroes or regicides were left ambiguous. Later writers reported the event, but did not judge whether the poisoning of John was a moral act.

### ***Henry III***

Henry III was age sixty-five at his death on the feast of St. Edmund of Canterbury, 16 November 1272, having reigned since the age of nine. He was at Westminster Palace when he died, and he had previously selected Westminster Abbey as his burial site. According to William Rishanger and later Thomas Walsingham, on his deathbed, Henry called his nobles to

---

<sup>14</sup> TNA SC 1/2/106, published in *Foedera* (Record Commission), i, pt. 1, 192.

<sup>15</sup> Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c. 550-1307* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), 360.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 366-367.

his side. He then confessed his sins, received last rites, and, having adored the Cross one last time, passed into the next world.<sup>17</sup> The St. Albans chronicle “Opus Chronicorum” added to the narrative of William Rishanger that Henry requested that his debts be paid and alms be distributed to the poor; Thomas Walsingham did not mention this in his later account.<sup>18</sup> Ranulph Higden noted that it was fitting for Henry to die on the feast day of the archbishop that he, in Higden’s view, had hounded to death.<sup>19</sup> Broadly, the chronicles agree that Henry was pious, despite any minor flaws.

Henry III died under the unique circumstance that his heir, while fully grown, was absent from the kingdom; Prince Edward was on crusade at the time of his father’s death. Cognizant of this, Henry had called his landholders, not so much to pay their final respects to him, but rather to ensure their loyalty to their absent future king and to entrust temporary care of the realm to Edmund, earl of Cornwall (the king’s nephew), and Gilbert, earl of Gloucester.<sup>20</sup> The swearing of fealty to Edward I is recorded as occurring on 22 November 1272, the Feast of St. Cecelia, two days after the burial of Henry III.<sup>21</sup> By his pious life and his efforts to ensure that Edward I would be recognized as king both in his absence and in his return, Henry III died a quiet, good death. As such, most fifteenth- and sixteenth-century chroniclers repeated almost verbatim what their peers had written in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> William Rishanger, “Chronica et Annales, 1259-1307,” *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ii, edited by H.T. Riley. RS 28 (London: 1865), 74; Thomas Walsingham, “Historia Anglicana, pt. 1,” *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, edited by H.T. Riley. RS 28 (London: 1863), 7.

<sup>18</sup> “Opus Chronicorum,” *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, iii, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1866), 37.

<sup>19</sup> Higden, *Polychronicon*, viii, 258-259.

<sup>20</sup> *The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds, 1212-1301*, edited by Antonia Gransden (London: Nelson, 1964), 53; “Continuatio Chronici Willelmi De Novoburgo, Ad Annum 1298,” *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, ii, edited by Richard Howlett. RS, 82 (London: 1885). Robert Fabyan is the only later chronicler to include this, in *The New Chronicles of England and France*, edited by Henry Ellis (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, et. al., 1811), 368-369.

<sup>21</sup> “Annales de Dunstapalia” *Annales Monastici*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1866), 254; “Annales Prioratus de Wigornia,” 461-462, describes Gilbert’s oath as taking place at York after the burial of Henry III, but with no specific date.

<sup>22</sup> See n. 20 above for Robert Fabyan; also John Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, translated by Francis Charles Hingeston. RS, 7 (London: 1858), 101, takes his version of events directly from Wykes, “Chronicon,” 252-253.

## *Edward I*

Edward I died on 7 July 1307 at Burgh-by-the-Sands of dysentery while on campaign against the Scots; this is the basic narrative offered by most accounts.<sup>23</sup> Only the author of *Flores Historiarum* overtly stated that Edward made a confession. Others detailed his service to the Church, including his participation in the Crusades.<sup>24</sup> Alternatively, in order to reveal Edward's kingly nature, like the later Henry IV and Edward IV, the chroniclers inserted Christian advice into Edward's mouth for his son.

The chronicler at Osney made the point that Gaveston was immediately recalled upon the death of Edward I.<sup>25</sup> While other contemporary chroniclers connected the two events, only the later chroniclers expanded upon them. Writing in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, Thomas Walsingham offered more detail on Edward I's final moments; the concern of Gaveston was but one of several. Edward I ordered his son to not bury his bones, but rather to take them on campaign against the Scots until Scotland was conquered. Edward's second wife, Margaret, was to be respected as Edward's own mother would have been in life.<sup>26</sup> Edward I ordered the continued exile of Gaveston. Then Edward desired that his heart should be taken to the Holy Land, along with £32,000 and twenty-seven suitable knights; the young Edward was strongly cautioned against using the money for any other reason.<sup>27</sup> Walsingham then launched into a tirade against Edward II and his failings, as he disobeyed his father on every account. By creating the 1307 scene nearly a hundred years later, the chronicler set the stage for the troubled reign of Edward II and later the crisis of 1327. He also contrasted the Good King Edward I with his wilful, wasteful son.

---

<sup>23</sup> *Eulogium*, iii, 193; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 405; Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Historiarum*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 95 (London: 1890), 137; Higden, *Polychronicon*, viii, 296.

<sup>24</sup> Rishanger, "Chronica et Annales," 423; Thomas Walsingham, "Ypodigma Neustriæ," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, vii, edited by H.T. Riley. RS 28 (London: 1876), 240.

<sup>25</sup> "Annales de Oseneia," *Annales Monastici*, iv, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1865), 342.

<sup>26</sup> Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 1," 114; "Ypodigma" also mentions his bones not being buried until the Scots were subjugated, 240.

<sup>27</sup> Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 1," 115.

Fabyan, in the fifteenth century, stated that after ensuring the loyalties of Aymer de Valence, Henry Percy, Henry Lacy, and Robert Clifford, Edward I summoned his son to give one final instruction: never allow Piers Gaveston to return.<sup>28</sup> Edward I spoke of other “dyvers poyntes” but only the one relating to Gaveston was specified. Again, this version of the tale emphasized the steps taken by Edward I to ensure peace in the realm and then revealed Edward II’s discarding of his father’s advice.

In truth, the future Edward II was not at his father’s deathbed; rather, the news reached him via messenger in the vicinity of London, possibly in Lambeth, on 11 July, four days after his father’s death on the Scottish border.<sup>29</sup> As such, perhaps the continuation of Walter of Guisborough’s *Chronicle* was most accurate. Edward suffered from dysentery for a number of days, only rising from his bed with aid to eat. On the last of these occasions, the monarch died in the arms of his servants.<sup>30</sup> There was no great death speech or wise old king imparting knowledge; a man nearing his seventieth year died of a common camp disease far from his capital, necessitating a long trip back to England. This account did not have the same longevity or circulation as the version that was written to retroactively foreshadow Edward II’s reign.

## ***Edward II***

Until Edward II’s captivity, the end of his reign is uniform among sources. After being cornered by the invading forces of Queen Isabella at Kenilworth, Edward II came under the custody of the Crown and remained at that castle as prisoner.<sup>31</sup> In January 1327, he was persuaded to surrender his crown in favour of his son, Edward.<sup>32</sup> After this, he was removed to

---

<sup>28</sup> Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 405; Rishanger, “Chronica et Annales,” 422-423.

<sup>29</sup> Seymour Phillips, *Edward II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 124-125, citing evidence from TNA E 101/370/16, E101/373/15 f. 43v, and E 101/373/7 m. 1.

<sup>30</sup> Walter of Guisborough, *The Chronicle*, 378-379.

<sup>31</sup> “Annales de Oseneia,” 347-348.

<sup>32</sup> “Annales de Oseneia,” 348; Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 197; *Eulogium*, iii, 199; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 431; Walsingham, “Historia Anglicana, pt. 1,” 186. Both Thomas Walsingham and John Capgrave

Berkeley Castle in April 1327.<sup>33</sup> The next news heard of the old king was that of his death on 21 September of that year.

From here, the narrative fragmented due to the uncertainty of events. Several accounts, both close and distant from the date of death, simply say that he died.<sup>34</sup> Biographer Seymour Phillips suggests that the combination of depression and an ailment could have resulted in the king's death;<sup>35</sup> at the time, in 1327, there was little suspicion of foul play.<sup>36</sup> Later accounts offer more elaborate tales of death, misery, and accusations of murder, especially after the 1330 execution of Roger Mortimer. Those that reported the reasons for Mortimer's execution contemporaneously said he had conspired against or caused the death of Edward II.<sup>37</sup> Adam Murimuth, writing soon after, implicated Roger Mortimer and his two henchmen, John Mautravers and Thomas Gurney. In this scenario, Edward II had been suffocated.<sup>38</sup> Others took the accusation further.

During the course of the fourteenth century, the death of Edward II transformed from a single line in a chronicle to a lurid tale.<sup>39</sup> Geoffrey le Baker offered the detailed, graphic account of Edward II's internal burning via iron spit,<sup>40</sup> using circumstantial details from

---

observe that the young Edward of Windsor piously refused to take his father's crown until the elder Edward had surrendered it willingly.

<sup>33</sup> "Annales de Oseneia," 348; Higden, *Polychronicon*, viii, 324; Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 198.

<sup>34</sup> *Eulogium*, iii, 199; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 438. Contemporary Froissart also does not indicate there was any foul play, stating he learned of the event early in his service to Queen Philippa in 1366. In fact, it is only in one late manuscript edition of his *Chroniques* that Edward's death is mentioned at all: Città del Vaticano Reg. lat. 869, f. 10v (Luce refers to this as the Rome MS). Jean Froissart, *Chroniques*, i, pt. 2, 246-247. Froissart's reasoning for Mortimer's execution, without mentioning Edward II's death, was that he had caused the death of the Earl of Kent and that he had impregnated Isabella, the queen mother, 88.

<sup>35</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, 563.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 548.

<sup>37</sup> *CChR, 1326-1341*, 199 and 210, both dated 18 January 1331. "Annales de Oseneia," 348; "Annales Paulini," *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, i, edited by William Stubbs. RS, 76 (London: 1882), 352; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 438. The exception to this trend is Froissart. See n. 34 above.

<sup>38</sup> Adam Murimuth, *Continuatio Chronicarum. Robertus de Avesbury De Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii*, edited by Edward Maunde Thompson. RS, 93 (London: 1889), 54; 63-64.

<sup>39</sup> For a very useful list of the death accounts of Edward II, see Ian Mortimer, "Sermons of Sodomy: A Reconsideration of Edward II's Sodomitical Reputation," in *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2006), 58-60. The entire article provides insight to the creation of the iron spit story.

<sup>40</sup> Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicon*, edited by Edward Maunde Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), 33. Baker also included tales of Edward II being forced to shave with ditch water, being locked into a room full of rotting corpses, and other indignities, 31-32.

Murimuth to further his story. The author of the *Brut* followed the same line of events.<sup>41</sup>

Walsingham, who retold le Baker's version of the murder, concurred with Murimuth's identification of the murderous henchmen as Mautravers and Gurney, acting on Mortimer's orders.<sup>42</sup> Others using the le Baker narrative emphasized that the method was used to hide any signs of murder.<sup>43</sup> John of Reading believed that both impalement with the hot poker and suffocation occurred.<sup>44</sup> The king had met a wretched, undeserved, and foul end. Or had he?

Prior to Mortimer's capture, trial and execution, rumours surfaced that the late Edward II was still alive. This was more than a folk tale or a commoner's gossip; Edmund, earl of Kent, Edward II's half-brother, became convinced that the former king still lived.<sup>45</sup> At his questioning on 16 March 1330, the earl explained that he, Pope John XXII, Archbishop William Melton of York, and a vast web of collaborators had conspired to rescue Edward II, who was not dead but secretly hidden in Corfe Castle.<sup>46</sup> The earl lost his head on a charge of treason, despite apologizing and recanting his belief in the rumour.

In 1878, a letter from one Manuel Fieschi surfaced, dating to the late 1330s. It detailed the survival of Edward II, his escape to Italy, his years as a hermit, and at last his body's repatriation to England through the machinations of his son Edward.<sup>47</sup> The Fieschi letter has been also connected to several entries in the Wardrobe accounts of Edward III's visit to Germany in 1338. During this journey, a man called William de Galeys or Waleys claimed to be Edward II and sought to meet with Edward III. Surprisingly, not only did Edward III

---

<sup>41</sup> *The Brut*, i, edited by Friedrich W.D. Brie. Early English Text Society, 131 (London, 1906), 253.

<sup>42</sup> Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 1," 189, 191.

<sup>43</sup> "Annales de Osencia," 348; Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 199; Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 1," 189, 191; Walsingham, "Ypodignma Neustriae," 267; Baker, *Chronicon*, 33.

<sup>44</sup> John of Reading, *Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Canuariensis, 1346-1367*, edited by James Tait (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914), 78.

<sup>45</sup> Froissart, *Chroniques*, i, pt. 2, 88; Murimuth, *Continuatio Chronicarum*, 59-60; Walsingham, "Ypodignma Neustriae," 269; Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 200.

<sup>46</sup> Murimuth, *Continuatio Chronicarum*, 253-257. This is transcribed from BL Cotton MS Claudius E VIII. Thomas Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 2," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1864), 351-352, contains this in Latin.

<sup>47</sup> Text printed in translation in G.P. Cuttino and Thomas W. Lyman, "Where is Edward II?" *Speculum*, 53, no. 3 (July 1978), 526-527.



meet with him, but he entertained him. Though some argue that this is evidence that William was indeed Edward II, it may have been a protest at Edward's presence that the king took in stride,<sup>48</sup> or it could have been a man in his dotage that Edward III humoured.

The notion that Edward II survived the events of 1327 has received increased attention over the last four decades and even some champions.<sup>49</sup> These voices remain in the minority; most historians consider Edward to have died on 21 September 1327 and to have been buried on 20 December 1327 at Gloucester Abbey, now a cathedral. As will be discussed in Chapter IV, Edward's funeral, burial, and commemoration still operated within the confines of royal regulation and tradition. The location of Gloucester, while unique, was also not unacceptable.<sup>50</sup> Additionally, it was the goal of the new regime to have a normative and uneventful funeral that obscured any untoward circumstances of the old king's departure from the scene. Edward II and all other kings that died under mysterious circumstances will have their funeral, burial, and commemoration assessed as genuine events.

### *Edward III*

In the year before his death, Edward III suffered the loss of his eldest son, Edward of Woodstock, the Black Prince. Private and public pressure forced Edward III to make clear his intentions regarding the succession.<sup>51</sup> The heavily damaged BL Cotton Charter XVI 63 appears to be a fifteenth-century copy of a fourteenth-century entailment addressing the succession of Richard of Bordeaux, Edward III's grandson, to the throne.<sup>52</sup> In granting the boy

---

<sup>48</sup> Cuttino and Lyman, "Where is Edward II?" 529-530, and 530, n. 43.

<sup>49</sup> Ian Mortimer, "The Death of Edward II in Berkeley Castle," *English Historical Review*, 120, no. 489 (December 2005), 1175-1214, lays out the modern manifesto for this position.

<sup>50</sup> See Chapter V, 188-189.

<sup>51</sup> W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 558-559; both the Black Prince and Parliament demanded assurances that Richard of Bordeaux would be the heir apparent.

<sup>52</sup> Michael Bennett, "Edward III's Entail and the Succession to the Crown, 1376-1471," *English Historical Review*, 113, no. 452 (June 1998), 582-584. Richard was to succeed on the basis of his father's claim, followed by Edward III's surviving sons ahead of Philippa, his eldest daughter. However, as Ormrod points out, if the entail had gone public, this would have been a reverse in domestic and international policy; Ormrod, *Edward III*, 564-565. Edward I had made the Earl of Gloucester swear loyalty to the future Edward II in 1290. Given the mortality of

his father's titles,<sup>53</sup> Edward III had publicly and privately stated that the boy should succeed him. The chronicles present two stories surrounding his final hours on 21 June 1377.

Froissart stated that Edward spent his final hours at the manor of Sheen. At his bedside were his sons John of Gaunt, Edmund of Langley, and Thomas of Woodstock, along with John, duke of Brittany, and Edmund Mortimer, earl of March.<sup>54</sup>

The other story, relayed by Thomas Walsingham, indicated that Edward III was without his family when he died. With great difficulty, the priest sought ways to accommodate the king's debilitated state in order that he might be confessed and receive last rites. Ultimately, this was successful, and despite the spiritual perils he faced, Edward died a good Christian death thanks to the persistence of the priest who would not abandon him.<sup>55</sup>

One could dismiss this story as a monk's creation illustrating the consequences of immorality, were it not for the unique description of Edward himself in a variant text, BL Royal MS 13 E IX. This is the source for the tale of Edward's much despised mistress, Alice Perrers, stealing the rings right off the dying man's fingers. Combined with the appearance of the king's funeral effigy, Walsingham's description of Edward's symptoms supports the notion that Edward died during the aftermath of a stroke or a series thereof.<sup>56</sup> As theorized by Anthony Goodman, Walsingham likely received his information from Adam Rous, Edward III's

---

all his other sons, the same oath stated that if Edward of Caernarfon died, Edward I's daughters and their heirs would then inherit, *Foedera* (Record Commission), i, pt. 2, 742. At this point, the next male relatives were Edward I's brother Edmund and his son Thomas, but Edward I gave precedence to his own daughters and their heirs, naming his eldest daughter Eleanor to follow Edward if the boy should fail. Edward III himself claimed the throne of France through his mother, the daughter of Philippe IV.

<sup>53</sup> Parliament made a plea that this be done almost immediately after the death of the Black Prince. *PROME*, Parliament of April 1376, item 50. This finally occurred on 20 November 1376, *CChR, 1341-1417*, 231. Richard is also recognized as the heir in Edward III's will, *A Collection of Wills*, 60.

<sup>54</sup> Froissart, *Chroniques*, viii, 230-231.

<sup>55</sup> Thomas Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica majora of Thomas Walsingham*, i, edited and translated by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 118-123.

<sup>56</sup> Mark Duffy, *Royal Tombs of Medieval England* (Stroud: Tempus, 2003), 121, believes Edward III's funeral effigy was crafted using his death mask. The effigy appears to have a pull to the left side of Edward's lip. One-sided weakness is indicative of a stroke, but Walsingham's description fleshes out this supposition. In BL Royal MS 13 E IX, Walsingham describes Edward III as dull-eyed, being unable to speak, having difficulty using his hands, and going cold in his extremities, *The St. Albans Chronicle*, i, 987. All of these are classic symptoms of a stroke victim, though the cold would have been perceived by the victim rather than those touching him. As such, Walsingham's account may be untrue as far as the king's solitude and comeuppance for his sins, but the chronicler almost certainly had a source that was privy to the king's condition at death.

surgeon and a major benefactor of St. Albans,<sup>57</sup> a situation not unlike Matthew Paris receiving information from Henry III about John's last days. Both of Edward III's deaths are "good," though in different ways. Froissart's version emphasized Edward as a father figure with good and loyal children, while Walsingham offered the herculean efforts of both Edward III and his priest in trying to confess sins. Both narratives conclude with Edward III's burial at Westminster Abbey.

### ***Richard II***

Richard II's death narrative begins much like Edward II's. The king was captured, forced to abdicate, and then left guarded in the Tower of London and then Pontefract Castle.<sup>58</sup> A significant number of chronicles simply state that he died, circumstances unknown. As in the case of Edward II, Froissart stated he does not know the details of the king's death.<sup>59</sup> The Kirkstall Chronicler also offered no insight, offering only that "God alone knows the truth of the manner of his death."<sup>60</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London's* author also remained neutral.<sup>61</sup>

Tudor chronicler Edward Hall appears to have done some research pertaining to the records of Parliament in Henry IV's early reign. He reported that Henry IV called "his high court of Parliament" to decide the best course of action with Richard. Thomas Merk, the bishop of Carlisle, delivered a tirade against Henry's actions.<sup>62</sup> The bishop was then entrusted

---

<sup>57</sup> Anthony Goodman, "Sir Thomas Hoo and the Parliament of 1376," *The Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 41 (1968), 145.

<sup>58</sup> *The Brut*, ii, edited by Friedrich W.D Brie. Early English Text Society, 136 (London: 1908), 359-360; Adam Usk, *The Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421*, edited by Chris Given-Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 91; *Incerti Scriptoris Chronicon Angliae de Regnis Trium Regum Lancastrensiu, Henrici IV, Henrici V et Henrici VI*, edited by J.A. Giles (London: D. Nutt of Fleet Street, 1848), 10-11; *Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and Anonymous Writers*, translated by H.T. Riley (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854), 355; Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 276; Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle, containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, et al., 1809), 19; Fabyan, *the New Chronicles*, 568, et al.

<sup>59</sup> Froissart, *Oeuvres*, xvi, 232-233. Froissart heavily implies that Henry IV was involved.

<sup>60</sup> *Kirkstall Abbey Chronicle*, edited by John Taylor. Thoresby Society, 42 (1952), 82.

<sup>61</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London*, edited by A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley (London: George W. Jones at the Sign of the Dolphin, 1938), 83.

<sup>62</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 13.

to the care of St. Albans.<sup>63</sup> Hall stated the decision of the meeting: that Richard should be well-cared for, but if any uprising occurred, he should be the first to die.

Save for the death of Richard, this is an accurate description of the surviving minutes of the meeting, which discussed what to do with Richard. The first solution is as stated above: to keep Richard in a manner suitable to his station. Then follows a list of criteria for those that were to be pardoned for acting on Richard's behalf and those that were to be executed for resisting Henry. The last entry of the minutes states that *if* Richard died, he should be shown to the people.<sup>64</sup> It is possible Hall may have seen the minutes and transcribed them incorrectly or had someone try to recite them to him by memory, thus connecting Richard's death directly with an insurrection.

Hall was not the first to believe that the insurrection caused Richard's death; Richard's death is typically preceded in both contemporary and later narratives by a revolt in his name. The official Lancastrian account of Richard's deposition and death was distributed to contemporary writers such as Thomas Walsingham.<sup>65</sup> As such, those following in his works directly affiliate Richard's death with the failure of the Epiphany Rising in January 1400, saying that he refused to eat out of grief and sorrow, despite the urging of a very concerned Henry IV.<sup>66</sup> Other chroniclers report this rumour in tandem with the accusation that indeed, Richard was starved, but not by himself; he was deliberately denied food and drink.<sup>67</sup>

Edward Hall again offered a unique construction concerning Richard's death. He reported initially that Richard may have been starved in the most horrible way: he was served

---

<sup>63</sup> Interestingly, the bishop of Carlisle is detained for his supposed conspiracy against the Duke of Gloucester rather than his impudence toward Henry IV in Walsingham's "Annales Henrici Quarti Regis Angliae," *Chronica Monastici Sancti Albani*, iii, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1866), 329-330.

<sup>64</sup> BL Cotton MS Cleopatra F III 9b/14b. This manuscript has been heavily damaged by fire and appears to have been torn in recent years; the ends of the words closest to the gutter of the page are now obscured by tape.

<sup>65</sup> Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c. 1307- the Early Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), 140, 189.

<sup>66</sup> Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 2," 245-246. "Annales Henrici Quarti Regis Angliae," 330-331. *Eulogium*, iii, 387; *Incerti Scriptoris*, 10-11; *Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland*, 355. In a variation of *The Brut* (Lambeth MS 84), Richard II refuses food, but is at one point fed white roses by an angel, *The Brut*, ii, 592.

<sup>67</sup> Usk, *Chronicle*, 91; *The Brut*, ii, 360; Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 276.

delicious food, but never allowed to touch it or consume it.<sup>68</sup> The writer then stated that he had heard otherwise and then recreated the martyrdom of Becket, having Henry sigh at his table, stating, “Have I no faithful friend which will deliver me of him whose life will be my death, and whose death will be the preservation of my life?”<sup>69</sup> Sir Piers Exton, upon hearing this, immediately took it upon himself to go to Pontefract with eight knights.

Other earlier chroniclers recorded this version of the story, but instead of stealing the Becket motif (a deliberate slight against Henry IV and his devotion to St. Thomas), they simply stated that Henry ordered Exton to kill Richard. The threads recombined at Pontefract. Exton and his men invaded Richard’s sanctum at dinner. Rather than going like a lamb to slaughter, Richard immediately disabled one of the attackers. He stole the thug’s weapon and proceeded to kill four men before Exton managed to manoeuvre behind him and fell him. Exton immediately expressed remorse, sobbing that he had lost his honour by murdering the man that had been king for twenty-two years.<sup>70</sup>

Richard II is traditionally considered to have died on or about 14 February 1400. Despite the numerous death stories surrounding Richard II, chroniclers still recorded that some believed that Richard was still alive, before and after his funeral at King’s Langley, on 6 March 1400.<sup>71</sup> As such, conspiracies to put Richard back on the throne continued during Henry IV’s reign and even into Henry V’s reign, becoming a constant source of instability. For

---

<sup>68</sup> *Hall’s Chronicle*, 20.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid*, rendered in modern English.

<sup>70</sup> *Chronicque de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Dengleterre*, edited and translated by Benjamin Williams (Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, 1964), 94-96 and 249-251. Higden, *Polychronicon*, viii, 540-541; *Hall’s Chronicle*, 20; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 568. Fabyan also mentions the possibility that Richard starved to death, but he relates the Exton tale with much greater gusto and seems to personally put more stock in it.

<sup>71</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 360; Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 278; Walsingham, “Historia Anglicana, pt. 2,” 328; Walsingham, “Annales Henrici Quarti Regis Angliae,” 330-331. In “Annales Henrici Quarti,” Walsingham reports that France demanded tribute from the Isle of Wight in the name of Richard II and his French child-queen, Isabella; until the king of France received his daughter and her dowry back, he refused to recognize Richard as dead, 381.

years, the Scots claimed that Richard was in Scotland.<sup>72</sup> The afterlife of Richard II will be further discussed in Chapter VII in the context of his reburial.

### *Henry IV*

Over the course of his reign, Henry IV suffered ill health.<sup>73</sup> In return for his transgression of executing Archbishop Scrope in 1405, Henry was supposedly cursed with leprosy and suffered sudden, severe “attacks” in the years leading to 1413.<sup>74</sup> Usk described his condition as “the infection which for five years [since 1408] had cruelly tormented Henry IV with festering of the flesh, dehydration of the eyes, and rupture of the internal organs, caused him to end his days.”<sup>75</sup> However, Douglas Biggs has pointed out in several articles that Henry IV’s ability to govern had been curtailed by illness since 1406, with Parliament creating multiple short- and long-term stop-gap measures to compensate for the weakened king.<sup>76</sup> Only the *Eulogium Historiarum* makes exact reference to Henry’s supposed leprosy around the time of his death in 1413; there had been a suggestion to crown the king’s firstborn son Prince Henry while his father was still alive, as Henry IV was a leper, but this had been rejected by the king.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> For an assessment and dismantling of this theory, see P.W. Dillon, “Remarks on the Manner of Death of King Richard the Second,” *Archaeologia*, 27 (January 1840), 75-95.

<sup>73</sup> If the account of Adam Usk is to be believed, Henry first suffered ill health during his reign immediately after his coronation; the so-called oil of St. Thomas Beckett caused Henry’s hair to be afflicted with lice and baldness; Usk, *Chronicle*, 243. This was later said to be in retribution for the usurpation and eventual death of Richard II.

<sup>74</sup> Peter McNiven, “The Problem of Henry IV’s Health, 1405-1413,” *English Historical Review*, 100, no. 397 (October 1985), 747; Walsingham, “Annales Henrici Quarti Regis Angliae,” 322-323.

<sup>75</sup> Usk, *Chronicle*, 243. Leprosy kills through compromising the skin barrier, permitting secondary infections; this does not fit in with reports of sudden attacks. It also must be noted that a wide range of contagious skin ailments were called leprosy in the Middle Ages. At his tomb’s opening in 1832, no disfiguration of Henry IV’s face was observed; see J. Spry, “A Brief Account of the Examination of the Tomb of King Henry IV, in the Cathedral of Canterbury, August 21, 1832,” *Archaeologia*, 26 (January 1836), 440-445.

<sup>76</sup> Douglas Biggs, “Henry IV and the Long Parliament of 1406,” in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2003), 185-205; Biggs, “An Ill and Infirm King: Henry IV, Health, and the Gloucester Parliament of 1407,” in *The Reign of Henry IV: Rebellion and Survival, 1403-1413*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2008), 180-209.

<sup>77</sup> *Eulogium*, iii, 420-421; Chris Given-Wilson, *Henry IV* (London: Yale University Press, 2016), 495.

In 1412, Henry IV had planned an expedition to the Holy Land; by November of that year, the galley ships were in production.<sup>78</sup> The king was gravely ill at Christmastide, but recovered.<sup>79</sup> On 20 March 1413, while praying at the shrine of Edward the Confessor, Henry IV collapsed and was carried emergently to a nearby chamber. As he came to his senses, the king asked where he was. The answer was the Jerusalem Chamber.<sup>80</sup> Some writers left this as irony: “Jerusalem” turned out to be a room in Westminster Abbey rather than the anticipated venture into the Holy Land. Others connected it to a prophecy or horoscope stating that Henry IV would die in Jerusalem.<sup>81</sup> Henry IV did make one final pilgrimage, however; he elected to be buried at Canterbury Cathedral near the shrine of St. Thomas Becket.

Henry IV made his confession before dying in the Jerusalem Chamber.<sup>82</sup> The tale told by Shakespeare of an overeager Prince Hal taking the crown from his father is sourced from Edward Hall’s work in the sixteenth century, in which Prince Henry thought his father had died already and took the crown, only to be chased down the king’s attendants who corrected his mistake.<sup>83</sup> John Capgrave, in his *Chronicle of England*, reported that Henry IV’s confessor wanted him to confess to the specific sins of causing the deaths of Richard II and Archbishop Scrope and of wrongfully possessing the crown. According to Henry, he had received a dispensation from the Pope for his roles in both Richard II’s and Scrope’s deaths. However, he could not see any easy solution to the third point, as he would not deny his heirs the crown.<sup>84</sup> Although this confession seems half-hearted, it illustrates the tradition that Henry had taken care for his Christian soul by seeking the dispensations and showing concern for his successors.

---

<sup>78</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 372; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 576.

<sup>79</sup> Walsingham, “Historia Anglicana, pt. 2,” 289; Walsingham, “Ypodignma Neustriae,” 437.

<sup>80</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 372; *Eulogium*, iii, 421; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 576-577; Usk, *Chronicle*, 243; Higden, *Polychronicon*, viii, 547, from the version in BL Harley MS 2261.

<sup>81</sup> Specifically *The Brut*, Fabyan, and Higden make this prophetic connection.

<sup>82</sup> *The Brut*, 372; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 577; Higden, *Polychronicon*, 547.

<sup>83</sup> *Hall’s Chronicle*, 45.

<sup>84</sup> Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 302-303.

Capgrave depicted Henry quite differently in his later work, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, which had been commissioned as an exemplar for Henry VI. Instead of a meagre confession, Henry IV instead called his son Henry to his side and extolled the Lord God as the power behind the king in all things. The new king was to pay his father's debts, take care of the kingdom, and obey God.<sup>85</sup> Henry IV was transformed by Capgrave from a reluctant confessant to a paragon of Christian virtue during the reign of his grandson, Henry VI, who was known more for his religious piety than for his actual skill as a ruler.

Capgrave is one example of a chronicler that altered his narrative in order to suit the politics of his time; Matthew Paris in regard to the death of John is another.<sup>86</sup> In the late fifteenth century, John Rous would laud Richard III as the lord of Warwickshire in his *Rous Roll*, only to edit the accessible Latin copy to better suit his new position under Henry VII. This version removed Richard and replaced him pictorially with Anne Neville's first husband, Edward of Westminster.<sup>87</sup> The *Roll* became completely unthreatening to the Tudors. Rous went on to write the *Historia Regum Anglie*, which was hyper-critical of the Yorkists. The English version of the Rous Roll survives unedited, the differences between the Latin and English copies proving the impact of a change in regime.<sup>88</sup>

### ***Henry V***

Unlike John, Henry V received immediate praise for his preparations for his minor son's rule. On the last day of August 1422, Henry V died abroad in France, the first king to do so since Richard I in 1199. He was also the heir apparent to the throne of France at the time.

---

<sup>85</sup> Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, 123-124.

<sup>86</sup> See above, 41-43.

<sup>87</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c. 1307-Early Sixteenth Century*, 316; Charles Ross, *Richard III* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1981), xxii.

<sup>88</sup> John Rous, *The Rous Roll with a Historical Introduction on John Rous*, edited by Charles Ross (London: Alan Sutton 1980), xvii.



These two elements necessitated innovative funerary arrangements, due to the status of the individual and the distance the corpse had to travel.

Henry originally took ill with dysentery in Paris and left in order to find better air,<sup>89</sup> meeting his end in Bois de Vincennes.<sup>90</sup> One odd characteristic about Henry's death is that there are reports that he was in denial about his dire condition until the last moment,<sup>91</sup> resulting in his counsellors urging him to organize his affairs. Ultimately, Henry survived long enough to deliver his last orders, the content of which depended on the narrator.

The narratives tend to place emphasis on one of two virtue sets: his fatherhood and his administration skills, or his reputation as a warrior king and his piety. These two rarely intersect. In the first case, Henry was lauded for the provisions he made for his son, his upbringing, and his minority rule.<sup>92</sup> This included the appointment of John of Bedford as the new king's his regent in France, and Thomas Beaufort as his guardian; the *Brut* also identified Henry Beaufort as a guardian of the infant, though Henry V's will only made him one of his executors.<sup>93</sup> Several chroniclers, such as Edward Hall, recorded Henry making specific demands concerning policy as well as a caution against partisanship during the reign of a child-king.<sup>94</sup>

Chroniclers that did not remark upon Henry's paternal actions tended to emphasize Henry's military career. His conquest of France was highly praised, and the writers were sympathetic to his regret that he could not march on Jerusalem for the glory of God, as his life

---

<sup>89</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 429. This version is derived from BL Cotton MS Galba E VIII. Hall reports several rumours regarding Henry's exact cause of death, including the Scots believing it to be poison, but these do not seem to have gained much traction over the years.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid*, 493; this variant is found in BL Additional MS 10099, f. 181. Bois de Vincennes or Vincent is identified in *Hall's Chronicle*, 110-111; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 589; Higden, *Polychronicon*, viii, 555, from BL Harley MS 2261.

<sup>91</sup> *The Chronicles of Enguerrand de Monstrelet*, i, edited by Thomas Johnes (London: William Smith, 1840), 483. Upon reviewing the 26 August 1422 codicils at Eton, Bertram Wolffe believes this to be accurate; see Wolffe, *Henry VI* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1981), 28-29.

<sup>92</sup> Thomas Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 2," 343.

<sup>93</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 429.

<sup>94</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 111-112.

was being cut short.<sup>95</sup> The conquest of France and aspirations of further military glory cemented Henry V's legacy but they also led to his death of a camp disease in a foreign land. Henry's exequies had to compensate for the distance his body had to travel – from Paris to Westminster Abbey in England – and for the two crowns that would be held by his son.

### *Henry VI*

Henry VI's death occurred in the controlled environment of the Tower of London, and he was interred within three days, curtailing the ability of stories to grow. Henry died on or about 21 May 1471, after the victory of Edward IV at Tewksbury and the death of Henry VI's son, Edward of Westminster. There are fewer variations regarding the manner of his death, but there are several notable ones.

As observed by Charles Ross, the reigns of Henry VI and Edward IV suffer from a lack of contemporary sources. Monastic chronicles were on their way out, but political and official histories were yet to fill the void.<sup>96</sup> As a result, both the deaths of Henry VI and Edward IV have fewer variations than other kings' deaths. Henry VI, unlike his deposed peers, did not have pretenders or rumours concerning his survival. Rather, his "afterlife" was that of a popular saint, which ultimately facilitated his reburial. This will be explored in Chapter VII.

In histories sympathetic to the Yorkists, Henry VI died of sadness and shock at losing both his kingdom and his son, Edward.<sup>97</sup> Others that were either more sympathetic to Henry VI or simply more opposed to Richard, duke of Gloucester (later Richard III) soon turned the old king's death into a condemnation of Richard. The chronicler at Crowland Abbey believed that foul play had occurred, but he did not name names; whoever it was, he was a tyrant and

---

<sup>95</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 493; *The Chronicles of Enguerrand de Monstrelet*, i, 483; Higden, *Polychronicon*, viii, 555, from BL Harley MS 2261.

<sup>96</sup> Charles Ross, *Edward IV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 429.

<sup>97</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 603; "Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recouerye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI AD MCCCCLXXI," edited by John Bruce, in *Three Chronicles of the Reign of Edward IV* (Gloucester, UK: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1988), 184 [38 of the chronicle named].

Henry VI a martyr.<sup>98</sup> In *Warkworth's Chronicle*, Richard, duke of Gloucester was at the Tower at the time Henry was “putte to dethe.”<sup>99</sup> The story was embellished further by Hall and Fabyan, who named Richard’s weapon of choice as a dagger.<sup>100</sup> Polydore Vergil identified the weapon as a sword,<sup>101</sup> but all three stated that Richard’s motive was to secure the kingdom for his brother. The so-called “tradition” that Henry was killed while kneeling in prayer does not seem to come from any contemporary source.<sup>102</sup> Henry VI was swiftly buried in semi-obscurity at Chertsey, but his political afterlife was not as easily swept away.

### ***Edward IV***

Edward IV suddenly became severely ill in April 1483, eventually dying on 9 April. Edward IV lived long enough to summon political leaders to London in order to make arrangements for the succession of his young son, Edward.<sup>103</sup> This included adding several codicils to his will and naming Richard, duke of Gloucester as Lord Protector.<sup>104</sup> Most chroniclers simply state that Edward was seized with ill health suddenly, causes unknown.<sup>105</sup> Polydore Vergil and the author of the *Crowland Chronicle* continuation stated that once Edward realized he was dying, he was swift to make arrangements and give instructions for the

---

<sup>98</sup> *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations: 1459-1486*, edited by Nicholas Pronay and John Cox (London: Alan Sutton for Richard III and Yorkist History Trust, 1986), 129-131.

<sup>99</sup> “Warkworth’s Chronicle (A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth),” edited by James Orchard Halliwell, in *Three Chronicles of the Reign of Edward IV* (Gloucester, UK: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1988), 43 [21 of the chronicle].

<sup>100</sup> *Hall’s Chronicle*, 303; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 662.

<sup>101</sup> Polydore Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil’s English History, Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III*, edited by Sir Henry Ellis. Camden Society, Old Series, 24 (London: 1844), 155-156.

<sup>102</sup> Several secondary sources cite Wolffe’s biography of Henry VI for this rumour, but this is a false attribution; Wolffe does not discuss a theoretical bludgeoning or Henry being murdered while at prayer.

<sup>103</sup> Thomas More, “The History of Richard the Third” in *Richard III: The Great Debate*, edited by Paul Kendall (Chatham, UK: The Folio Society Limited, 1965), 37-38; *Hall’s Chronicle*, 338-339.

<sup>104</sup> The codicils are lost, but it is clear there was some alteration to the will made in 1475, which had placed Elizabeth Woodville in firm control of the care of their children and left her to manage their affairs, including their marriages. Richard, duke of Gloucester is absent from this will. For the 1475 will, see *Excerpta Historica*, edited by S. Bentley (London: S. Bentley, 1831), 366-379. Ross, *Edward IV*, 415, believes that there were indeed late alterations to the will. Ross points out, however that a dead king’s will was not binding; Henry V’s will had been deliberately ignored in order to check the power of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester in 1422. As such, Richard’s role as Lord Protector was legally unstable. Ross, *Richard III*, 65-66.

<sup>105</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London*, 229-230.

raising of his minor son and heir, Prince Edward, as well as expressing regret for his sins.<sup>106</sup>

The *Crowland Chronicle* goes a step further in describing the conundrum that was Edward IV, his faith, and his morals.

Two Tudor writers provide specific death speeches. Thomas More stated that Edward asked for the cooperation of various lords, especially William, Lord Hastings, and the Marquess of Dorset, Thomas Grey, the son of Elizabeth Woodville by her first husband; the Marquess was Edward IV's stepson and the new king Edward V's half-brother. According to More, Edward IV's deathbed scene was an invocation to the lords present to care for his children, regardless of differences, and for all parties to get along. The king expressed regret over his own violence but prayed for his own children's avoidance of it. At this, Edward rolled onto his right side and died.<sup>107</sup> The contents of Hall's death speech for Edward pertained more to the transience of time and Edward's frustration at his inability to do all that he had promised as a king and as a Christian. It was only later in his speech that he begged those present to raise his children well and be loyal, good counsellors to them lest disaster follow.<sup>108</sup> At this point, Edward stated his exhaustion and went to sleep, waking up periodically to further emphasize what he had said in his great speech. He then experienced a further decline in his health before dying.

Edward IV's death speech to his courtiers and family gave his final hours further dimension. Here, More and Hall cast the dying king into the role of Cassandra: he gave warnings about factionalism, but these admonitions were ignored at the kingdom's peril. The

---

<sup>106</sup> Vergil, *Three Books*, 171; *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, 151-153. These authors also mentioned Edward's deathbed will and accepted that one codicil assigned Richard, duke of Gloucester the role of Lord Protector, but the rest of the contents were unknown.

<sup>107</sup> More, "The History of Richard III," 40. The cause of Edward's death is unknown, but the contemporary writers at the time offer more clues than those who recorded the death of Henry IV. Dominic Mancini attributes the illness to cold morning out fishing and Edward's despair over his inability to aid the Flemings; Dominic Mancini, *The Usurpation of Richard III*, translated by C.A.J. Armstrong (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1984), 59. Edward had caught a cold and lacked the will to fight it, possibly letting it turn into pneumonia. Based upon his symptoms and reports by Mancini of emetics abuse (67), peritonitis or gastric rupture are also feasible.

<sup>108</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 338-341. The speech is significantly longer than More's.

inability to cooperate ultimately enabled Richard, duke of Gloucester to take the throne as Richard III. It is unknown whether this scene took place as it is written. It may have been created in hindsight, like Edward I's deathbed scene in Scotland,<sup>109</sup> so as to explain the transition of a stable kingdom to a chaotic one so rapidly; England would have four kings between 1483 and 1485. Because people did not act unselfishly and virtuously, trouble occurred. Despite shortcomings associated with his intemperance, his chroniclers created a tale in which Edward IV was correct about the misfortunes to come and tried to prevent them, as any good king should. Edward IV was buried at St. George's Chapel at Windsor by his own choice.

### ***Edward V***

Edward V reigned uncrowned for less than three months before he was declared illegitimate.<sup>110</sup> Edward V is the only king to truly disappear from the historical record. There are no reports or documents relating to his death or burial. The king, along with his brother Richard, drift in and out of the public consciousness constantly. The bones housed in Westminster Abbey have been traditionally accepted as those of the princes, but no recognized modern method of identification has been attempted.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> See above, 45-46.

<sup>110</sup> See Chapter VIII, 291-293, for a discussion of this.

<sup>111</sup> Lawrence E. Tanner and William Wright, "Recent Investigations regarding the Fate of the Princes in the Tower," *Archaeologia*, 84 (1934), 1-25, and the pictures included in the report remain the basis of various speculative articles and books, both in the medical and historical realms; see A.S. Hargreaves and R.I. MacLeod, "Did Edward V Suffer from Histiocytosis X?" *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 87 (February 1994): 98-101, for example. P.W. Hammond and W.J. White, "The Sons of Edward IV: A Re-Examination of the Evidence on their Deaths and on the Bones in Westminster Abbey," in *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship, and Law*, edited by P.W. Hammond (London: Richard III and Yorkist History Trust, 1986), 104-147, discuss doubts concerning the bones. The identification of the bones interred in 1678 as the princes' rely on a) the bones being those found in the 1674 excavation; b) the structural similarities of the jawbones to indicate shared blood; c) the estimated age of the victims at death based upon development; d) Thomas More's overall reliability as a historian. The first three items were determined by a comparative examination in 1936 of the bones and connecting them to historical sources on the princes; there was no objective, scientific approach taken on the matter. The last item has been put into question and, in some quarters, dismissed. See also Chapter VIII, 295-298.

The death of Edward V is only rumoured. Fabyan stated that the boy ruled briefly and that he and his brother never emerged from the Tower again.<sup>112</sup> Dominic Mancini believed the boys to have suffered their ends by the time he wrote his report in the autumn of 1483 for Archbishop Cato of Vienne, who was very high up in the court of Louis XI.<sup>113</sup> The boys were seen less frequently before disappearing entirely into the Tower in July. Edward V's physician, John Argentine, was supposedly the last person to see the boys alive, and he reported that Edward V had prepared himself for death. Other foreign sources contemporary to the death of the boys believed Richard III was responsible, but there was no recounting of events – only an assignment of blame.<sup>114</sup>

Later chroniclers were in the employ of Richard III's successors, the Tudors. Much like Edward II's tale of woe, time matured the stories of Edward V's death, and like the work of Mortimer and his minions, Richard III's actions and those of his cronies become more monstrous. These deeds were so horrid that not even a loyal Ricardian could carry them out; sources claimed that Robert Brackenbury, constable of the Tower, was ordered to murder the boys, but he would not do it. He was depicted as either standing in the chapel of Our Lady at the Tower, valiantly refusing, or simply hiding and hesitating long enough for Richard to grow impatient and assign the task to another.<sup>115</sup> The boys were suffocated using their own beds and blankets according to Hall and More, but Vergil assigned no manner of death, stating that it was done on Richard III's direct order.<sup>116</sup> These accounts were written down at least twenty-five years after the events concerned.

Although there was no agreed manner of death, contemporaries concluded that the boy king and his brother were dead by November of 1483. At that time, Henry Tudor, earl of

---

<sup>112</sup> Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 669.

<sup>113</sup> Mancini, *The Usurpation*, 93.

<sup>114</sup> Hammond and White, "The Sons of Edward IV," 110-111.

<sup>115</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 375, for the brave Brackenbury; Vergil, *Three Books*, 188, for the coward.

<sup>116</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 378; More, "The History of Richard III," 105-106; Vergil, *Three Books*, 188-189.

Richmond stated his claim to the throne.<sup>117</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London* collected a fair number of the rumours swirling at this time within the city, stating that these pieces of gossip spurred Henry in his declaration and others in joining his cause. The boys may have been smothered between two feather beds, drowned in malvesy (possibly meaning malmsey wine, thus conflating their end with that assigned to their uncle, George, duke of Clarence), or poisoned.<sup>118</sup> Only one other king, Richard II, had such a collection of death rumours recorded.

In any case, as stated by Michael Hicks, the boys were politically dead. Whether their actual physical demise had occurred was unknown, but politics and the question of succession had moved on without them.<sup>119</sup> In France, in January 1484, Guillaume de Rochefort made an address to the States General accusing Richard of murder so as to drum up support for France's own child king, Charles VIII, who was only thirteen at the death of Louis XI.<sup>120</sup>

Unlike his brother Richard of Shrewsbury and his cousin Edward of Warwick, Edward V had no tales of survival swirling around him. At the death of Edward V, Richard and Warwick were next in the line of succession, until they both were eliminated. Those pretending to be Richard and Warwick frustrated Henry VII's efforts to secure the throne prior to 1500. The political impact of Edward V and his succession will be discussed in the concluding chapter. In this work, he must be put aside until then, as he has only rumours of rituals and hopes of a final resting place.

### ***Richard III***

The third and last Yorkist king was thirty-two at his death on Bosworth Field on 22 August 1485. Richard III's death is unique among the post-Conquest medieval kings of England: he was the first to lose his crown in battle since Harold Godwinson in 1066. His

---

<sup>117</sup> *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, 163-165; *The Great Chronicle of London*, 236.

<sup>118</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London*, 236-237.

<sup>119</sup> Michael Hicks, *Edward V* (Stroud: Tempus, 2003), 177-178; 181.

<sup>120</sup> Hammond and White, "The Sons of Edward IV," 108.

death and initial burial in 1485 are currently under reassessment, due to the arrangements carried out by Leicester Cathedral in 2015. That said, Richard's death narrative is fairly straight-forward and, unlike his peers, supported by modern forensic evidence gathered from his skeleton.

At Bosworth, despite having nearly double the number of men as Henry Tudor's forces, Richard III elected to lead a spearhead directly to the rear of the Lancastrian forces in order to find and kill Tudor, thus achieving a quick end to the battle.<sup>121</sup> What Richard had not foreseen was William Stanley committing his troops to the Lancastrian side in Richard's own immediate vicinity.<sup>122</sup> With the spearhead force completely surrounded, the enemy converged on the ensnared king. Despite being urged by his men to flee, Richard chose to remain and fight.<sup>123</sup>

The skeleton identified as Richard III in 2012 displays multiple peri-mortem injuries to the skull, ribs, and pelvis.<sup>124</sup> Ten wounds in total were inflicted upon the skull itself, including two severe wounds to the back of the head that would have resulted in death. Injuries to the ribs and pelvis likely occurred while the body was without armour. These details align with accounts of Richard's death at Bosworth. Richard was said to have "received many mortal wounds and like a spirited and most courageous prince, fell in battle on the field and not in flight."<sup>125</sup> Thereafter, Richard's body was stripped and slung over the back of a horse to be taken to Leicester.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 418; *The Great Chronicle of London*, 237-238.

<sup>122</sup> Vergil, *Three Books*, 224.

<sup>123</sup> *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, 181-183; Richard Grafton, "The Continuation of Sir Thomas More," in *Richard III: The Great Debate*, edited by Paul Kendall (Chatham, UK: The Folio Society Limited, 1965), 141-142.

<sup>124</sup> Richard Buckley, Mathew Morris, Jo Appleby, Turi King, Deirdre O'Sullivan, and Lin Foxhall, "The King in the Car Park': New Light on the Death and Burial of Richard III in the Greyfriars Church, Leicester, in 1485," *Antiquity*, 87 (2013): 536.

<sup>125</sup> *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, 183.

<sup>126</sup> Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 673; *Hall's Chronicle*, 421; More, "The History of Richard III," 145.



Richard's reputation had already been marred by the manner in which he acquired the throne, the disappearance of his nephews, and the rumours surrounding his marital ties. Despite this, chroniclers were still willing to assign him good kingly characteristics, such as his bravery in battle and even his wit, as cruel and cunning as it was.<sup>127</sup> In addition, the chroniclers seem to have been keen to condemn those who did not treat the body well, or at least to express some pity for Richard at that moment. Despite being a horrible king, in their view, Richard was still a king, and his body was not deserving of the insults heaped upon it; those that abused him were reviled.<sup>128</sup>

The Crowland Chronicle recorded that Richard had sought a priest the morning before the battle, but could not find one; Richard was thus deprived of the opportunity for a final confession, a pitiful and mitigating point.<sup>129</sup> As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, the Church assumed that one who died suddenly without confession had made his peace with God already; the fact that Richard made the effort to seek a priest would have further alleviated any burden on Richard's soul.

The rediscovery of Richard III's bones does little to change the narrative of Richard's death and burial: he still died at Bosworth Field, surrounded by the enemy. He was still put in earth at Greyfriars' church in Leicester, though there was controversy among chroniclers as to whether he had an ecclesiastical burial.<sup>130</sup> The bones generate interest because they confirm that Richard had a deformity of the back and that his remains were not thrown into the River

---

<sup>127</sup> *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, 183.

<sup>128</sup> *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, 183; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 63; *Hall's Chronicle*, 421; Vergil, *Three Books*, 226; *The Great Chronicle of London*, 238; Francis Bacon, *History of King Henry VII*, edited by J. R. Lumby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1889), 6. Bacon, writing in 1621, stated that Richard deserved it anyway.

<sup>129</sup> *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, 181.

<sup>130</sup> Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 673, states he was buried with little reverence; *Hall's Chronicle*, 421, states that he was given a funeral. Meanwhile, Vergil, *Three Books*, 226, says no funeral occurred. Jean Molinet states that Richard was buried at the door of the church with "no royal solemnity," quoted in *Richard III: A Source Book*, edited by Keith Dockray (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997), 125.

Soare, details that have been argued over by various proponents for centuries. Until his skeleton's rediscovery, they were unanswerable questions.<sup>131</sup>

### *Henry VII*

Henry VII died at the age of fifty-two on 22 April 1509, having lingered for three weeks after the creation of his will on 31 March 1509. Henry's health had been precarious since 1507, as reported by the various ambassadors at his court.<sup>132</sup> Despite their vigilance, Henry slipped away at approximately 11 pm, and according to the Garter King of Arms, Thomas Wriothesley, his death was kept a secret for at least two days by his son and his closest advisors.<sup>133</sup> An illustration from BL Additional MS 45131 depicts Henry VII's deathbed, using coats of arms to identify those in attendance: Richard Fox, the bishop of Winchester; George, Lord Hastings; Richard Weston, an esquire of the body and a groom of the Privy Chamber; Richard Clement, a groom of the Privy Chamber; Matthew Baker, an esquire of the body; John Sharpe and William Tyler, gentlemen ushers; Hugh Denys, an esquire of the body; and William Fitzwilliam, a gentleman usher.<sup>134</sup> A description of how Henry came to be remembered by an Elizabethan audience comes from Bacon:

And thus this Solomon of England, for Solomon also was too heavy upon his people in exactions, having lived two and fifty years, and thereof reigned three and twenty years, and eight months, being in perfect memory, and in a most blessed mind, in a great calm of a consuming sickness passed to a better world[...]<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup> Richard's spinal curve could have been masked during his life with well-tailored clothes and customized armour; see Jo Appleby, Piers D. Mitchell, Claire Robinson, Alison Brough, Guy Ruddy, Russell A. Harris, David Thompson, and Bruno Morgan, "The Scoliosis of Richard III, Last Plantagenet King of England: Diagnosis and Clinical Significance," *The Lancet*, 383 (31 May 2014), 1944. Once stripped, however, Richard's back was exposed and became known outside intimate royal circles. It also immediately became fodder for Tudor propagandists and chroniclers. The extent of his curve quickly evolved from lopsided shoulders to hunchback with withered arm and limp by the time Shakespeare wrote his play c. 1592.

<sup>132</sup> S.B. Chrimes, *Henry VII* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1977), 313. Both Spanish and Venetian ambassadors dedicated considerable parchment to the matter of the king's health.

<sup>133</sup> BL Additional MS 45131, f. 52v.

<sup>134</sup> British Library, "Henry VII on his deathbed," *Henry VIII: Birth, Accession, and Death*, online exhibition, posted 26 March 2009, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/henryviii/birthaccdeath/deathbed/>. The manuscript image is found in BL Additional MS 45131, f. 54r.

<sup>135</sup> Bacon, *History*, 211, rendered in modern English.

Despite this conclusion, Bacon also recorded the steps Henry took before his death in order to remedy his legacy.<sup>136</sup> A unique source of detail concerning Henry VII's last actions comes from the sermon delivered by Bishop John Fisher, who officiated the funeral at Westminster Abbey. Fisher revealed that during the last two months of his life, Henry had devoted himself to penance for all his previous misdeeds and for being a harsh master to his kingdom.<sup>137</sup>

This campaign had three major actions: reformation of the justice system, the promotion of worthy men within the Church, and the issue of a general pardon to all, save for thieves and murderers. After detailing Henry's penitential activities, Fisher illustrated the physical suffering of Henry VII on his deathbed, to "stir us to have compassion and pity upon this most noble king."<sup>138</sup> Sharp pains afflicted the king for over twenty-seven hours, and his soul was tormented by fear of God's judgment.<sup>139</sup> He, being a good Christian, bore these agonies, but still called his son, Prince Henry to him in order to give his last advice.<sup>140</sup> The death of Henry VII is perhaps the clearest example of that carefully constructed motif: all kings receive a good death. He was a virtuous Christian, he used his kingly traits in order to right his own wrongs and show concern for his kingdom, and he imparted advice to his successor.

### *Conclusions*

As demonstrated above, the deaths of medieval English kings were not uniform. Not only were there greatly varying circumstances to consider, there were also different narratives to

---

<sup>136</sup> Ibid, 230-231.

<sup>137</sup> John Fisher, *The English Works of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester*, edited by John Mayor. Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 27 (New York: 1876), 271. *Hall's Chronicle*, 504-505, takes this the logical step further: Henry did this so that the people would remember him as a good king.

<sup>138</sup> Fisher, *The English Works*, 276.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid, 277.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid, 285-286. According to some sources, Henry VII managed to extract a promise from Prince Henry to marry Katherine of Aragon, Prince Arthur's widow. For more information as to the uncertainty regarding this request, see David Starkey, *Henry, Virtuous Prince* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2009), 253. The deathbed promise is implied in a letter to Margaret of Savoy dated 27 June 1509. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Volume I: 1509-1514*, edited by J.S. Brewer (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862), 31, item 224.

explain how the king met his end. These narrative variants speak more about the perceived character of the king and potentially his successor than they do about the historical events. For example, Edward II was not at the deathbed of Edward I, but in their tales of Edward I's death, the chroniclers managed to praise Edward I, condemn Edward II, and place the blame for the kingdom's early fourteenth century upheavals in one fell swoop.

Although there are many narratives, one theme is constant: all English kings go to Heaven. Whether by religious or civic virtue, pathetic demise, or personal traits, each one escaped the grasp of Hell. For those kings that did not die suddenly, their final statements were used by chroniclers to reveal their good death. The statement may have been in the form of a confession to cleanse the soul. At other times, the chronicles paired it or replaced it with final orders for the good of the kingdom. Henry III was mindful not only to confess his soul, but also to secure the kingdom until the return of Edward I from the Crusades. Dying in service to God and the kingdom atoned for many wrongs, as seen with Henry VII's efforts to redeem his memory among the people.

The unfortunate death of a king spurred both pity and the effort to mitigate the king's bad actions in life. Murder was a common crime, but regicide was a crime against God's anointed. A king may have been bad, but anyone who killed a king was worse. Those that were viewed as guilty of the crime met bad ends themselves; the monk who poisoned John died as well, risking Hell for what he and his superior perceived as the greater good. Henry IV and Richard III were thought to have had sudden and painful deaths, each blamed for the death of their predecessor.

Despite the damnable sin of regicide, these kings are still salvageable by chroniclers. John and Henry IV confessed and left good advice; their Christian virtue and care for the succession balanced their past sins. In contrast, Richard III's wit and courage were lauded, and there were harsh words for those that mistreated his body. He also tried but could not find a

priest for confession and the Holy Sacrament the morning before the battle, another point in favour of his eternal soul. Although they may have spent years in Purgatory for their sins, these kings would eventually reach Heaven; Richard I took thirty-three years, according to the bishop of Rochester.<sup>141</sup>

The death of a medieval king was his mortal end, but it was only the beginning of both his soul's journey and his legacy on earth. Although the body natural died, the body politic remained, and the memory of the king became part of that surviving entity. The king's actions in life dominated, but the manner and interpretations of his death also began the processing of both the king's legacy and that of his successor; it mattered how the old king was treated by the new one. This is the moment where Ernst Kantorowicz lost interest in his mortal subject. Although the physical body remained as an object to be disposed of, kingship had moved on; the corpse was, in Kantorowicz's unsaid opinion, politically dead. The ceremonies around it mattered, but the body within itself was irrelevant. However, given the concern shown by kings, the court, chroniclers, and the general public for the dead body and its attached soul, this cannot be true.

Considering the diversity of deaths within one king and the wide spectrum of deaths across medieval English kingship, the royal prescriptive texts must have had some power or capacity to create a funeral that both compensated for the range of deaths and provided a funeral for a King of England. The status of King had to be satisfied, but the individual circumstances described above had to be made to fit into an ideal mould. Unsurprisingly, the duration between the king's death and funeral was often counted in weeks and months rather than hours and days. Regardless of the exact circumstances of his death, the king would become equal with his peers by virtue of his funeral and burial. In fact, he had to; a crowned king was an anointed king, and that could not be undone, even by deposition or usurpation.

---

<sup>141</sup> Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, iii, edited by H.R Luard. RS, 57. (London: 1876), 212; *Flores Historiarum*, ii, 203.

### Chapter III: By the Books

As seen in Chapter II, the deaths of kings were individual events, varying in all matters. At times, the only thing these kings did have in common was that they were monarchs of England. The royal prescriptive texts<sup>1</sup> – *De Exequiis Regalibus* from *Liber Regalis* and other manuscripts, the funerary section in *Liber Regie Capelle*, and Henry VII's Household Articles of 1494 and its addenda by Margaret Beaufort – represent a collective effort to normalize the funeral and burial of a king, regardless of the circumstances. Although these texts developed over the course of centuries, they do not contradict each other but instead build upon the expectations to honourably (*honeste* in the texts)<sup>2</sup> and fittingly (*decenter*) inter the king.

Each text was written from a different perspective. *De Exequiis Regalibus* discussed the mortuary preparations for the king's body; the writer observed and recorded the final, personal acts of care given to the corpse. The funerary information in *Liber Regie Capelle* was written for someone involved in the coordination of the burial church, the archbishop, the Chapel Royal, and the court at the Office of the Dead and the votive masses. The Household Articles of 1494 were issued as a series of rules for those in attendance and what was expected of them. All of these texts could – and did – operate independently of the others.

However, when pieced together, these texts form a unified, more complete picture of the ceremonies they depict. An overarching self-consciousness is present. Their compilers were aware of the other authorities, written or not. Thus, the events described in *Liber Regie Capelle* and the Household Articles could not occur without the work done in *De Exequiis Regalibus*, and *De Exequiis Regalibus* had little point in existing, unless it anticipated the lengthy activities described in the other two texts.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter I, 23-27 for an introduction to these texts.

<sup>2</sup> Mark Duffy translates this word as “faithful,” *Royal Tombs of Medieval England* (Stroud: Tempus, 2003), 181. This translation suggests virtue in adherence to something, while the translation as “honourably” grants the executors some leeway, particularly when a king was intestate.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the aforesaid royal prescriptive texts and assess their elasticity. Both the necessity and ability of the prescriptive texts to yield to situations will be established. Their deliberate flexibility is found in their focus upon the end result: the visual impact of the royal funeral. The means of achieving this end did not matter to the original writers. However, these mechanics will be investigated by setting the royal prescriptive texts in the context of contemporary Church sources and medical treatises; there were limits as to what could be performed. Because of the flexibility of the prescriptive texts, the delineation between the king and the King did not exist in stark contrast. The king's two bodies, as envisioned by Kantorowicz, did not function separately, but rather, both facets compromised in order to produce a successful funeral and burial.

While these kings had widely varying lives and deaths, the one binding factor was that they all shared in being the King of England. Using Kantorowicz's concept of the king's two bodies, just as the king (body natural) and the King (body politic) had separate interests, one may hypothesize that the king and the King had separate final testaments. The personal will of a king provided for his family and dealt with his personal affairs and private holdings. These testaments were often followed closely when dealing in strictly private matters. This is perhaps most evident in the splendour of Henry VII's Lady Chapel. Henry VII's religious devotions did not interfere with the running of state, so a great deal of the personal requests were fulfilled, though there are signs of negotiation between the executors and the King's Council to reach the £60,000 that were ultimately spent.<sup>3</sup> However, when personal demands of the body natural began to intrude on the realm of the body politic, the personal will may have had to be discarded. The royal prescriptive texts -- applicable to all kings -- acted as a corporate will of the body politic.

---

<sup>3</sup> Margaret Condon, "God Save the King! Piety, Propaganda and the Perpetual Memorial," in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 60.

That does not mean that both the corporate and personal wills of kings were always kept if they were non-competitive. More accurately, they both were tempered to suit the circumstances and practical limitations of any individual enterprise. The King had to dispose of the former king in a suitable manner, but this could not be done without considering the mortal contexts in which the king died. The prescriptive texts could not be rigid, or else an inappropriate response to the death would be produced.

The rituals of the royal funeral enforced the hierarchy, but being anything less than visually intact at the ceremonies undermined this. A king rotting in front of his subjects was a mortal concern, but it would be an embarrassment to the office and its dignity. If the king was King “by the grace of God,” what did a putrescent corpse mean? The conduct and order of those at the ceremony also mattered. The prestige of the guests reflected the station of the deceased, and their behaviour had the potential to lead to disruption if inappropriate.

The wording in the royal prescriptive texts was deliberately vague as to how cope with such unpredictable mortal concerns; the texts were most concerned with the end product, particularly the visual elements. They were like elastic bands, allowing for variations and changes in time, place, venue, and other factors germane to the royal exequies. However, all elastic bands have a point of resistance, then breakage; the moments the band snapped will be addressed in Chapter IV.

### *De Exequiis Regalibus*

English tradition required the body of a dead king to be displayed. Ralph Giesey argues that Henry II set the precedent for the post-mortem display of a king in all his regalia.<sup>4</sup> After his death in Chinon in 1189, Henry lay in state wearing his crown and dressed in his robes. In his hands, he held a sceptre and a sword. Giesey believes this was done not only to

---

<sup>4</sup> Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in France* (Gèneve, France: Librairie E. Droz, 1960), 21.



prove that the king was dead, but also to seal his status as “king,” just as a monk would be buried in his cassock or a knight in armour. With the birth of this tradition, the bodies of kings and queens of England typically were shown post mortem.

Piero Camporesi postulates that the medieval idea of Paradise was the inversion of reality: the Hereafter was clean, sweet-smelling, and fresh, without rot.<sup>5</sup> As such, people who lived good lives sometimes received the privilege of a heavenly body at death; their bodies did not decay or stink.<sup>6</sup> Incorruptibility was a sign that the soul had gone on to Heaven and that no sin had been harboured within the body; a good evisceration and embalming could achieve the same effect with a far less holy life. Recent study of Richard I’s remaining heart dust revealed that his remains had been treated with both preservative and aromatic powders, including frankincense; frankincense was associated with the odour of sanctity (the smell reportedly emitted by saints) and was one of the three gifts of the wise men.<sup>7</sup> The modern Catholic Church has a much more rigorous definition of incorruptibility due to developments in the mortuary arts, but in the medieval period, any sort of ability to avoid rot after death was a sign of God’s favour. The converse was also true; those who had lived sinful lives tended to rot rapidly and spectacularly.<sup>8</sup>

The first royal prescriptive text, *De Exequiis Regalibus*, describes the activity surrounding the newly dead king’s body prior to its transport to the funeral. There is little mention of the funeral church or burial site; it only states that the king was to be taken

---

<sup>5</sup> Piero Camporesi, *The Incorruptible Flesh: Bodily Mutilation and Mortification in Religion and Folklore* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 25.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 75, 155.

<sup>7</sup> Philippe Charlier, et al., “The Embalmed Heart of Richard the Lionheart (1199 AD): A Biological and Anthropological Analysis,” *Scientific Reports*, 28 February 2013, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1038/srep01296.

<sup>8</sup> Camporesi uses Peter Damian’s tale of the doge’s wife as an example of these beliefs. The wife lived a hedonistic and sinful life, and when she became ill, the smell drove everyone away from her. She died alone in pain and trapped in her rotting body. From Peter Damian, “Instituto monialis,” *Opera Omnia*, iii (Venice: Bassano, 1783), column 779-780, quoted in Camporesi, *The Incorruptible Flesh*, 77-78.

reverently to the burial site of his choice after undergoing the most honourable funeral rites of a king.<sup>9</sup> The lines directly related to embalming process are brief:

Primo a suis cubiculariis corpus ejusdem aqua calida sive tepida lavari debet. Deinde balsamo et aromatibus unguetur per totum. Et postea in panno lineo cerato involueretur, ita tamen quod facies et barba illius tantum pateant. Et circa manus et digitos ipsius dictus pannus ceratus ita erit dispositus ut quilibet digitus cum pollice utriusque manus singillatim insuatur per se ac si manus ejus cirotecis lineis essent operte.<sup>10</sup> De cerebro tamen et visceribus caveant cubicularii praedicti.

To summarize, the servants washed the body in hot water and then anointed it with balsam and other aromatics. The corpse was then wrapped in waxed linen – cerecloth – with the face and beard showing. The hands were wrapped with cerecloth, the fingers wrapped individually, taking on the appearance of gloves. Almost as an afterthought, the writer mentions that the servants were “aware of the brains and viscera.” The corpse was then dressed for presentation and burial.

Evisceration and embalming were crucial elements of medieval royal exequies. As seen in Appendix Eight, by the end of the fourteenth century, an English king could reasonably anticipate his corpse being on display, with his face showing or within his coffin, for at least ten days.<sup>11</sup> The deceased king could not visibly rot until he was entombed; he had to be preserved.

In all probability, the evisceration and brain extraction occurred before the corpse was washed; any other order would require a second washing. These activities certainly occurred before the attendants wrapped the body, yet the text does not mention it until the end. John Wickham Legg reports that the entire “De cerebro tamen et visceribus” line is added in the margins of Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 425.<sup>12</sup> The Rawlinson manuscript predates the illuminated manuscripts at Westminster Abbey, but the funeral section seems to have been

---

<sup>9</sup> *Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, ii, edited by John Wickham Legg. Henry Bradshaw Society, 5 (Bury St. Edmunds: Boydell Press, 1999), column 735; *Liber Regalis*, edited by Frederick Lygon, Earl Beauchamp (London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1870), 37.

<sup>10</sup> In *Liber Regie Capelle*, 112, it is written as “cooperte.” Both mean “covered” but “cooperte” has the connotation of being covered over, while “operte” tends toward “being enveloped.” *Missale ad Usum*, ii, column 734, transcribes this as “operte.”

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix Eight, 323 of this work.

<sup>12</sup> *Missale ad Usum*, ii, column 734. See Chapter I, 23-24, for further information on this source.

added at a different, later time than the coronation orders. This does not preclude the possibility that it is still the earliest record of the royal body's funerary preparation. If Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 425 is a copy of another, earlier text, then the scribe may have missed the line and put it in the margin, with all copies thereafter (including the illuminated manuscripts of Westminster Abbey) replicating the error. The evisceration is chronologically out of place at the end; it should be at the beginning of the text.

However, if MS Rawlinson C 425 is the original version of the funerary text, it would suggest that the scribe was not familiar with the events described. Someone proofreading his work corrected it, and the line was added in the margin. In either case, it appears there is an inherent mistake in *De Exequiis Regalibus*.

The evisceration and embalming of a king were vital and technical processes. The treatment of the brains and viscera had to be performed well, and often a professional, such as a surgeon or apothecary, was employed.<sup>13</sup> In his *Cyurgia*, early fourteenth-century French royal physician Henri de Mondeville provided three descriptions of preparing a corpse for burial, each based upon the station of the person concerned and what he could pay for the service.<sup>14</sup> For a high-ranking corpse that lay out for three days or more, Mondeville recommended that the corpse's bowels be evacuated, along with the standard procedure: plug all of the orifices with preservatives, rub the body with balm and spice and herbs, and wrap the body tightly.<sup>15</sup> For esteemed persons whose faces were to be exposed and bodies on display for

---

<sup>13</sup> For an introduction to the physicians at hand, see Chapter I, 29-30. The four works are used to illustrate the spectrum of options available to someone embalming an elite body over the course of the 1216-1509 period. All of these works are known to have crossed the Channel.

<sup>14</sup> Henri de Mondeville, *The Surgery of Master Henry de Mondeville, Surgeon of Philip the Fair, King of France, written from 1306 to 1320, translated by E. Nicaise*, translated and edited by Leonard D. Rosenman (Xlibris Corporation, 2003), 737; Henri de Mondeville, *Chirurgie de Maître Henri de Mondeville*, translated and edited by E. Nicaise (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer Baillière and Co., 1893), 569-570. There are actually four methods, but he excludes the description of preparing a pauper, as "it neither is useful or necessary, and it pays nothing."

<sup>15</sup> Mondeville, *The Surgery*, 738; Mondeville, *Chirurgie*, 570.

four days or more, Mondeville prescribed that a balm should be applied to the face, though he doubted its effectiveness.<sup>16</sup> The second additional precaution was to eviscerate the body.

When the body must be preserved for longer than four nights, and when granted dispensation by the Church at Rome,<sup>17</sup> you open the abdominal wall with an incision from the chest to the pubis in men and with a double incision from the substernal notch into both flanks in women, and then fold back the flap based on the pubis (i.e. the sexual parts) through those incisions, remove all of the abdominal viscera down to the anus. Then liberally apply the following powder to all the inner surfaces: equal parts of myrrh, mummy,<sup>18</sup> aloes, spices, and herbs that prevent decay and lessen bad odors, including roses, violets, camphor, sandalwood, and musk. Add salt to equal the total of the others. Fill the abdomen with sweet-smelling herbs such as camomile, melilot, pennyroyal, mint, menthastrum, balsamita, etc., enough to fill out the normal contours, then sew the incisions and complete the embalming process. If you must preserve the viscera, cover them with the powder and place them in a silver or lead jar, which you seal with many layers of waxed cloth.<sup>19</sup>

As seen here, the organs were removed and preserved for future transport in a separate case.

The body was effectively stuffed, half with spices, herbs, and asphalt and the other half entirely of salt. While the herbs and spices were to reduce the smell, the salt was to dry the insides of the corpse. How much spice depended upon the size of the person and the space that was left by the removed organs.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Mondeville, *The Surgery*, 739; Mondeville, *Chirurgie*, 572. He stated that he attempted to use it on two French kings with little to no benefit. He was likely referring to Philippe IV in 1314 (age 46) and Louis X (age 27) in 1316. Mondeville offers that perhaps the balm did not work because “they were so loose-bodied with soft and delicate and beautiful faces. Perhaps the balm was stale.”

<sup>17</sup> The dispensation that Mondeville speaks of was required after Boniface VIII’s papal bull of 1299, *De Sepulturis*, in which he explicitly banned the *abusum destatande feritatis* (the detestable abuse of savagery) of *mos teutonicos*. Various interpretations of the bull have caused confusion, both in the medieval era and the present day; whether Boniface only meant *mos teutonicos* or if he meant any sort of post-mortem division of the body (including heart burial, medical dissection, or even the division of saints) is still hotly debated. The bull was effectively voided by a number of dispensations granted to Jean II the Good in 1351. For the text of the bull, see *Les Registres de Boniface VIII: Recueil Des Bulles de Ce Pape*, ii, edited by Georges Digard, Maurice Faucon, and Antoine Thomas (Paris: Librairie Des Écoles Française D’Athènes & De Rome, 1885), 575-576. For dispensations achieved by the French royal family in response to the bull, see *Privilèges accordés à la Couronne de France par le Sainte-Siège*, edited by Adolphe François Lucien Tardif (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1855), 107-109, 141-142, 155-156, 164-165, 190, and 223-261. For the feud between Philippe IV and Boniface VIII, see Elizabeth A.R. Brown, “Death and the Human Body in the Later Middle Ages: The Legislation of Boniface VIII on the Division of the Corpse,” *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 12 (1981), 221-270; Elizabeth A.R. Brown, “Authority, the Family, and the Dead in Late Medieval France,” *French Historical Studies*, 16, no. 4 (Autumn 1990), 803-832; and Agostino Paravicini Bagliani. “The Corpse in the Middle Ages: The Problem of the Division of the Body,” in *The Medieval World*, edited by Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson (New York: Routledge, 2001), 327-341.

<sup>18</sup> Likely asphalt, as in the substance used to tar roads. This has been commonly used in mummification since the mummies of ancient Egypt.

<sup>19</sup> Mondeville, *The Surgery*, 740; Mondeville, *Chirurgie*, 572-573.

<sup>20</sup> As an aside here, larger bodies needed more preservatives. As such, when comparing the cost of embalming for kings and queens who died in close chronological proximity, the amount of money spent may be more reflective of the person’s size rather than the quality of the embalming.

Mondeville's method of embalming would easily be hidden by the robes worn by the corpse. One element in *De Exequiis Regalibus* that is missing from Mondeville's narrative is the matter of the brain. Papal physician Guy de Chauliac provided the information that the nose, ears, and mouth were plugged to keep the brain inside as it went to liquid.<sup>21</sup> Chauliac admitted that this information was not first-hand, as he gave credit to "Jacob" or "James," an apothecary who embalmed the popes. The rest of the embalming method described by Mondeville was similar; the bowels were to be removed and replaced by preservative salts and herbs.<sup>22</sup> Chauliac applied herbs several times, rolling each part of the corpse in the spices and covering the exterior in quicksilver, pitch, and other resins in order to seal the pores.<sup>23</sup> He also mentioned that a lead casket would be a prudent measure.

Chauliac echoed Mondeville's doubts concerning the effectiveness of the supposed face balm; his own research had turned up nothing on the matter on the source of the legendary effectiveness.<sup>24</sup> Also, the balm was "now" meant to be applied to corpses on display for longer than eight days, not the four prescribed by Mondeville. The legend of the balm might have grown, but equally likely, the events that the balm would be used for were also increasing in length. Mondeville died before completing his great work c. 1320. At that time, he considered four days an extended duration for a corpse to be unburied. By the 1363 completion of his own *Chirurgie*, Chauliac determined that eight days were now the threshold for a long exposure of the body.

Late sixteenth-century French royal physician Ambroise Paré recommended sawing through the skull (likely through the back) and removing the entire organ.<sup>25</sup> Paré also removed

---

<sup>21</sup> Guy de Chauliac, *The Chirurgie of Guy de Chauliac*, translated by Margaret Ogden. Early English Text Society, 265 (London: 1971), 413-414.

<sup>22</sup> As noted by Danielle Westerhof, there is no mention of the papal dispensation that Mondeville had needed to perform these actions. Danielle Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2008), 90.

<sup>23</sup> Chauliac, *The Chirurgie*, 414.

<sup>24</sup> Chauliac, *The Chirurgie*, 415.

<sup>25</sup> Ambroise Paré, *The workes of that famous chirurgion Ambrose Parey translated out of Latine and compared with the French*, translated by Thomas Johnson (London: Thomas Johnson, 1634), 1131.

the viscera and internal organs, keeping the heart on the side for the family to do as they deem fit. Unlike Chauliac, Paré did not just roll the body in herbs and spices; rather, he slit each limb open to stuff them with the same mixture that went into the empty space in the abdominal cavity.<sup>26</sup> Instead of pitch and quicksilver, Paré preferred to work with vinegar and turpentine. Having embalmed several kings in his time,<sup>27</sup> the royal physician stressed the importance of the conditions in which the body is kept:

For thus the body being over and above washed in strong vinegar, or lie, shall be kept for a long time, if so be that a great and dissolving heate does not beare sway, or if it be not put in a hot and moyst place. And this condition of time and place is the cause why the dead bodyes of Princes and Kings, though embalmed with Art and cost within the space of sixe or seaven dayes, in which they are kept to bee shewed to the people after their embalming, doe cast forth so grievous a scent that none can endure it so that they are forced to be put in a leaden coffin. For the ayre which encompasseth them groweth so hot by reason of the multitude of people flowing to the spectacle and the burning of lights night and day that the final portion of the native heate which remaineth being dissipated, they easily putrefie[...]<sup>28</sup>

Although kings had been embalmed for centuries, Paré gave voice to the obstacles that a grand royal funeral presented. The light and the heat accelerated the decomposition of the corpse. In the 1634 English publication of his *Workes*, Paré discussed new theories of embalming, including repeated punctures to allow the vinegar and other liquids to penetrate the flesh.

Philbert Guybert's *The Charitable Physitian*, published in 1639, offers several innovations that had developed since Paré's death in 1590. Guybert delineated his roles as physician and apothecary throughout this text, separating the surgical activity from the making of balms, serums, and rubs. The most evident of Guybert's innovations was the use of exsanguination in order to make the corpse last longer.<sup>29</sup> The method sounds quite similar to

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Henri II, Francois II, and Charles IX. It is unclear whether he embalmed Henri III.

<sup>28</sup> Paré, *The workes of that famous chirurgion Ambrose Parey*, 1131-1132.

<sup>29</sup> Philbert Guybert, *The charitable physitian: with the Charitable apothecary. Written in French by Philbert Guibert Esquire, and physitian regent in Paris: and by him after many severall editions, reviewed, corrected, amended, and augmented. And now faithfully translated into English, for the benefit of this kingdome by IW* (London: Thomas Harper, 1639), 143-144. The body was punctured multiple times in the back and limbs, ensuring the body thoroughly drained out.

the theory Paré considered nearly fifty years earlier. All of the openings were stuffed with not only balm and vinegar, but also cotton, a new substance for embalming.<sup>30</sup>

Out of the four texts mentioned here, Guybert's manual provides the most detailed description of the preservation of organs, the removal of the brain, and the sewing up of the skull. The first half of the section on embalming emphasizes the techniques of cutting, sewing, and manipulating the body; here Guybert is most akin to the modern sense of "surgeon."<sup>31</sup> The second half of the section is dedicated to the balms used in the preservation of the corpse. Various concoctions are prescribed based upon what part of the body was being preserved and what supplies were at hand.<sup>32</sup> Notably, Guybert gave the preservation of the heart its own specific instructions.<sup>33</sup> Though there is no record of Guybert having served a king or a pope, his medical treatise indicates extensive knowledge and the training to perform such duties.

These four medical texts illustrate how decay could have been controlled in medieval England. They also fill in the gaps left by *De Exequiis Regalibus*. While none of these texts are authorities in regard to the English royal funerary ceremonies, they present options and possibilities for successful funerals. All agree that the abdominal viscera had to go. Given the perishability of the brain and the lengthening of the funerary and burial ceremonies, brain removal may have become a most attractive option by the end of the fourteenth century, if the skull sutures were concealed at the viewing. While a lead coffin, as described by Chauillac and Paré, could alleviate some of the problems of a decaying corpse, one must keep in mind that these caskets were not airtight. The quality of the evisceration and embalming remained critical.

This brings into question the use of the term *cubicularii*. Typically, *cubicularii* is translated as "servants," with the connotation of being attached to the bedchamber;

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, 145.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, 143-146.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, 146-151.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, 146.

“chamberlains” could also be an acceptable translation.<sup>34</sup> Evisceration and embalming required advanced knowledge of the topics at hand, and a typical valet acting as embalmer is unlikely. *Cubicularii* more likely referred to the status of the person handling the corpse: the person should be in service to the king. As observed by papal historian Agostino Paravicini Bagliani, one possible scenario is that the *cubicularii* took care of the external embalming (the washing, the application of spices and balms, the wrapping), while the anatomical aspect was outsourced to a professional.<sup>35</sup>

The station of the acting mortician was relevant. Whoever attended the deceased king’s body could not have been too low in station, and typically, when documented, the person was not. King John was eviscerated and embalmed by the abbot of Croxton in 1216.<sup>36</sup> The royal house also hired out non-religious people to embalm their dead. “A woman” was hired to disembowel Edward II shortly after his death in September 1327; no information is supplied about her in the accounts.<sup>37</sup> One can surmise she had some effective knowledge of the body; Edward II’s funeral occurred without incident in December 1327, three months after his embalming. Edward’s heart was also successfully extracted and was buried with his queen, Isabella, thirty years later.<sup>38</sup> A reasonable guess would be that the anonymous woman who attended the king’s body was a midwife.

In the narrative of Edward IV’s funeral in 1483, an English paraphrase of *De Exequiis Regalibus* precedes the funeral description. However, there are significant differences. Rather

---

<sup>34</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, “The Exequies of Edward III and the Royal Funeral Ceremony in Late Medieval England,” *English Historical Review*, 124, no. 507 (April 2009), 264.

<sup>35</sup> Agostino Paravicini Bagliani, *The Pope’s Body*, translated by David S. Peterson (London: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 134-135.

<sup>36</sup> Matthew Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, ii, edited by F. Madden. RS, 44 (London: 1866), 193. Paris identifies the abbot as having knowledge of anatomy.

<sup>37</sup> S.A. Moore, “Documents Relating to the Death and Burial of King Edward II,” *Archaeologia*, 50 (1887), 218.

<sup>38</sup> BL Cotton MS Vitellius F XII, f. 275v. Despite some fire damage, the Register for Greyfriars London remains legible and clear on this matter. The Register has been transcribed by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford in *The Grey Friars of London: Their History with the Register of Their Convent and an Appendix of Documents* (Aberdeen: The University Press, 1915); on 74-75, there are entries for Isabella of France and other members of the royal family entombed there prior to the Dissolution. F.D. Blackley, “The Tomb of Isabella of France, wife of Edward II of England,” *International Society for the Study of Church Monuments*, 8 (1983): 161.



than referring to servants or some equivalent of *cubicularii*, the text line states that the king must be “washed and censed by a bishop for his holy annoyntment.”<sup>39</sup>

The rest of the text follows the general structure of *De Exequiis Regalibus*, except for the evisceration and embalming; they are skipped over. Immediately following the washing, anointing, and dressing, the corpse was put on display “by the space of ij days and more, if the weder will it suffer.”<sup>40</sup> Evisceration and embalming are finally mentioned at this point:

And when he may not goodly<sup>41</sup> lenger endur take hym away and bowell hym and then eftsones bame hym, wrappe hym in raynes well trammeled, in cordis of silke, then in tartryne<sup>42</sup> trammeled and then in velvert and then in clothe of gold well trammeled. Then lede hym and coffer hym in his lede with hym a plait of his stile, name, and date.<sup>43</sup>

*De Exequiis Regalibus* does not mention the display of the king prior to embalming. Edward IV only sat out for “ten or twelve hours” according, but this interval still puts him out of synch with *De Exequiis Regalibus*.<sup>44</sup>

The written accounts of Edward IV’s exequies convey the idea that the writers were very aware of the status of the persons handling the king’s body. While handling a body was thought of as low work, the royal corpse still had to be treated with the dignity afforded to a king by his coronation and consecration. As such, a bishop washed the external body, lending credence to the idea that the embalmer was outsourced. The variant texts are more forthright in stating the limits of the natural corpse: two days, if the conditions were good. Given the closeness in meaning of the original Latin text and the English texts, it is fascinating that the English texts deviate at the incorrect placement of evisceration and embalming seen in *De Exequiis Regalibus*. The English paraphrase corrects the errant chronology of evisceration by explaining

---

<sup>39</sup> London, College of Arms MS I.7, ff. 7r-8v, quoted in Anne Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York at Windsor* (Richard III Society 2005), 33. Also found in “An Extract Relating to the Burial of K. Edward IV. From a MS of the late Mr. Anstis, now in the Possession of Thomas Astle, Esquire,” *Archaeologia*, 1 (January 1770), 348; BL Egerton MS 2642, ff. 181r-182v.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> “An Extract Relating to the Burial of K. Edward,” 348, states “godely” here.

<sup>42</sup> Written as “tarseryn” in “An Extract Relating to the Burial of K. Edward,” 348.

<sup>43</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 33-34; “An Extract Relating to the Burial of K. Edward,” 348-49; BL Egerton MS 2642, f. 181v.

<sup>44</sup> “An Extract Relating to the Burial of K. Edward,” 349. This also appears in BL Egerton MS 2642, f. 186v.

that the king was washed then put on display prior to embalming for a short period. Before Edward IV, the only kings to die in Westminster were Henry III and Henry IV; the rest died away from the capital and required preservation in order to return to the city. Henry III was buried within five days of his death, and Henry IV's funerary records are scant. It is unknown whether any previous king had exposure between death and embalming.

No further detail regarding the evisceration and embalming is supplied in *De Exequiis Regalibus*. Thereafter, the text specifies that the attendants dressed the corpse in regalia and sent the monarch onward toward his funeral and burial.<sup>45</sup> Again, the emphasis was on the appearance of the corpse rather than how it came to appear that way.

The late king wore an ankle-length tunic and a decorated pallium. His beard was arranged fittingly on his chest, his head shrouded and then crowned. Over the wrapped hands were placed gloves with gold fringe, and on top of that, a ring on the right middle finger. The king was to hold a rod with a ball and cross in the right hand, a sceptre in the left, with the rod and sceptre both crossing the king's chest. The feet were shod in silk boots and sandals. In this way, the king was adorned with the regalia of his majesty and *pontificalibus*. *Pontificalibus* comes from *pontifex*, a word commonly translated as pope or, at times, a priest and the regalia thereof. However, in this case, it should be translated more literally as "bridge maker." By his anointment, much like a pope, the king was an intermediary between God and man. As Gieseey postulated in the case of Henry II, the manner of dress in death signified the king's function in life.<sup>46</sup>

Limited eyewitness accounts of kings and their grave goods exist. Thomas Wykes wrote that Henry III was shown wearing robes and a diadem during the funeral procession.<sup>47</sup> The

---

<sup>45</sup> *Liber Regalis*, 37.

<sup>46</sup> Gieseey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony*, 21.

<sup>47</sup> Thomas Wykes, "Chronicon," *Annales Monastici*, iv, edited by H.R. Luard RS, 36 (London: 1869), 252. Wykes appears to have been closely affiliated with the household of Richard of Cornwall, Henry III's brother. He may have seen the funeral procession, or he may have been involved with the household's preparations; see N. Denholm Young, "Thomas Wykes and his Chronicle," *English Historical Review*, 61, no. 240 (May 1946), 178.

robes were items also reported to have gone to the grave with the king in the accounts of the Great Wardrobe.<sup>48</sup> Wykes' account is used by only one later chronicle, John Capgrave's hagiographical *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, created for Henry VI.<sup>49</sup> Most writers were not intimate with the goings-on of the evisceration and embalming, nor the state of the corpse before complete enclosure. Henry III is somewhat of an oddity; kings were typically displayed to the inner circles of court, not the general populace. The exceptions to this were kings that been deposed and were being paraded by their successor to confirm the death.<sup>50</sup>

A more consistent source of grave goods (or lack thereof) is a post-medieval tomb opening. Tombs of medieval kings have been opened, some with more limited findings than others; if an embalming were less than ideal, the decay of the body would affect the decay of any cloth items. Conversely, a well-done embalming usually meant that the grave goods were also in recognizable condition. Edward I was found to be in an excellent state of preservation at the opening of his tomb in 1774, and the episode stands as good case study of embalming and surviving grave goods.

Edward I experienced a particularly long interim period between his death on 7 July 1307 and his burial on 27 October 1307, enclosed in his coffin above ground. As such, his embalming had to be superior in order to avoid incident. The reason for opening Edward I's Purbeck marble tomb in the late eighteenth century was to determine whether the king's body had been taken out yearly to have his cerecloth renewed.<sup>51</sup> Upon removing the inner coffin lid

---

<sup>48</sup> David Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 429-432, citing TNA E 372/116, m. 1v. My thanks to Paul Dryburgh for informing me of the jewel account's publication in *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III*, edited by Benjamin Wild. Pipe Roll Society, 58 (96) (London: 2012), 155. Carpenter's examination of the Great Wardrobe found that if an effigy was employed, the clothes it wore were eventually returned to the Great Wardrobe, while those worn by the corpse never made it back for obvious reasons. Henry III thus took all his clothes to the grave, while one set of Edward II's clothes (mantle, tunic, dalmatic, belt hose, shoes, cap, and spurs) made it back and the other (tunic, shirt, cap, gloves, and coronation coil) did not. Both sets are identified in TNA E 361/3, r. 8/16 as items used on the day of Edward's coronation.

<sup>49</sup> John Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, translated by Francis Charles Hingeston. RS, 7 (London: 1858), 101. Capgrave renders Wykes's account and eulogy of Henry III almost verbatim.

<sup>50</sup> See Chapter IV, 136-137, 141.

<sup>51</sup> Joseph Ayloffe, "An Account of the Body of King Edward the First, As It Appeared on Opening His Tomb in the Year 1774," *Archaeologia*, 3 (January 1775), 377-378. See Chapter VI, 223-226, for an exploration of this myth.

and the face covering, the antiquaries in attendance found that that the king's skin had tanned rather than rotted; eyewitnesses reported a deep brown colour.<sup>52</sup> Edward's facial features were distinguishable, though the nose had shrunk, and the glabella and lower jaw reportedly had sunk; his eyeballs were still palpable.<sup>53</sup>

Edward's regalia had also been preserved in superior condition. He wore a crown.<sup>54</sup> His hands were wrapped, finger by finger, and he held a sceptre and rod, though not adorned with an orb, as prescribed by *De Exequiis Regalibus*.<sup>55</sup> Because the fingers had likely shrunk over time, the investigators concluded that the ring had fallen off and was still likely in the coffin, though they elected not to disturb the body in an effort to find it.<sup>56</sup> His feet were covered by "figured gold cloth;" it could not be determined whether Edward wore any footwear, but his feet were felt to be intact.<sup>57</sup> Although some of the more delicately made items, such as his gloves, appeared to have deteriorated to dust, the vast majority of the body and grave goods of Edward I survived to at least 1774 and aligned with *De Exequiis Regalibus*' demands, including a coronation shroud and crown.<sup>58</sup>

The utilization of the *De Exequiis Regalibus* text can be confirmed within the English royal house. The evisceration and embalming were exacting, laborious processes which made it possible for the king's corpse to withstand exposure over the course of several weeks. This text was meant for a very select group of people: those who would be handling the king's body after death. They had to know the intended appearance of the king and what was buried with him as well. The presentation of the king's body to the lords was the final expression of his dominance over them. The regalia upon his corpse placed him firmly at the top of the

---

<sup>52</sup> Ayloffé, "An Account of the Body of King Edward the First," 382.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid, 384.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid, 385.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, 383 and 385; Ayloffé goes on at length stating that beyond the lack of orb, very few deviations from *De Exequiis Regalibus* were able to be determined.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid, 378. Ayloffé reports that the Dean of Westminster, Dr. John Thomas, was adamant that the tomb, body, and anything within the casket not be disturbed more than necessary or removed.

hierarchy. Until the 1440s, no other prescriptive text is known to have been created relating to the exequies of kings. Clearly, there was some anticipation of what came next for the royal corpse, or else there would not need to be such extensive preparations in *De Exequiis Regalibus*. The labours found in medical manuals would be unnecessary if the king was only anticipated to stay out of his tomb for a few days. When one examines the personal wills of kings, these expectations become much clearer.

### *The Personal Wills of Kings*

The personal will of a king expressed what he, as a private person, expected to be done after his death for himself and for those he left behind. Three kings are believed to have died intestate: Edward II, Edward V, and Richard III.<sup>59</sup> Others left wills that simply dictated where they were to be buried and attempted to make clear the transition of government, such as John<sup>60</sup> and Henry III.<sup>61</sup> Edward I's will left the destination of his corpse to his executors, being primarily concerned with settling his debts and caring for his wife Eleanor of Castile and their children.<sup>62</sup> Edward III dedicated most of his will to his grandchild and heir Richard, his surviving children, and his religious foundations;<sup>63</sup> the executors were entrusted with the rest of his estate. The only comments he had about his funeral and burial were that he was to be

---

<sup>59</sup> The young Edward V is very unlikely to have made a personal will. If Edward II or Richard III made a will, the paperwork was lost or deliberately misplaced by the succeeding governments.

<sup>60</sup> Stephen Church, "King John's Testament and the Last Days of His Reign," *English Historical Review*, 125, no. 514 (June 2010), 12-14.

<sup>61</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 15-16; Henry III left money and jewels to his son Edward, his wife Eleanor, the fabric of St Edward's shrine at Westminster, but his only demand as to his funeral and burial was to be buried at Westminster by the shrine of St. Edward. He acknowledged that he had originally chosen to be buried at New Temple, but he reiterated in his will that this choice was no longer valid. For the original decision for New Temple, see *CChR*, 1226-1257, 235, writ dated 6 July 1231. For the change to Westminster Abbey, see *CLR*, 1226-1240, 306, dated 23 October 1246.

<sup>62</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 18-21. Edward I made his will while recovering from an attempted assassination in 1271. This testament was never updated. Edward made clear his thoughts on the succession at a meeting at Amesbury in 1290; see Michael Bennett, "Edward III's Entail and the Succession to the Crown, 1376-1471," *English Historical Review*, 113, no. 452 (June 1998), 591; *Foedera* (Record Commission), i, pt. 2, 742.

<sup>63</sup> For the legal difficulties of this, see Chris Given-Wilson, "Richard II and His Grandfather's Will," *English Historical Review*, 93, no. 367 (April 1978), 320-337.

buried at Westminster Abbey with his forebears with little ostentation, though he did request that his tomb be well-lit.<sup>64</sup>

The nature of royal wills changed at the end of the fourteenth century. As a group, these later wills are less detached than their predecessors; they actively engage with the political scene at the time of their writing and became more individualized. The wills dated between 1216 and 1377 abide by a similar format and address the concerns of body, soul, and care for survivors, though on a grander scale than most. Although Edward I ordered debts to be paid using lands spread across England, Gascony, and Ireland, the basic function of such transactions was analogous to a common man's sale of his best cloak or horse to free his children and widow from debt. Beginning with Richard II's last testament of April 1399, politics became more prominent in the royal will, as did the king's opinion about his own exequies and commemoration.<sup>65</sup>

With the death of his wife Anne of Bohemia in 1394, Richard II seems to have become preoccupied with his death and burial. Part of this was due to the construction of a shared tomb for himself and Anne that began in 1395; it was complete before his deposition in 1399.<sup>66</sup> Upon reading his will from April 1399, one easily sees that Richard II had dedicated extensive thought to plans relating to his funeral. He was the first king to do this in a personal will, and his requests predated the second royal prescriptive text, the funerary section of *Liber Regie Capelle*, by fifty years.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 60. See Chapter IV, 158-159, for a contrast with his father, Edward II, who had no candles, and in Chapter VI, 211-212, his grandparents Edward I and Eleanor of Castile, who had a profuse number of candles.

<sup>65</sup> More attention will be paid to the commemorative elements of the wills in Chapter VI.

<sup>66</sup> In the last year of his reign, Richard II ordered the *gisants* to top the tomb for a sum of £100; *Issues of the Exchequer*, 270.

<sup>67</sup> As pointed out by Joel Burden, the wills of Richard II's father the Black Prince and uncle John of Gaunt addressed the visual appearance of their exequies. Burden, "How Do You Bury a Deposed King?: The Funeral of Richard II and the Establishment of Lancastrian Royal Authority in 1400," in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2003), 48-49. However, the Black Prince and John of Gaunt connected many of these visual elements to their personal votive and penitential sentiments, while Richard II's will places minimal emphasis on his soul. For the relevant sections of the Black Prince's will, see *A Collection of Wills*, 66-70; for the relevant sections of John of Gaunt's will, see *Testamenta Eboracensia*, i, edited by J. Raine, Surtees Society 4 (London, 1836), 224-226.

After the formulaic preamble, Richard requested burial in Westminster Abbey with his wife, Anne, in their shared monument.<sup>68</sup> He then explained his concept of a funeral done *in more regio*, in the royal way. First, he needed no fewer than four hersees for his body to rest under during the obsequies, with the involvement of at least two churches: St. Paul's London and Westminster Abbey, the latter receiving the best herse. The mention of the herse in royal prescriptive texts did not occur until the 1440s, but Richard and his progenitors had use of these funeral devices long before they became prescribed elements.<sup>69</sup> A herse was a wooden structure built within a church, before the high altar, to hold the coffin and numerous candles. The size varied based upon the status of the deceased.

If Richard died away from London, the procession carrying his body should cover a gruelling fourteen to sixteen miles per day if possible. Twenty-four torches were to be burning at all times during the liturgical hours and masses that were to be said at each stop, but once the funeral procession entered the capital, another hundred torches were to be added so that all of London would see it.<sup>70</sup> If Richard's body lay beyond sixteen miles, then the executors had to choose the four most important churches for the hersees to be set up in, each being equidistant from the next. However, if Richard died in Westminster and there was no need for a huge procession, only one very grand herse was required, and there should be four days of solemnities.<sup>71</sup> The last day should have the grandest exequies possible to compensate for the lack of grand procession.

The manner of dress of the king in *De Exequiis Regalibus* is not specific as to the colours and styles; this is characteristic of the prescriptive texts' flexible nature, as style and popular colours changed, and the king's personal taste had to be accounted for. Richard filled

---

<sup>68</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 192.

<sup>69</sup> Seymour Phillips, *Edward II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 553. Edward II had at least two hersees during his lying in state between September and December 1327, the second being grander and used at his funeral. See also Moore, "Documents Relating to the Death and Burial of King Edward II," 221-222.

<sup>70</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 193.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid*, 193-194.

in the gaps here, stating he wished to be buried in a robe of white velvet or satin, with a crown and sceptre without jewellery and precious stones, save for a ring on his finger valued at twenty marks.<sup>72</sup> He also specified that all Catholic kings should receive a gold cask or cup worth £45. It is unclear whether these items were to be sent out to other kingdoms, or whether these were for kings who might attend Richard's funeral.

Richard made very generous gifts to his close friends and advisors.<sup>73</sup> His servants were to receive his garments.<sup>74</sup> Isabella, his very young wife, was to have her jewels back if she survived him.<sup>75</sup> Westminster Abbey was to receive the first residuals of Richard's jewellery and circlets. Richard also set the budget for his funeral in his will of 1399: 6,000 marks, or £4,000, including transport to Westminster. This reveals the luxury he was envisioning; Edward IV's funeral in 1483 came to a total of £1,496 17s,<sup>76</sup> and it was only with the funeral of Henry VII in 1509, at a cost of more than £7,000, that Richard II's figure was surpassed.<sup>77</sup> Richard also ordered that lepers should receive alms, chapels should be given money to celebrate mass for him, and his servants should be paid for their service.<sup>78</sup>

Richard II then added clauses to this will that were circumstantial. The accoutrements of the royal chapel were to remain in Richard's successor's chapel as long as the will was adhered to, the executors obeyed, and relationships with all of Richard's adherents maintained.<sup>79</sup> Richard left £20,000 to his successor, as long as he maintained the statutes set out

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid, 194.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid, 196.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid, 199.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid, 199.

<sup>76</sup> *Registrum Thome Bourghier, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi AD 1454-1486*, edited and translated by F.R.H. Du Boulay. Canterbury and York Society, 54 (Oxford: 1957), 54.

<sup>77</sup> Ian W. Archer, "City and Court Connected: The Material Dimensions of Royal Ceremonial, ca. 1480-1625," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 71, no. 1 (March 2008), 161, suggests that Henry VII's funeral cost approximately £8,474 based upon the entries in TNA LC 2/1. Mark Duffy indicates a different disbursement, *Royal Tombs*, 284; Duffy estimates that Henry VIII spent about £7,000 on his father's funeral, while Henry VII endowed his Lady Chapel with over £21,000 to build and establish it, and £1257 6s 8d was spent on his shared tomb with his wife, Elizabeth of York. It is unclear how much overlap there is with the £60,000 spent to execute Henry VII's will; see above, 71, and the affiliated n. 3.

<sup>78</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 196.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, 195.



in September 1397, commonly referred to as the **Revenge Parliament**. The successor also had to maintain the statutes laid out in September 1398.

Here, Richard's will of his body natural crossed into the realm of the body politic. Maintaining the statutes set out in the **Revenge Parliament** was the business of the office of **King**, not the business of the mortal king Richard. The events of September 1398 require further explanation for placing the will in context. On 16 September 1398, Richard II halted a duel between Thomas Mowbray, duke of Norfolk and Henry Bolingbroke, exiling both of them. Mowbray was to be banished for life, Bolingbroke for ten years. Bolingbroke was promised that he would still inherit the lands of his father, John of Gaunt.<sup>80</sup> After Gaunt's death on 3 February 1399, Richard elected both to banish Henry for life and to disinherit him in March 1399.<sup>81</sup> This is the context of Richard's demands of April 1399: even if the successor refused to uphold the statutes of the **Revenge Parliament** and the exiles of Mowbray and Bolingbroke, the executors were given 91,000 marks to maintain the will of Richard II forever, to the point of death.<sup>82</sup>

Richard II's will stands out from those of his predecessors and also his immediate successor. Henry IV requested burial in Canterbury Cathedral and ordered a chantry chapel for his sake to be created there.<sup>83</sup> There were no demands for his appearance at his funeral, his procession, or his political agenda. Like the kings before Richard II, Henry IV was concerned with the welfare of his wife and children, discharging his debts, and preserving his soul. In contrast, Richard's will spells out the royal expectation for multiple heres in multiple churches, the clothes on the corpse, and the nature of the procession. It also brought the business of the body politic into the will by its circumstantial bequests.

---

<sup>80</sup> *CPR, 1396-1399*, 425, letters patent granted 3 October 1398.

<sup>81</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, "Richard II, Edward II, and the Lancastrian Inheritance," *English Historical Review*, 109, no. 432 (June 1994), 566-567.

<sup>82</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 197-198.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid*, 203.

The trend for the simpler royal will did not continue past Henry IV. The wills of kings during the fifteenth century made more far-reaching requests than those of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, though not in the same fashion as Richard II's last testament. Henry V created at least three documents that organized his affairs in the event of his death. The first two were created prior to excursions to France, and the last was created in France in June 1422, along with codicils added on his deathbed. The first, in 1415, was predominantly centred on the care of his soul.<sup>84</sup> Henry ordered thousands of masses to be said for his soul and made endowments to many of his foundations, particularly to Westminster Abbey. Henry detailed what masses were to be said and when. His is the first will to organize such meticulous religious commemorative activity. Henry V also requested a chantry chapel to be built over his body, resulting in the unique, elevated structure over the tomb in the east end of the Confessor's Chapel today. He also made gifts to his friends and family. However, the details of his funeral were left to the discretion of the executors, only requesting that the arrangements be suitable for a king's dignity. This implies some expectation as to the proper treatment of a king.

In a second will or arrangement dated 21 July 1417, Henry V was concerned about the passage of his lands to the proper people; his final resting place or his exequies were not mentioned.<sup>85</sup> In his final testament of June 1422, Henry again specified his choice of Westminster Abbey,<sup>86</sup> and he outlined how he wished to be commemorated through his chantry chapel, the founding of altars, and other foundations.<sup>87</sup> This latter part is rather extensive, as in the first will. Still, the funeral itself was still left to the discretion of the executors, only with a request that there were to be candles of three different sizes in his herse

---

<sup>84</sup> *Foedera* (The Hague), iv, pt. 2, 138-139.

<sup>85</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 236-242.

<sup>86</sup> Patrick Strong and Felicity Strong, "The Last Will and Codicils of Henry V," *English Historical Review*, 96, no. 378 (January 1981), 89.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid*, 90, 92, 93,

on the day of his interment.<sup>88</sup> Like his predecessors, the king settled his past debts,<sup>89</sup> provided for his widow,<sup>90</sup> and was generous to those dear to him.<sup>91</sup> In his codicils created two months later on his deathbed, Henry assigned further goods to his wife and son and attempted to put his son's house in some sort of practical, working order, including assigning custody of the boy.<sup>92</sup> This did go beyond the traditional bounds of the wills prior to Richard II.

Henry VI's will, made in 1447, is very unlike the others discussed above, including that of Richard II. His will focused on the business of establishing Eton and Cambridge, rather than his own final exequies and personal commemoration; Eton and Cambridge were his only legacy.<sup>93</sup> Despite having been married for over two years, no mention of his wife or anyone else in his personal circle is present. The will performs a singular function; one may speculate that Henry VI intended to create another, more traditional will thereafter, but by the arrival of his son in 1453, he had already suffered his first major psychiatric episode.

Edward IV's will of 1475 stated his desired place of burial: St. George's Chapel at Windsor Castle.<sup>94</sup> It then continued on to describe the tomb he desired: a grave in vault, whose covering stone was to have the figure of Death upon it, as well as the vital information of his life and death. Above the vault space and the figure of Death was to be a tomb with a silver (or copper) and gilt *gisant* or recumbent image of the king; this suggests the possible form of a *transi* tomb. The tomb was to be within Edward IV's newly founded chantry chapel, near to an altar.<sup>95</sup> The chapel was to hold thirteen people for divine services.

Edward then moved on to discuss the discharge of his debts.<sup>96</sup> In his provisions for his children, Edward discussed the proposed marriage schemes for each and how they should be

---

<sup>88</sup> Ibid, 91.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, 91.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, 93.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid, 94-96.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, 98-100.

<sup>93</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 291-319.

<sup>94</sup> *Excerpta Historiæ, or Illustrations of English History*, edited by S. Bentley (London: Samuel Bentley, 1831), 366.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, 367.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, 367-369.

carried through after his death; he was in the individual circumstance of creating a will at an age when he had children that could be married off.<sup>97</sup> After this, the management and possession of lands, as well as the continued progress at the works at Windsor, were discussed in a manner similar to Henry V's will.<sup>98</sup> The last part of the will contains the various instructions for the chapel and his commemoration.<sup>99</sup> Of note is the great deal of power Edward granted to his wife, Elizabeth Woodville, concerning the welfare and arrangements for the children after his death;<sup>100</sup> what actually occurred after Edward IV's death in 1483 clearly indicates that there was some sort of alteration or codicil to the will.<sup>101</sup>

Edward IV's will combines the core interests of the earlier royal wills, the visual features of Richard II's last testament (Edward being more concerned with his tomb rather than his corpse and procession), and the practical instructions pertaining to the management of the household and children (in Henry V's final will) as well as his foundations (in Henry V's final will and Henry VI's will). Such careful construction suggests that Edward IV understood, at least in broad terms, the content of his predecessors' wills. Though no mandated form for a royal will existed, Edward IV's last testament was a very useful template.

The final extant will of this period, Henry VII's, was created on 31 March 1509, weeks before his death.<sup>102</sup> He selected Westminster Abbey as his place of eternal repose.<sup>103</sup> Following the structure of Edward IV's will, Henry VII laid out his plans for his tomb. It was to be in his newly constructed Lady Chapel before the high altar and shared with Elizabeth, his wife,<sup>104</sup> who

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid, 369-370.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid, 371-372.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid, 373-376.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid, 378.

<sup>101</sup> See Chapter II, 59, n. 104.

<sup>102</sup> *The Will of Henry VII*, edited by Thomas Astle (London: T. Payne and B. Whit, 1775), 1. Margaret Condon newly transcribed the will in TNA E 23/3 to correct errors in printing in the 1775 edition. However, these edits do not alter the content pertinent to this thesis, so the more widely available 1775 edition will be used for pagination here. Margaret Condon, "The Last Will of Henry VII Document and Text," in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 99-140.

<sup>103</sup> *The Will of Henry VII*, 3.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid, 4.

had predeceased him in 1503; Henry requested that her body be moved from her temporary resting place to the new tomb. The tomb was to be made of touchstone, topped with the couple's figures of copper and gilt and with the dates of their lives and deaths. The tomb was to be surrounded with tabernacles or shrine niches with images, as well as a grate on all four sides.<sup>105</sup> All of these requests were to be performed if Henry had not already done so while alive.

The matter of funding for the completion of the chapel, tomb, and his funeral was addressed in the will;<sup>106</sup> Henry left the details to his executors. The will also discussed the commemorative requests and their funding rather extensively.<sup>107</sup> In an interesting comment, Henry VII ordered that even if, for some reason, he was unable to be buried in Westminster Abbey, the monastery should still carry out the commemorative elements ordered in the will.<sup>108</sup> The late king's debts were to be settled with all due speed.<sup>109</sup> Questions of land feoffment were also settled.<sup>110</sup>

Gifts and bequests to churches and religious orders were made.<sup>111</sup> Henry returned to the subject of the decoration of his new chapel, its altars, and the area surrounding his tomb, specifying the desired appearance and also requesting that his image be added to the shrine of Edward the Confessor.<sup>112</sup> Likewise, a similar image was to be placed at the shrine of Becket at Canterbury.<sup>113</sup> Henry VII also made rather extensive provisions for the marriage of his daughter Mary, his last unmarried child.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibid, 5.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid, 5-8.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid, 8-11; 13-21.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid, 11.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid, 11-13.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid, 22-27.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid, 27-33; 36-38.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid, 33-36.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid, 37.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid, 38-42.

Although longer than any other will,<sup>115</sup> Henry VII's will covers similar ground as those of his predecessors, though with intense attention to his tomb and chapel. Edward IV's descriptions and requests were not nearly as exacting. Again, it appears that Henry VII may have looked at the structure of his predecessors' wills, particularly that of his father-in-law, Edward IV.<sup>116</sup>

A clear series of developments occurred in the writing of the personal royal will. At first sight, the 1509 will of Henry VII bears little resemblance to the 1216 will of John, yet upon closer inspection, the concerns expressed in John's testament are addressed in Henry VII's. The significant difference lies in the wills from Richard II onward: they begin to make excursions over the line between the body politic and the body natural. Although any normal medieval father would expect to have a say in his children's marriages, the marriage of a royal child resulted in a political alliance, a matter for the body politic; while Edward IV and Henry VII as kings both expressed their desires regarding the management of their children, the political climate and the aspirations of their successors as the King of England ultimately caused their plans to be dashed.

Similarly, Richard II's oblique orders concerning Henry Bolingbroke were ultimately discarded. They likely would not have stood even if a normative succession had occurred, as they dealt in policy rather than personal business. From 1216 to 1509, the changes in the personal will of the monarch were a process of accretion, taking aspects and topics from other wills over the course of time to create larger, all-encompassing final testament. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the personal royal will took care of the basic obligations of most medieval men: a statement of their intended burial site, care for widows and children, resolution of debts, and, if possible, gifts to churches. By the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, there was a conscious effort to make comprehensive wills

---

<sup>115</sup> Henry's will runs about fifty pages, pending the typeset.

<sup>116</sup> Condon, "The Last Will of Henry VII," 112.

reflecting the diverse concerns of kings. However, there was no guarantee these items were followed by the living after the king's death.

That said, save for Richard II, kings left the exact funerary arrangements to their executors. As a result, there was an implicit elasticity in the management of the funerary and burial ceremonies in the personal royal will. Although kings had very particular ideas about their tomb and their commemoration,<sup>117</sup> they were more inclined to allow the living handle the immediate aftermath of their death.

The minutiae dictated in Richard II's will were not addressed in the extant prescriptive text, *De Exequiis Regalibus*. *De Exequiis Regalibus* dealt with the preparation of the body and its appearance prior to coffining. The second prescriptive text, the *Liber Regie Capelle*, was written c. 1449. *Liber Regie Capelle* contained the regulations for the Chapel Royal, but it also included greater detail as to the appearance of the actual funerary service and procession, details that Richard II addressed in his will of 1399.

### *The Liber Regie Capelle*

The funerary section of the *Liber Regie Capelle*, the book that governed the Chapel Royal's activity and lifestyle, continues the body's journey through the funerary mass. This particular segment also includes a transcription of *De Exequiis Regalibus*. Thereafter, the *Liber Regie Capelle* dictates the appearance of a funerary herse, the decoration of the church, the religious authorities in attendance, the nature of the hours and masses for the dead person, the non-religious royal rituals performed for the corpse, and lastly the procession to the burial church if needed.

Prior to the full funeral text, the *Liber Regie Capelle* has a small paragraph which dictates the expected dress of the attendees and the appearance of the chapel or church in

---

<sup>117</sup> This will be discussed in Chapter VI, 205-251.

cases of either a funeral or anniversary. The altars were to be covered in black, and the members of the Chapel were to be clothed in black cloth of gold or black velvet. Those in attendance, including the king and queen, were to wear black over their garments. If the body was present, then a herse was to be in the church as well.<sup>118</sup>

Much like *De Exequiis Regalibus*'s relationship with the funeral of Edward III, it is worthwhile to speculate whether the text in *Liber Regie Capelle* pertaining to the royal funeral was originally narrative in nature.<sup>119</sup> The source text may have been an account of Henry V's funeral in 1422; it only became prescriptive when it was written into the *Liber Regie Capelle*.<sup>120</sup> Evidence for this can be seen in the detail dedicated to military symbolism and extensive processions for a dead king who had to be transported some distance to his burial place.

In the case of Henry V (and most of his progenitors), the corpse had to travel *from* elsewhere *to* Westminster, where it was buried. Henry IV presents the unique case of dying at Westminster, having hours and masses said at the Abbey, and moving *from* Westminster *to* Canterbury and having hours and masses said there. The *Liber Regie Capelle* may have drawn on the events of Henry IV's funeral due to its arrangement (significant mass event, then carriage of the body elsewhere), but this cannot be conclusively proven due to a lack of narrative accounts. Henry V thus serves as the best illustrative example the events of *Liber Regie Capelle*, though not necessarily the earliest.

Henry V had died in France on 31 August 1422 near Bois de Vincennes. He was eviscerated and embalmed,<sup>121</sup> his bowels buried at Saint Maur des Fosses,<sup>122</sup> and then the body

---

<sup>118</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 7.

<sup>119</sup> Given-Wilson, "The Exequies of Edward III," 262; Given-Wilson also makes the valid point that some elements of the *Liber Regie Capelle* funerary text also made an appearance at the funeral of Edward III, such as the presentation of the achievements, 271-273. See also Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power, 1200-1400* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), 195-196, for the similarities between Edward III's tomb and the illustrations in *Liber Regalis* and *The Lytlington Missal*.

<sup>120</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 10.

<sup>121</sup> TNA E 36/266, f. 7v.

<sup>122</sup> Enguerrand de Monstrelet, *The Chronicles of Enguerrand de Monstrelet*, i, edited by Thomas Johnes (London: William Smith, 1840), 483-484.



was coffined to a high standard.<sup>123</sup> His corpse travelled from Bois de Vincennes through Paris, Rouen, Abbeville, Hesdin, Montreuil (Pas de Calais), Boulogne, and Calais in France,<sup>124</sup> and then Dover, Canterbury, Ospringe, Rochester, Dartford, and London in England,<sup>125</sup> each stop punctuated by the Office of the Dead and the three votive masses. This amounts to approximately 350 miles, including a crossing of the Channel. It must be remarked here that Henry at this point did have the option of being buried in France, as he was heir to the French throne. There appears to have been popular support for it,<sup>126</sup> but he maintained on his deathbed that he wanted to return to England. This desire to be buried in England will be further discussed in Chapter V.

Accommodations for kings that died far from their burial sites are made in the *Liber Regie Capelle* toward the end of the text. The king should be wrapped again in cerecloth, placed in a new wood coffin, and enclosed by a lead coffin.<sup>127</sup> This was to be covered with a white damask or satin cloth that had a red velvet cross on it. For some kings, this may have happened before the final funeral mass, particularly if he had to travel before reaching it. Being secured for travel, the body was to be placed in a chare, covered in black, with an effigy of the king on top of the one “that [was] enclosed.”<sup>128</sup> Both the effigy and the king were clothed for display. However, as discussed above,<sup>129</sup> the king was displayed to his lords prior to any procession; he was not necessarily shown in public. For Henry V, the coffin was sealed by the time it reached England, due to the long journey; only the effigy was visible.

Henry V’s funeral procession was remarkable in that it spanned France and England, but it was not abnormal that his body travelled far from his place of death to his burial site.

---

<sup>123</sup> *The Brut or The Chronicles of England*, ii, edited by Friedrich W. D. Brie. Early English Text Society, 136. (London: 1908), 430.

<sup>124</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 430; Monstrelet, *The Chronicles*, i, 484.

<sup>125</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 336.

<sup>126</sup> Thomas Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica majora of Thomas Walsingham*, ii, edited and translated John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011), 776.

<sup>127</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid*, 116.

<sup>129</sup> See above, 72-73, 81-82.

Edward I had died in Burgh-by-Sand in 1307, and his body was brought about 300 miles to Westminster via Waltham for burial; there appears to have been a drive by Edward I's heir and executors for him to be buried an assuredly English location, not one on the border. A logical supposition would be that the same preparations, precautions, and conduct applied to any the journey to the burial church. The description for the procession occurs toward the end of the *Liber Regie Capelle* text for the royal funeral and burial, but in the case of Henry V, the procession occurred first.

Henry V had his first night of offices and day of masses at Paris.<sup>130</sup> Votive activity was a part of the procession. The Office of the Dead was composed of the liturgical hours of Vespers, Matins or Vigil, and Lauds. Vespers and Matins had set times, dusk and midnight, respectively. Lauds had variation in timing. In monastic communities, Lauds was said after a break.<sup>131</sup> However, in the case of funerals, Matins and Lauds were always held consecutively, whether the location was secular or monastic, thus the habit of chroniclers referring to them as one service, *Dirige*. The following day, three masses were said for the soul of the deceased: the Mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mass of the Trinity, and the Mass of Requiem. The first two masses were always votive masses, meaning that they were offered as a gift or token to the Blessed Virgin and the Trinity. Typically, a reciprocal gift from these entities was expected; in the context of a recent death, the gift may be intercession or aid in expediting the soul's stay in Purgatory. The Requiem Mass, in the case of the procession or on anniversaries, was votive in nature as well,<sup>132</sup> but at the funeral, it was the final mass that preceded burial and had accompanying special prayers at the end.

---

<sup>130</sup> Monstrelet, *The Chronicles*, i, 484.

<sup>131</sup> John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: a Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 74.

<sup>132</sup> See Appendix Seven, 322.

For Henry V, the *Brut* records that he had his *Dirige* (Matins and Lauds) said at Rouen.<sup>133</sup> It is assumed that *Placebo* (Vespers) was celebrated as well. At each of the above mentioned stops in France and England, according to Monstrelet, the Office of the Dead and votive masses were offered for Henry V.<sup>134</sup>

At Calais, the body was met by Queen Catherine and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry Chichele.<sup>135</sup> Per the *Liber Regie Capelle*, the Archbishop – no particular see is specified – was the main celebrant of the final offices and masses on behalf of the king.<sup>136</sup> It is possible that the Archbishop was the officiant for the entire route in England and bishops and other priests assisted him. The *Liber Regie Capelle* states that the Chapel Royal was to lead those present in song and lesson “on the long and lamentable trail.”<sup>137</sup> Although the Chapel Royal had joined Henry at Agincourt in 1415 and Rouen in 1419,<sup>138</sup> there is no mention of its presence in the chronicle narratives. Its disposition for this very long procession is thus uncertain; the Chapel Royal may have only run the Office of the Dead on 6 November and the final masses on 7 November 1422 at Westminster Abbey, leaving the churches to supply their own choir and attendants for each stop.

Henry V had been embalmed, but it is unknown what if any grave goods were included in his coffin. His body was not displayed in England due to its long journey; it would take a tomb opening to determine whether he had obeyed *De Exequiis Regalibus*. His funeral therefore is more accessible through the *Liber Regis Capelle*'s prescriptive text for the royal funeral, which includes the long procession and the requirement of a funeral effigy.

The *Liber Regie Capelle* contains the first mention of an effigy in royal funerary prescriptive texts. The first documented effigy had appeared in 1327 at the exequies of Edward

---

<sup>133</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 430.

<sup>134</sup> Monstrelet, *The Chronicles*, i, 484.

<sup>135</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 430.

<sup>136</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 113-114.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid*, 113.

<sup>138</sup> W.H. Gratton Flood, “The English Royal Chapel under Henry V and Henry VI,” *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 10, no. 4 (July-September 1909), 564.

II.<sup>139</sup> Westminster Abbey still holds the physical evidence of Edward III's effigy from 1377.<sup>140</sup> Yet, it was only in the late 1440s that this detail was committed to prescriptive accounts of the royal funeral.<sup>141</sup> The funeral effigy was an element of some importance. Dressed in the king's robes, a crown was placed on the effigy's head and a rod and sceptre in its hands.<sup>142</sup> These items were the only mandated regalia for an effigy; there were no strictures as to what robes the king's effigy should wear. Henry V's effigy was robed, crowned, and held both a sceptre and a ball, "like a king," according to Edward Hall.<sup>143</sup> Monstrelet described the effigy as a painted leather figure, with a crown, sceptre, and rod.<sup>144</sup> The leather had been boiled, just as it would have been if used to create armour; this process gives leather short-term flexibility for moulding into the shape of a man. The leather can maintain the shape over time, but it becomes more susceptible to piercing and other damage. As such, it is unsurprising that this effigy did not survive the ages like its wooden peers at Westminster. While the construction of the effigy is never dictated in the prescriptive texts, wood seem to have been the preferred material to work with until the seventeenth century.<sup>145</sup>

The *Liber Regie Capelle* dictates that six or seven horses should pull the chare.<sup>146</sup>

Monstrelet witnessed Henry V's procession while it was still in France and reports only four horses.<sup>147</sup> This may have changed once the body reached England. The chare was to be

---

<sup>139</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, 553.

<sup>140</sup> Richard Mortimer, "The History of the Collection," in *The Funerary Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, edited by Anthony Harvey and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 31.

<sup>141</sup> The effigy will be further discussed later in this chapter, 106-109.

<sup>142</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114.

<sup>143</sup> Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle, containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods* (London: Printed for J. Johnson; et. al., 1809), 113.

<sup>144</sup> Monstrelet, *The Chronicles*, i, 484.

<sup>145</sup> Unfortunately, Westminster Abbey sustained severe water damage during the Blitz in 1941. This destroyed the straw, paper maché, and cloth parts of the effigies, leaving the wooden skeleton and heads. For information for the effigies prior to World War II, see W.H. St. John Hope, *On the Funerary Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England with special references to those in the Abbey Church of Westminster* (London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1907). For the effigies' restoration after World War II, see R.P. Howgrave-Graham, "The Earlier Royal Funerary Effigies," *Archaeologia*, 98 (January 1961): 159-169; Howgrave-Graham's diary on the restoration is found in WAM 64922.

<sup>146</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114.

<sup>147</sup> Monstrelet, *The Chronicles*, i, 484.

escorted at all times by twenty-four valets dressed in white with torches, and all accompanying lords were to be dressed in black. This matches Monstrelet's description of Henry's transport from Abbeville to Hesdin and onward toward Calais. The lords and the ecclesiastics of a given rank were to meet Henry's body before it entered the town and then escort it to the church for its offices and masses. According to popular legend, Edmund Lacey, bishop of Exeter, met the procession of Henry V on the porch of the Holy Trinity parish church in Dartford.<sup>148</sup> The *Liber Regie Capelle* reports that each church should receive a vestment and chalice,<sup>149</sup> probably to offset the costs of decoration, hurses, and candles.

This brings us to the actual beginning of the text in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. The hurses were set up at each stop in England for Henry V. This came at a cost of £300 12s 6d for eight hurses at Dover, Canterbury, Ospringe, Rochester, Dartford, St. Paul's in London, and Westminster.<sup>150</sup> The last herse at Westminster was more lavishly decorated than the others, so it is unlikely that they all cost the same. A similar occurrence can be seen with Edward III's hurses; the final herse at Westminster amounted to £50 16s 8d, while the immediately preceding one at St. Paul's was £11.<sup>151</sup>

In each church, the coffin was to be placed underneath the covered herse, decorated with black cloth, and surrounded by two rings of mourners, all of whom were clothed in black. The interior ring contained the queen and her ladies, and the exterior ring contained the lords of close relation and high rank. Beyond these rings were other nobles, "with two hundred or more torches in their hand," again all dressed in black.<sup>152</sup> Two hundred torches combined with several hundred sources of body heat, burning candles, and burning incense made for a hot

---

<sup>148</sup> This is a story iterated by Dartford's tourist information bureau, but it is not mentioned in the narratives of Henry V's procession, nor in George Oliver, *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter and a History of the Cathedral with An Illustrative Appendix* (Exeter: William Roberts, Broadgate, 1861), 100-104.

<sup>149</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 115.

<sup>150</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 336.

<sup>151</sup> W.H. St. John Hope, "The Funeral, Monument, and Chantry Chapel of King Henry the Fifth," *Archaeologia*, 65 (1915): 131.

<sup>152</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 112.

church. An embalming had the potential to fail under these conditions, a concern voiced by the physician Paré.<sup>153</sup>

The Archbishop, given his importance to the ceremonies, was to sit to the immediate right of the high altar corner, unless the service was in his own church, in which he would have a designated stall.<sup>154</sup> His entourage was to sit close to him, the Royal Chapel (if present)<sup>155</sup> in the lower stalls, and the other bishops in the upper stalls. Bishops also travelled with an entourage, though not as large or as dignified as that of the Archbishop; these clerics were expected to stand. The Archbishop and the bishops were also all dressed in black, including their mitres.

The *Liber Regie Capelle* describes Matins in some detail. The Office of the Dead has psalmody throughout, but only Matins has nine lessons or readings, taken from the book of Job. For the dead king's Matins, the bishops would read the first eight lessons, and the archbishop would read the last lesson, all "according to their order."<sup>156</sup> A more fitting translation here would be "their Use."

The readings from Job were set, but there was some measure of flexibility seen in the antiphons, responsorial psalms, and verses, as they varied by the Use employed. Viewing Appendix Three, the content of Matins diverges among the Uses at the second set of three lessons. There is consistency among the Roman, the Benedictine, and Westminster *ordines*.<sup>157</sup> The Sarum and Dominican rites correlate to each other in a similar manner.

The Old Testament and New Testament readings at the masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary varied; different parts of Mary's story in the Gospels and the supplementary readings of the prophets and epistles were read at different times of the year. Appendix Five illustrates

---

<sup>153</sup> Paré, *The workes of that famous chirurgion Ambrose Parey*, 1131-1132.

<sup>154</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 113. This comment suggests that this text is based off of Henry IV's funeral; at Canterbury Cathedral, the archbishop would have his own stall. However, there is lack of narrative evidence, and the archbishop's church could have been one of the ones en route to the burial church, as it was in the case of Henry V.

<sup>155</sup> This aside in the *Liber Regie Capelle* furthers the supposition on 94-95 of this work that the Chapel Royal was not present for the entire procession.

<sup>156</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 113.

<sup>157</sup> See Appendix Three, 316-317.

this.<sup>158</sup> As such, unless kings died in close geographical proximity at the same time of the year, no two kings had identical offices and masses.<sup>159</sup> Despite some differences in choice of psalmody, the Office of the Dead and the votive masses were not completely unrecognizable from one Use to another. It should be noted, however, that was enough difference from one Use to another that a particularly astute elite may have had preferences or opinions regarding them.

Unless the king died and had his exequies in the same location, he had multiple Uses employed during the liturgical hours and masses for which his body was present. Only Henry III can easily fit into this simpler mould, having died at Westminster Palace and being buried five days later at Westminster Abbey. Henry IV and Edward IV died in Westminster but elected to have their final exequies at Canterbury and Windsor. Edward I, Edward III, and Henry VII died elsewhere and came to Westminster Abbey; masses and Offices of the Dead were celebrated for them en route. Richard II and Henry VI had offices and masses said for them at Westminster, as well as at sites in between their places of death and initial interments at Dominican King's Langley and Benedictine Chertsey. John and Edward II died away from London, and their bodies were not transported there for masses; they were subject to the Benedictine Use at Worcester Priory and Gloucester Abbey. Likewise, Richard III was buried at Greyfriars' Leicester, so there is a reasonable expectation that any offices and masses followed the Roman Rite.

For the deceased Henry V, no fewer than four Uses are known to have been employed: those of Paris, Rouen, Sarum, and Westminster. Work on the French Uses is outside the realm of this thesis. The possibility does exist that the Roman Rite was also used, bringing the total Uses employed in 1422 to five. The *Liber Regie Capelle* does not dictate the Use for a king. What concerned the Chapel Royal more was that the full Matins of nine lessons was

---

<sup>158</sup> See Appendix Five, 319-320.

<sup>159</sup> See Appendices Two through Seven, 315-322.

carried out and that the Archbishop – or someone of suitable station – was the main president. The resulting appearance mattered more than the inner clockwork that had to occur for it to be possible.

Continuing onward in time, *Liber Regie Capelle* ends the combined service of Matins and Lauds with *Benedictus* and the censing of the king's coffin.<sup>160</sup> After the Offices of the Dead, it is suggested by *Liber Regie Capelle* that there was a communion service, as the archbishop administered the Eucharist and wine to those present of a certain station.<sup>161</sup> Thereafter, vigil was kept in the church throughout the night, which likely involved the guarding of the body as well as prayer. On the morrow, the three masses were celebrated. At each mass, an offering of gold cloth was to be made: sixteen for the first mass (the Blessed Virgin Mary), twenty-four for the second mass (Trinity), and thirty for the final mass (Requiem).<sup>162</sup> Lords of the blood were expected to make offerings of gold cloth as befitting their station, and they did so at Henry V's funeral.<sup>163</sup>

At this point, a chronological error seems to occur, much like that of *De Exequiis Regalibus*. Here, the *Liber Regie Capelle* describes a mounted horseman riding into the church at the end of Requiem mass. The horse was to have belonged to the deceased, and both the animal and the man were clothed in the arms and armour of the dead king.<sup>164</sup> This pair, at the step to the high altar, was to offer the banners that were used most often by the king – his personal arms, the banners of his personal saints, and his insignias *de guerre*. To fit with the rest of the *ordo*, the rider should have appeared at every Requiem mass, but then the text rights itself. At the end of mass when the body was to be buried, “another” soldier on

---

<sup>160</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114.

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, 113.

<sup>163</sup> Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle*, ii, 779. WAM 19664 reveals that cloths of gold, even for absentees, were offered for Henry V at his hours and masses. The most notable people absent from the exequies were the infant Henry VI and Catherine of Valois.

<sup>164</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114.



horseback arrived to offer the king's shield.<sup>165</sup> The arrival of the second is contingent upon the first, and the second only arrived when the body was being put into the ground; this did not happen at every stop. It should happen at the final Requiem Mass only.<sup>166</sup> This arrangement is borne out by the fact that only the burial churches kept and displayed the achievements of the deceased king.<sup>167</sup>

In a highly symbolic gesture, the shield and the arms of the second soldier were crossed, as if to say, *Consummatum est*.<sup>168</sup> The most famous speaker of this line is Jesus in John 19:30, as he died on the Cross. Christological symbolism was not foreign to English kings; the fiction of the king's two bodies,<sup>169</sup> the royal anointment, and the royal touch<sup>170</sup> reached for such connections. In turn, then, a lord received that shield and inverted it as if to say, *Vivit* (sic) *rex*, the king lives. This referred to not only the continued survival of the body politic or the office of the King, but also the transfer of the kingship to the new mortal body.<sup>171</sup> The order of service ends abruptly, stating that afterwards a solemn dinner was held for the guests. The actual burial service and prayers took place after the offering of the shield, though this is not explicitly stated by the text.<sup>172</sup>

The *Liber Regie Capelle* granted the flexibility for the king to choose his burial site by not constraining the Office of the Dead and the masses of the Blessed Virgin, Trinity or Requiem to a particular Use. The unaddressed goings-on in each Use, much like those of the embalming, were crucial to the final appearance, though not to the fulfilment of the prescriptive

---

<sup>165</sup> Ibid.

<sup>166</sup> Given-Wilson also assesses this section of *Liber Regie Capelle* in "The Exequies of Edward III," 271-272, as there is evidence that this part of the ceremony was first performed for Edward III in 1377. This strengthens the suggestion that *Liber Regie Capelle's* text was narrative rather than prescriptive in its initial forms.

<sup>167</sup> For Henry VI's achievements at Windsor, see C.R. Beard, "The Tomb and Achievements of King Henry VI at Windsor," in *Fragmenta Armamentaria, Volume II, Part 1*, edited by Francis Henry Cripps Day (Frome: Butler and Tanner, 1936). For the investigation of the achievements of Edward III at Westminster Abbey, see WAM 62481-62485; the sword and replica shield remain on display. For a full discussion of arms, see Chapter IV, 148-156.

<sup>168</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 115.

<sup>169</sup> Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

<sup>170</sup> Marc Bloch, *The Royal Touch*, translated by J. E. Anderson (New York: Dorset Press: 1961).

<sup>171</sup> See Chapter I, 18.

<sup>172</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 115.

texts' demands. As evidenced by Appendices Three and Five, by the varying liturgies, no king was likely to have had the exact same Matins and Mass of the Blessed Virgin. This was entirely acceptable by the loose constraints in *Liber Regie Capelle*.

In the early fifteenth century, the wills of kings began to express personal wishes as to the grandness of the royal obsequies and commemoration. By the middle of that century, those expectations became prescribed elements of the funerary and burial ceremony. The mortuary prescriptive text of *De Exequiis Regalibus* had its usefulness and necessity reaffirmed by the ceremonies described in the *Liber Regie Capelle*; gone were the days of John and Henry III, when a king was interred within five days of his death, unless something was amiss. Now he could reasonably anticipate lying out of the grave for weeks, numerous liturgical hours and masses being said for his soul. His body would rest underneath decorated hurses in several churches, accompanied by mourners that would pray and make offerings for his soul. Vast crowds would indeed turn out to see the procession, as anticipated by Richard II's will.

The preparations of *De Exequiis Regalibus* operated in the private, most intimate sphere. Though the evisceration and embalming may have been done by a stranger, the king probably was washed and dressed for the last time by the same servants who tended to him during his life and last days. The *Liber Regie Capelle*'s funerary section describes events that were seen by the family and other elites, but still managed by the Chapel Royal. This was a more formal, public sphere, but still not what the common person saw. Only the details relating to the procession – the six or seven horses, the twenty-four torches, and the funerary chare – were visible to those not entering the churches.

During the medieval period, both the servants of the king's chamber and the members of the Chapel Royal were in direct service to the king. As such, to this point in the royal prescriptive texts, the audience for the events of *De Exequiis Regalibus* and the *Liber Regie Capelle* was limited to the elite of society and their households. The final prescriptive text, the

Household Articles of Henry VII, focused upon managing the behaviour and dress of the guests, as well as the ordering of the procession.

*Articles Ordained by King Henry VII for the Regulation of His Household 31 December 1494*

The Household Articles offers an account similar to *Liber Regie Capelle*. However, its attention is on the people attending the exequies rather than the corpse and the activities of the king's Household and Chapel Royal. The Household Articles dictate the proper behaviour and activities for noble and royal funerals. The king himself may have attended the funeral of a lord, and even he was subject to the prescribed clothing. In this fashion, the Household Articles make indirect mention of the relationship between the traditions of the royal house and those of noble blood: they often borrowed from each other. Although the exequies of a king were meant to be on a grander scale, concepts such as the offering of arms were borrowed from the elite, just as effigies eventually found their way into non-royal funerals.

The Household Articles of Henry VII which contain funeral information are found in BL Harley MS 642 and BL Harley MS 6079, with minor differences.<sup>173</sup> As in the funeral narratives of Edward IV, *De Exequiis Regalibus* in Latin is inserted at the beginning of the article pertaining to the royal funeral. Both versions of the Household Articles then address the transportation of the body to the burial site at the beginning of the text, unlike *Liber Regie Capelle*. BL Harley MS 642 states that the corpse was to be placed in a new coffin covered in white damask with a red velvet cross on top, with the cloth both wide and long enough to completely cover the coffin.<sup>174</sup> BL Harley MS 6079 calls for English damask instead of white, stating that the damask should be long enough to cover the chest.<sup>175</sup> An effigy should be placed

---

<sup>173</sup> See Chapter I, 25-26, for a discussion of the Articles and the difficulties of dating them, with the associated footnotes as to alternative versions which lack the funeral information.

<sup>174</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 130.

<sup>175</sup> BL Harley MS 6079, f. 25v

on the coffin wearing the robes that the person wore when crowned or created; princes should wear their circlets. The coffin and effigy were then to be placed in a chare, covered in black with the sides rolled up so that the effigy was visible. The chare was to be led by six horses and riders, the first wearing the arms of St. George. The rest should have worn the various arms of the deceased, with the highest rank appearing last.

The arrangement of the lords for the procession is similar to that found in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. All should be wearing their robes of estates and hoods, with a minimum of twelve torches to greet the body upon its arrival to the church, though sixteen or twenty-four was also acceptable, depending on rank.<sup>176</sup> The church bells were to be pealing as the body was brought into the church to rest overnight, whilst at least twelve knights and squires kept watch; vigil here is explicitly identified as guarding the body.

There was an expectation of a stop for the liturgical hours and masses at every town the corpse went through, as written in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. For Matins and Lauds, forty-eight torches were needed for “a great duke;”<sup>177</sup> a king clearly could expect more. This continued each night for the duration of the procession toward the burial site. Again, as stated in the *Liber Regie Capelle*, the church was to be given gifts for its troubles, specified in the Household Articles as a book, a bell, a testament, and a chalice.<sup>178</sup>

Kings were likely to have multiple hersees (and normally did), but since this prescriptive text was created to apply to nobles of varying degrees, some may have been able to supply only one, the burial site herse. The description of the herse, its draping, and the two-ringed arrangement around the corpse is nearly identical to that found in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. After the description of the herse, the Household Articles state what the king should be wearing if in attendance.

---

<sup>176</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 130.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid*, 131.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid*, 130.

And if the king be in presence he must have a traverse of blue on the right hand of the quire, and to have on his robes of blue; and if he have on his mantle, he must have his hood laid on his shoulder, fastened on the one side with an owche [brooch] of gold, his cap of estate of blue on his head, and his sceptre in his hand; and if he wear not his robe, he must have his hood slived about his neck; his cap of estate on his head; his sceptre in his hand; and the chamberlain to bear his train.<sup>179</sup>

It is established here that the mourning colour for royalty was blue. This particular custom was certainly in use before the issue of the Household Articles in 1494. Edward IV wore blue at his father's re-interment at Fotheringhay in 1476.<sup>180</sup> In 1492, after the death of her mother Elizabeth Woodville, Elizabeth of York took to wearing blue; Margaret of Anjou did the same when her mother died in 1453.<sup>181</sup>

Margaret Beaufort, Henry VII's mother, is believed to have written a text regarding the appropriate dress of ladies in procession by station. The higher the rank, the longer the trains on the surcotes and mantels with hoods and tippetts. The queen would wear the longest of these, decorated to her preference with black or red satins and ermine fur; the queen mother had similar privileges.<sup>182</sup> Thereafter, the length and permitted customization of clothing was curtailed by rank; from the Beaufort text, the reader can infer the perceived proper order of precedence and in what order the women were expected to walk. After the queen and the queen mother came the king's unmarried daughters and aunts, then duchesses, countesses and duke's daughters, baronesses and earl's daughters (who lose the train entirely), and lastly lord's daughters and knight's wives. Initially, the BL Additional MS 45133 text stated that gentlewomen and esquires' wives were to be considered of the same rank as lords' daughters. However, the words "chief" and "the bode" were inserted before each of these words, respectively, with the text continuing on to state that the rest of the gentlewomen should wear

---

<sup>179</sup> Ibid, 130-131.

<sup>180</sup> Anne Sutton and Livia Visser Fuchs with P.W. Hammond, *The Reburial of Richard, Duke of York, 21-30 July 1476* (London: The Richard III Society, 1996), 18; BL Additional MS 45131, f. 24r, reports that the Richard of York's effigy was also clothed in blue.

<sup>181</sup> BL Arundel MS 26, f. 30r.

<sup>182</sup> BL Additional MS 45133, f. 141v.

slopes or cotehardies with hoods. Beaufort also expressed a steadfast opposition to the wearing of “beekys.” In this discourse on fifteenth and early sixteenth century mourning fashion,<sup>183</sup> the procession was ordered by rank. A later rendition of the order inserts marchionesses (“marquesses” in the text) after duchesses.<sup>184</sup> The copy found in BL Harley MS 1354 notes the need for women to wear wimples or barbs over their chins and throats, the height of which was also determined by rank.<sup>185</sup> A unique feature of the BL Cotton MS Tiberius version is the inclusion a paragraph that indicates that errors in the ordering of one’s rank was no reason to be disruptive.<sup>186</sup>

Returning to the original text of the Household Articles, after *Dirige*, the estates were to retire and then return for the funeral mass the next day. The Household Articles only state one mass, and this should not be surprising; the only Church-mandated mass for a deceased person was the Requiem. The Masses of the Blessed Virgin and the Trinity were votive, acting as a jump-start in aiding the deceased’s soul in Purgatory. The noble or his family had to be able to afford any additional masses and the expected offerings thereat. The Household Articles state that the king or the highest ranking male was to offer first – this likely refers to the cloths of gold described in the *Liber Regie Capelle*.<sup>187</sup> The liberate and issue rolls of the Exchequer record Henry III’s cloth of gold offerings for his deceased grandchild Katherine as well as Edward III’s for the Earl of Hereford and the Countess of Arundel.<sup>188</sup>

Thereafter, the queen, the women of estate, the mother of the king, and the lords of estate were to exit the herse’s bars and offer, in that order. At a king’s funeral, the heir

---

<sup>183</sup> Phillis Cunnington and Catherine Lucas challenge that the fashions described by Margaret Beaufort were unfashionable for the time. They label some items, such as the cotehardie and surcoat, as “antiquated” and “old-fashioned,” because of the definitions included within the text itself; they interpret the definitions’ presence as the author needing to define it for contemporary audiences. Cunnington and Lucas, *Costume for Births, Marriages, and Deaths* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1972), 208 and 210.

<sup>184</sup> BL Harley MS 1776, f. 8v.

<sup>185</sup> BL Harley MS 1354, f. 12r. See also Cunnington and Lucas, *Costume for Births, Marriages, and Deaths*, 211.

<sup>186</sup> BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, f. 161v (old 202v). See Chapter IV, 127-128 for a discussion of this paragraph.

<sup>187</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 115.

<sup>188</sup> For Henry III, see *CLR, 1260-1267*, 143; For Edward III, see *Issues of the Exchequer*, 189.

apparent, be it the king's son or brother, was to go last and alone.<sup>189</sup> Again, much like the *Liber Regie Capelle*, the Household Articles end abruptly, stating that after the offering, all but those closest to the deceased should leave the corpse to be buried by the bishop.

The Household Articles seem particularly disjointed compared to the unified activity presented in *De Exequiis Regalibus* and the *Liber Regie Capelle*. This can be attributed to the great emphasis placed upon the sights and sounds of the funeral procession, which were what people of any station could see. Outside the royal and elite circles, people in the streets would have seen a coffin covered with a white or English damask cloth with a red velvet cross on it in a funeral chare with a the great procession of many lords attending it. They would have heard the church bells and seen others of suitable station making their way to the church.

In contrast, prior prescriptive texts were intended for an audience far more familiar with the king. The heir apparent may have seen his father at his deathbed and after the corpse was prepared for burial. A lord of the blood may have seen the body prior to its enclosure in the coffin. Only those closest to the royal house saw the body before, during, and after the procedures of *De Exequiis Regalibus*. Someone slightly lower on the social scale would have participated in the procession, funeral, and burial without seeing the body. Those not inside the church did not see the full enactment of the rituals of the *Liber Regie Capelle*. The Household Articles were meant for this broad audience. When read with the other two prescriptive texts, the Household Articles do not contradict anything previously said. This reflects an awareness of the other texts written for the royal funeral.

### *Conclusions*

The royal prescriptive texts operated easily within the confines of mortuary science and the local Use. Ralph Giesey's assessment of the French royal funeral is strikingly useful here:

---

<sup>189</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 131.

The funeral of a French king was always, in some respects, the same as the funeral of any other Christian: a procession led by the clergy and followed by relatives and friends, and a religious service performed by the clergy. All the superstructure of the symbolic attachment of sovereignty to the corpse or effigy, and the final graveside disbanding of the household of the dead king and proclamation of the new king,<sup>190</sup> was appended to the essentially religious rites. ‘Appended’ is the proper word for there was never any real fusion of the secular and religious elements.<sup>191</sup>

In the case of the English royal funeral, it must be remembered that *De Exequiis Regalibus* and the *Liber Regie Capelle*, while kept in custody of religious bodies, did not demand special liturgical elements. Their distinguishing features were secular: embalming, effigies, presentations of arms, processions, etc. There were no special religious words created for these parts of the ritual. In fact, immediately before the burial, the majority of guests abandoned the king’s corpse to the Archbishop and went off to dinner; it is questionable whether the final prayers for the body’s interment were heard by anyone other than the ecclesiastics.

Although the royal prescriptive texts were tempered by the Office of the Dead (nine-lesson Matins, for example) and the masses on the day of burial, they did not fuse and become the King’s Office of the Dead or the King’s Masses. Some Uses did have prayers for the king to be said at Requiem Masses, but these are found among prayers for men, women, paupers, members of a religious order, donors, founders, and other characteristics or occupations that would call for special intercession.<sup>192</sup> Broadly speaking, royal funerals did not demand any special favours from the Church; no rules needed to be bent, nor were dispensations required. What made them exceptional was the money spent upon secular elements and how grand they were compared to a common person’s funeral.

The royal house could afford to have hundreds attend a funeral, to offer gold cloths, to gift items to churches, and to have masses in addition to the Mass of Requiem said for the

---

<sup>190</sup> During the time period covered by this work, this was only performed at the funerals of Edward IV and Henry VII.

<sup>191</sup> Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony*, 29.

<sup>192</sup> For example, *Breviarium ad Usus Insignis Ecclesiae Sarum*, ii, edited by Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1879), 521ff.



departed. It could also afford an embalmer to maintain the deceased king's body through the exequies, enabling processions that were increasingly long in distance and lavish funerals that were long in duration. There were no limits to the royal funeral (or a noble one), as long as the money was to be had; no element of the royal prescriptive texts flew against contemporary ecclesiastical styles, nor was anyone imprudent enough to test the limits of embalming, save perhaps Edward IV in his obsequies for Henry VI.<sup>193</sup> Even though Richard II's demands were highly specific, they broke no tradition, Church law, or natural limit to his preservation. Rather, the urgency in getting his corpse to London reflects his awareness of the limits of embalming.

That said, the funerary and burial ceremonies of kings also had unique characteristics that kept them above other nobles on the social ladder and made their exequies the final assertion of their status. Such nuance is evident in the Household Articles and its supplemental text from Beaufort; the number of torches, the amount of cloth of gold offered, and the order of the procession were affected by the rank of the deceased. Yet, documentary evidence exists of the king offering cloth of gold at noble funerals from the thirteenth century and earlier. The Household Articles of 1494 were not innovative in this aspect; before 1494, nobles attended the funerals of kings, but kings also attended the funerals of those beneath them, and all parties were expected to behave appropriately.

*De Exequiis Regalibus* and the *Liber Regie Capelle* detail ritual measures that had been in use for a considerable period before they were recorded. Richard II's will, which came between these two texts, considered processions, hereses, and multiple churches to be the established royal way. If the royal prescriptive texts were inflexible, the same funeral would be re-enacted for each monarch rather than new traditions and rituals developing; the King's funeral would always be the same and override the wishes of the mortal king.

---

<sup>193</sup> See Chapter IV, 128-131 and 137-138.

By the nature of the prescriptive texts, a royal funeral “by the books” was a highly adaptable, flexible creature; it could cope with and normalize the circumstances of a king’s death. Kantorowicz theorized that the king’s two bodies – the mortal king and the office of King – could be clearly delineated. This does not work in the context of the royal funeral: the forgiving nature of the prescriptive texts meant that they often gave way to mortal considerations and preferences, blurring the lines between the King and the king so as to make a successful funeral. This feature will be further pronounced in the next chapter.

The elastic and non-contradictory nature of the English royal prescriptive texts fostered the invention of traditions. These new ritual activities fit in with other older traditions and reflected their ideals. In the words of David Cannadine, they appeared to be “ancient” and “time-honoured” but in truth, they were innovative efforts to reassert the current monarch’s continuity with his dignified and revered forebears.<sup>194</sup>

One visual example of an invented tradition is the use of a funeral effigy. This wooden, life-size replica of the recently deceased king should not to be confused with a tomb effigy, the permanent stone or metal image that rests atop the deceased’s tomb; the latter shall be referred to as a *gisant*. As mentioned above, the first documented use of an effigy in England was at the funeral of Edward II in 1327.<sup>195</sup>

The effigy’s exact purpose has been debated amongst scholars with no easy consensus. Phillis Cunnington and Catherine Lucas suggest that the effigy was initially only displayed for bodies that could not themselves be displayed, due to time or circumstance, such as Edward II (long duration outside the grave) and Richard, duke of York (his reburial lacked an entire, preserved body to display fourteen years after his death).<sup>196</sup> In contrast, Carlos Eires believes

---

<sup>194</sup> David Cannadine, “The Context, Performance, and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the ‘Invention of Tradition’, c. 1820-1977,” in *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by E.J. Hobsbawm and T.O Ranger (London: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 108.

<sup>195</sup> See above, 99.

<sup>196</sup> Cunnington and Lucas, *Costume for Births, Marriages, and Deaths*, 173, 176, 179.

that England and France used effigies to represent the *persona ficta* of the royal dignity as “a means of easing the transition of power.”<sup>197</sup> Ralph Giesey, however, states that while the effigy initially acted as a stand-in for the royal body in both realms, it was only in France that the effigy became the focus of ceremonial attention and a representation of the royal dignity.<sup>198</sup> Ralph Griffiths agrees with this assessment; France’s use of the effigy prolonged the rule of the dead king until he was buried. In England, although ceremonial activity was performed around the effigy, the power passed to the king’s successor the day after the king died; by the mid-fifteenth century, this power passed at the moment of death.<sup>199</sup> Chris Given-Wilson offers the idea that, in England, the effigy represented the king at death (Edward III’s effigy had a pulled lip to reflect his debilitated state) but its splendour also reminded those present of how great he had been.<sup>200</sup> Books have been written about the philosophy and nature of the royal funeral effigies; these are but a few arguments to illustrate the depth of debate.

As pointed out by W.M. Ormrod, the dressing of the effigy in Edward II’s coronation garb (or at least part of it) and its possession of royal accoutrements emphasized the dead king’s status as a legitimate king of England.<sup>201</sup> If Edward II was undisputedly legitimate, then his son, Edward III, was legitimate as well. Edward II was embraced to reinforce the validity of his son’s reign, just as Henry VI and Richard III were rejected to legitimize their successors.<sup>202</sup>

The effigy continued in the funeral of Edward III (d. 1377) but it did not persist in the funerals of Richard II (d. 1399) and Henry IV (d. 1413). Richard II had been deposed, and

---

<sup>197</sup> Eires, *From Madrid to Purgatory: The Art and Craft of Dying in Sixteenth-Century Spain* (Cambridge University Press: New York, 1995), 358.

<sup>198</sup> Ralph Giesey, “Models of Rulership in French Royal Ceremonial,” in *Rites of Power*, edited by Sean Wilentz (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 46; see also R.C. Finucane, “Sacred Corpse, Profane Carrion: Social Ideals and Death Rituals in the Later Middle Age,” in *Mirrors of Mortality*, edited by Joachim Whaley (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1981), 47.

<sup>199</sup> Ralph Griffiths, “Succession and the Royal Dead in Later Medieval England,” in *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c. 1000-c. 1600*, edited by F. Lachaud and M. Penman (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 104.

<sup>200</sup> Given-Wilson, “The Exequies of Edward III,” 267.

<sup>201</sup> W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 69.

<sup>202</sup> See Chapter IV, 144-146.

his funeral, while respectably carried out, lacked the usual ostentation reserved for kings;<sup>203</sup> there was no funeral effigy for him though there had been one for his wife five years prior in 1394.<sup>204</sup> Henry IV's funeral is notoriously under-documented. J.H. Wylie attempted to recreate the obsequies in his *Life of Henry IV* through information on other funerals of English kings and nobles,<sup>205</sup> but even in his narrative, Wylie makes no mention of an effigy. Chris Given-Wilson excluded an effigy in his document-based arrangement of the exequies; it is doubtful that Henry IV had one.<sup>206</sup>

With the death of Henry V, the English nobles in France likely realized that Henry's body, even with the best embalming by the royal physicians, would not withstand exposure during the journey from Paris to Calais to Dover to London. The English tradition of viewing the royal body (established 1189) would be impossible for lords not already present in France. Thus, the newer tradition of an effigy (established 1327, last used 1377) was resurrected and implemented in 1422. The revival of this custom in the great funerary pageant was enshrined in *Liber Regie Capelle*, where it became a prescribed element of the royal funeral, despite only being used three times beforehand.

Of the kings during the period 1216-1509, five had effigies (Edward II, Edward III, Henry V, Edward IV, and Henry VII), with only one of these kings being deposed. Of the eight that are believed not to have had an effigy, (John, Henry III, Edward I,<sup>207</sup> Richard II,

---

<sup>203</sup> Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399-1422* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 104; Burden, "How Do You Bury a Deposed King?", 50.

<sup>204</sup> Julien Litten, "The Funeral Effigy: Its Function and Its Purpose" in *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey* edited by Anthony Harvey and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), 5.

<sup>205</sup> J.H. Wylie, *History of England Under Henry the Fourth*, iv (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898), 111-113. W.H. St. John Hope dismisses this section of Wylie's work, calling it "for the most part his own invention." Hope, *On the Funeral Effigies*, 19.

<sup>206</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *Henry IV* (London: Yale University Press, 2016), 519-521.

<sup>207</sup> There appears to be a recent tradition of stating that there was a wooden effigy temporarily placed on the tomb of Edward I, possibly as a stand-in for a *gisant* that was to be placed; Phillips, *Edward II*, 131; Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 566. Prestwich cites Aylofffe's account of the exhumation of Edward I in 1774. Aylofffe refers to one of the surviving medieval wood effigies ("the Ragged Regiment"), and he identifies it as Edward I's effigy by virtue of Pierre Langtoft's description via the translation by Robert of Bourne. W.H. St. John Hope points out in *On the Funeral Effigies*, 13, that Robert of Bourne had added extra information to Langtoft's original description, "creating" an effigy; Aylofffe (and those who have used him as a source) did not know this. Based upon the description of the effigy's construct and height in Aylofffe's article, the

Henry IV, Henry VI, Edward V, and Richard III), three predate the 1327 innovation (John, Henry III, and Edward I). The remaining kings that did not have effigies were also not buried initially at Westminster Abbey; save for Henry IV, all of these kings had been dethroned.

After Henry VII, out of eleven succeeding monarchs until George I, only two monarchs did not have effigies at their funerals: Charles I and James II. Both lost their thrones through deposition or conquest, denying them the typical dignities reserved for monarchs.<sup>208</sup> The obsequies of these kings, with the addition of the earlier Richard II, Henry VI, Edward V, and Richard III, lend credence to the idea that an expression of political disorder (current or historic) often manifests in disrupted rituals.<sup>209</sup>

An effigy at a royal funeral was an innovation that became a tradition. Other singular events at a given royal funeral may have been poised to become traditions, but they did not always take hold. Likewise, unexpected circumstances surrounding a king's death or even at the funeral itself may have caused certain adjustments to be made. Exceptional behaviour or activity at traditional events tends to be reported more readily than the commonplace happenings. These faults tended to remain in the minds of those recounting events. Deviations from the royal prescriptive texts were noticed, whether just because they were different from the accustomed agenda, or because there were consequences for not abiding by the strictures set forth by mortuary arts, the Church, or the accepted normative behaviour at funerals. This brings us to the next chapter.

---

wooden effigy he saw was likely Edward III's. As such, the possible effigy mentioned by Phillips and Prestwich does not exist.

<sup>208</sup> Charles I and James II lie beyond the scope of this work.

<sup>209</sup> Richard Huntington and Peter Metcalf, *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 164.

#### Chapter IV: Ceremonial Disruption and Deviation

The royal prescriptive texts provided a general structure and outline for the funeral of a king. The phrasing was vague in order to allow the king's executors to handle the aftermath of the death as they saw fit. In *De Exequiis Regalibus*, the exact methods to eviscerate and embalm the body were not specified, allowing for a more refined process to be utilized at a later time. Likewise, the *Liber Regie Capelle* remained open to various Uses, permitting the king to be buried anywhere; no music or readings were specified that restricted this. The Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Trinity, and the Requiem had to be said. The Mass of the Blessed Virgin had several seasonal variations, but the *Liber Regie Capelle* allowed for a king to be buried at any time of the year. The last prescriptive text from the Household Articles of Henry VII and its addenda by Margaret Beaufort were more concerned with order and conduct; the technical elements may have been covered by the previous two texts, but the Articles sought to control the human element.

The variations of the royal funerary and burial ceremonies were caused not only by practical matters changing - be it the embalming technique or local Use - but also by changes in fashion and traditions. As seen with the innovation of the funeral effigy at the end of Chapter III, the royal funeral and burial activities changed to suit the individual circumstances surrounding the death of a king. Repetition of such innovations created lasting traditions, some of which were committed to the royal prescriptive texts. However, the new ritual activity did not stagnate when it entered the prescriptive texts; details which made it relevant to a particular monarch changed with each iteration. The royal funeral never happened in a vacuum; it was receptive to the ever-changing world around it.

The elasticity of the royal prescriptive texts continues to be a theme in this chapter, which addresses the known deviations from the texts and the measure to which they were disruptive. The first section will address the known points where events went beyond the

ability of the prescriptive texts to compensate and normalize; the elastic band snapped, and the funeral should have stopped. When the funeral did not stop, it usually meant that other factors were at play, mitigating the severity of the error. The most salient and important elements of the royal funerary and burial ceremonies could not be altered without serious consequences.

As such, the second section of this chapter will investigate the elements that tested the prescriptive texts' elasticity, but did not break it. Not every broken rule had disastrous, evident results. Gauging the impact of deviation will demonstrate the innate value of certain passages of the texts, while also indicating other aspects that were nullified with little consequence. The goal of the prescriptive texts was to provide the deceased with a funeral and burial appropriate to his station. What must be considered is whether the dead king's station had changed before or at his death. If it had, the successor may have felt little obligation to follow the royal prescriptive texts; the dead man no longer fit into the exequies for a king.

Ambivalence on the part of the succeeding regime also existed in these cases; the new king may not have been certain of the former king's exact station. Both rejection of the old king and mixed feelings toward him were manifested in variations within the ceremonies themselves. The ambiguity of a king's status as well as a liberal interpretation of the prescriptive texts led to a wide range of appropriate funerary and burial ceremonies. This will be discussed also in the second section. Changes in location of interment resulting from these factors will be discussed in Chapter V. Long-term reactions to the exequies will be discussed in Chapter VI, dealing in commemoration. In some cases, the dissatisfaction with the initial exequies and commemoration resulted in a reburial, which will be discussed in Chapter VII.

The third and fourth sections of this chapter will look at the deliberate changes in the royal funeral that fit easily within the bounds of the prescriptive texts. Some customs fell in and out of practice over the centuries, such as heart burial. Other ritual items, while taking on the guise of being ancient traditions, were new innovations and only became true "traditions" with

repetition.<sup>1</sup> The effigy was one example, already discussed.<sup>2</sup> The presentation of arms was an expression of the exchange of status symbols between the royal house and elites, confirming the royal house as being above all others but also remaining part of a hierarchy; it was not untouchable and separate. Similarly, the activities of other royal houses were conveyed to the English royal family, and vice versa; the fourth section will discuss the exequies of Edward II with mind to the influence of French practice. A definite sense of rivalry existed between the royal houses in terms of how sumptuous and how well-executed their ceremonies were; one must act royally to be considered royal. These markers of status formed aspects of English royal identity and tradition in relation to domestic and foreign spheres of influence. The royal prescriptive texts retained their elasticity while remaining receptive to external forces, strengthening both their relevance and utility over the centuries.

The previous chapter used limited case studies that were selected according to their completeness in conformity to the written prescriptive texts. A blow-by-blow account of all royal funerals is unnecessary; most funerals happened without incident and with little commentary from the witnesses. With caution, it can be concluded that the prescriptive texts were highly effective at what they did, creating successful ritual events that were so “normal” (or normalized) that there was no need to gossip about them or express dissatisfaction.

In contrast, there will be more case studies used here than in the previous chapter. Good funerals were all alike; every bad funeral was bad in its own way. Funerals that went without comment were successful, even if they did not have perfect compliance. They ultimately fulfilled their function. The successful, text-compliant funerals from the previous chapter can be painted with a broader brush and illustrated with fewer examples. In contrast, less successful funerals had unique errors or deviations from the prescriptive texts that attracted

---

<sup>1</sup> David Cannadine, “The Context, Performance, and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the ‘Invention of Tradition’, c. 1820-1977,” in *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by E.J. Hobsbawm and T.O. Ranger (London: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 105-106, 122, 136-137.

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter III, 122-125.



attention. The focus should have remained upon the deceased and his status, not the fumbling of those in attendance or the lack of quality in executing the funeral. Due to the adaptive nature of both the prescriptive texts and the court, mistakes were singular events and not repeated at the next funeral. Each misstep needs to be assessed based upon both the rarity and individuality of each incident.

### *Disruptive*

No specific rule from a prescriptive text could be applied to one of the most dramatic disruptions at a funeral. The prescriptive texts have no instruction for what to do if someone dared to be late or start a brawl at the royal exequies. Anne of Bohemia died on 7 June 1394. Her funeral was delayed by two months, occurring on 3 August, so as to give her a funeral worthy of being a king's wife and the daughter of an emperor.<sup>3</sup> The later *Liber Regie Capelle* states that a queen was to be treated with the same pomp as the king.<sup>4</sup> As such, Anne's funeral was splendidly prepared and executed, save for one incident. Richard II, Anne's husband, struck and bloodied the Earl of Arundel, Richard Fitzalan. Arundel had arrived late and was attempting to leave early, displeasing the king. Richard II's action triggered an immediate evacuation of Westminster Abbey. The church had to be re-solemnized; blood had been spilt on holy ground.<sup>5</sup> The event went beyond the imagination of the prescriptive texts' writers.

As with his treatment of Edward III's death scene,<sup>6</sup> chronicler Thomas Walsingham left the reader with information that proved that he did have intimate knowledge of the matter at hand. Walsingham provided the reader with the exact timing of the transgression - at the beginning of the funerary masses, likely during the Mass of the Blessed Virgin, before the offertory. There were three masses plus the burial rites to be said for Anne, and cleaning and

---

<sup>3</sup> Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres*, xv, 137.

<sup>4</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 115; queens were to receive the same quality of exequies as kings with similar conduct.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica majora of Thomas Walsingham*, i, edited and translated by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 960-963.

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter II, 57-59.

resolemnizing the church would take hours; if the incident did happen as Walsingham wrote it, then the timing is accurate for a nightfall finish.

But did it happen?

This version of Anne of Bohemia's funeral comes from three of Walsingham's histories. The story was a late addition to Walsingham's works, written well into the reign of Henry IV.<sup>7</sup> It first appeared in the short history "Annales Ricardi Secundi Regis Angliae." Here, the Earl of Arundel did nothing to deserve such a strike.<sup>8</sup> In "Historia Anglicana," the incident was also reported.<sup>9</sup> It is only with Walsingham's "Ypodigma Neustriae," written for Henry V in 1419, that Arundel did something offensive. This tempers the narrative in favour of Richard II.<sup>10</sup> Historians who study Richard II, including Anthony Goodman<sup>11</sup> and Richard G. Davies,<sup>12</sup> accept that events occurred as Walsingham reported them. The incident is absent from Nigel Saul's *Richard II*, as noted by George B. Stow in his review of the book.<sup>13</sup> However, it is present in Saul's entry on Anne in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.<sup>14</sup> Chris

---

<sup>7</sup> George B. Stow, "Richard II in Thomas Walsingham's Chronicles," *Speculum*, 59, no. 1 (January 1984) 82-83. Stow gives this story's appearance the date of c. 1408. The editors of *St. Albans Chronicle*, i, believe that "Annales Ricardi Secundi" was written contemporaneously in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 7 (2) and completed no later than 1400, xxxii. However, they derived their version of Anne's funeral from a different manuscript, BL Cotton MS Faustina B IX, lxx. The BL Cotton MS was written c. 1420, and the story bears little resemblance to the original entry in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 7 (2). It is closer to the version in "Ypodigma Neustriae," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, vii, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1876), 366. Riley had associated the BL Cotton MS with "Historia Anglicana" rather than "Annales Ricardi Secundi," publishing it in *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, iii, RS, 28 (London: 1866), 423, as an interpolation to the 1863-4 edition of "Historia Anglicana," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, RS, 28. I thank Chris Linsley for drawing my attention to this debate.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Walsingham "Annales Ricardi Secundi," 168-169; Stow, "Richard II," 90-91. Stow discusses the variations in Anne's funeral story among "Annales Ricardi," "Historia Anglicana," and "Ypodigma Neustriae" as part of the transition from Richard II to Henry IV to Henry V.

<sup>9</sup> Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 2," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1864), 215.

<sup>10</sup> Walsingham, "Ypodigma Neustriae," 366. James G. Clark points out that these titles are not necessarily the names given to these documents by Walsingham, but rather added by later printers; as such, these are used for utility in distinguishing versions, rather than reflecting any original intent of the author; Clark, "Thomas Walsingham Reconsidered: Books and Learning at Medieval St. Albans," *Speculum*, 77, no. 3 (July 2002), 833.

<sup>11</sup> Anthony Goodman, *The Loyal Conspiracy: The Lords Appellant under Richard II* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), 62. Goodman only spares a sentence for the incident, moving on to Arundel's stay in the Tower, his oath and fine, and the expedition to Ireland.

<sup>12</sup> Richard G. Davies, "Richard II and the Church," in *Richard II: The Art of Kingship*, edited by Anthony Goodman and James L. Gillespie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 90.

<sup>13</sup> George B. Stow, "Book Review: Nigel Saul, 'Richard II,'" *Speculum*, 74, no. 2 (April 1999), 496.

<sup>14</sup> Nigel Saul, "Anne (1366-1394)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/555.

Given-Wilson also accepts that the event occurred, putting it in context with Richard's other reported episodes of anger, including a prior one involving Arundel.<sup>15</sup>

In previous commentary on changing narratives,<sup>16</sup> it was pointed out that chroniclers over time would alter their writing to better suit the regime, using stories to illustrate grander concepts and problems afflicting the realm, sometimes in retrospect. Here, the story changed several times to suit the attitude of the ruler toward his predecessor. Henry IV's success as a king partially rested on the memory of Richard II's poor performance,<sup>17</sup> and tales such as this reinforced that concept. Henry V was far more favourable toward Richard II than Henry IV was.

No other writer reports this story. The chroniclers chose to focus on the memory of the good Queen Anne,<sup>18</sup> the honourable nature of her funeral,<sup>19</sup> or the coincidental deaths of the wives of Lancaster and Derby instead.<sup>20</sup> Saul refers to these compliments and favourable descriptions of the queen as "no more than conventional."<sup>21</sup> The only narrative at odds with this is that of Walsingham, with his addition of the Arundel incident in the three chronicles abovementioned.

Perhaps Anne of Bohemia's funeral went perfectly, with all the torches and mourners she deserved. The tension between her husband and his nobles, however, was undeniably

---

<sup>15</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, "The Earl of Arundel, The War With France, and the Anger of King Richard II," in *The Medieval Python: The Purposive and Provocative Work of Terry Jones*, edited by R.F. Yeager and Toshiyuki Takamiya (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012), 27-28. Given-Wilson considers that while other reports of Richard's violence may not be true, Richard II had certainly assaulted Arundel at least twice, including Anne's funeral.

<sup>16</sup> See Chapter II, 51, 58-59, 64, 75-76.

<sup>17</sup> Joel Burden, "How Do You Bury a Deposed King?" in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2003), 37.

<sup>18</sup> *The Brut, or The Chronicles of England*, ii, edited by Friedrich W. D. Brie. Early English Text Society, 136 (London: 1908), 348; Robert Fabyan, *The New Chronicles of England and France*, edited by Henry Ellis (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, et. al., 1811), 539.

<sup>19</sup> Adam Usk, *Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421*, edited by Chris Given-Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 19; Froissart, *Oeuvres*, xv, 136-137.

<sup>20</sup> *The Westminster Chronicle, 1381-1394*, edited and translated by L.C. Hector and Barbara F. Harvey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 521; John Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, edited by Francis Charles Hingeston. RS, 1 (London: 1858), 258.

<sup>21</sup> Saul, *Richard II*, 455.

growing. The story reflects this, embodying the situation in the confrontation between Richard II and Arundel. It also offers literary foreshadowing to the events of 1398 and 1399. In the final recension of the story, although Arundel had acted dishonourably, the mass was not a complete loss until Richard II drew blood in a church. Though the Lancastrians had an ongoing conflict with Richard, it was not until the king acted out of order and deprived Henry Bolingbroke of his inheritance that the situation ended in disaster.<sup>22</sup>

Antonia Gransden has suggested that Walsingham was given access to official records by Henry IV, particularly those referring to Richard II's deposition in order to write his histories.<sup>23</sup> He likely was able explore beyond those bounds. In a letter close, Richard II ordered the arrest of Arundel on 3 August 1394, the day of the funeral.<sup>24</sup> However, the exact cause of his imprisonment was not recorded, not even when the earl was released on 10 August on £40,000 bond and made to swear an oath of loyalty.<sup>25</sup> Given the late inclusion of the tale in Walsingham's works, it is worthwhile to consider that Walsingham created the funeral fight to suit the circumstance of Arundel's imprisonment in early August 1394. He initially crafted a story that made Richard appear irrational and cruel for Henry IV, only to revise that story for Henry V in the context of that ruler's sympathy for Richard; in the latter form, Richard II was rightfully upset that the earl had arrived late and planned to leave early, though his response was inappropriate.<sup>26</sup>

Although this story may remark upon the present circumstances of the kingdom more than actual events, it furthers the point that people outside the royal house had certain expectations for funerals. They would be aware of improper conduct or something going

---

<sup>22</sup> See Chapter III, 97.

<sup>23</sup> Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Paul Kegan, 1982), 140.

<sup>24</sup> *CCR, 1392-1396*, 307.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*, 368.

<sup>26</sup> Further information on Walsingham, his writing, and reconsiderations thereof can be found in V.H. Galbraith, "Thomas Walsingham and the St. Albans Chronicle 1272-1422," *English Historical Review*, 47 (1932), 12-30; James Clark, "Thomas Walsingham Reconsidered: Books and Learning at Medieval St. Albans," *Speculum*, 77, no. 3 (July 2002), 832-860.

wrong. Walsingham did not need to explain why the events at Anne of Bohemia's funeral were aberrant; his audience understood that such behaviour was not acceptable at a funeral, even without knowledge of the prescriptive texts.

The heralds describing Edward IV's funeral had to be more instructive, as the disruption at that king's funeral in 1483 was decidedly more refined. The funeral also marked the implementation of a new style of the offering of arms.<sup>27</sup> In both the English<sup>28</sup> and the French<sup>29</sup> accounts of the exequies, an altercation occurred between William, Viscount Berkeley and Thomas Fitzalan, Baron Maltravers during the offering of achievements.<sup>30</sup> The two men disagreed upon who should walk on the right-hand side to receive the shield of the king. The English account offers no resolution. Anne Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs identify three connections that could have promoted Maltravers over Berkeley, causing him to argue that he should walk on the right. Maltravers was the eldest son of an earl (Arundel), brother-in-law to the king by virtue of his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville's sister Margaret, and a blood relative of the king through the Nevilles. The French account states that the lords decided that Maltravers outranked Berkeley by being the eldest son of an earl.

The offering of arms and the general arrangement of estates in the herse and procession were established traditions by the time of Edward IV and had been committed to text by 1449 in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. However, the organization was vague: *juxta status suos*, according to their status.<sup>31</sup> This was deliberate: the order of precedence was constantly being changed, and the royal prescriptive texts accommodated this.<sup>32</sup> Between 1399 and 1483,

---

<sup>27</sup> See below, 156-164.

<sup>28</sup> BL Egerton MS 2642, f. 187r; London, College of Arms MS I.7, f. 8r, which has been printed in Anne F. Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs with R.A. Griffiths, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York at Windsor* (London: Richard III Society, 2005) 39, and *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII*, i, edited by James Gairdner. RS, 24 (London: 1861), 9; BL Additional MS 45131, f. 29.

<sup>29</sup> London, College of Arms MS Arundel 51, f. 15v, printed in Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 42 (in French) and 44 (in English).

<sup>30</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 28.

<sup>31</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 113.

<sup>32</sup> These orders were compiled in Charles G. Young's "Ancient Orders of Precedency," a tract dated to 1850. It is in a bound collection at the British Library, *Heraldic Tracts 1835-1895*. The orders were likely drawn from

there were no fewer than three such orders issued,<sup>33</sup> the latest being in June 1479 with the first inclusion of the new rank of viscount. This order, written by Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers, states that a viscount outranked a baron, but the eldest son of an earl outranked a viscount by one rank.<sup>34</sup>

There is little evidence that this order of precedence was used at any funeral before its inclusion at Edward IV's funeral.<sup>35</sup> Edward's son George had died and was buried in March 1479, predating this order by over two months.<sup>36</sup> There was no line of nobles to receive the achievements as there would be at Edward IV's funeral; there was only a knight offering himself, the achievement helmet and shield, and his horse.<sup>37</sup> In the limited account of the funeral of Edward's daughter Mary in May 1482, no heraldic offering was made at all.<sup>38</sup> As a result, the first use of Earl Rivers' order of precedence in conjunction with an offering of arms was probably at Edward IV's exequies in 1483, with the positioning of the new rank of viscount causing disruption. After Edward IV's reign, orders of precedence continued to be issued in both the reigns of Henry VII<sup>39</sup> and Henry VIII.<sup>40</sup>

---

London, College of Arms Vincent MS 151, based upon the description of the manuscript in *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the College of Arms*, i, edited by Louise Campbell and Francis Steer (London: College of Arms, 1988) 380-381.

<sup>33</sup> The first was a list of ranks issued in either the last year of Richard II's reign or the first year of Henry IV's reign in 1399 with the inclusion of the new rank of marquess; Young "Ancient Orders," 3. The second was for Henry VI's coronation in his eighth year as king in 1429, Young, "Ancient Orders," 5. There was an order of precedence written by John Tiptoff, but it deals in the order of a procession from least to greatest, stopping at the rank of baron; it is questionable whether this is as authoritative as the previous two or the one to be written by Earl Rivers; Young, "Ancient Orders," 7-8.

<sup>34</sup> Young, "Ancient Orders," 9.

<sup>35</sup> The order may have been employed at the baptism of Edward's youngest child, Bridget of York, in November 1480 and then at Elizabeth Woodville's subsequent churching. Neither event employed such a coordinated ceremony as the offering of arms, however.

<sup>36</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 49.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 52-53.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 65.

<sup>39</sup> Written by Jasper Tudor, duke of Bedford and entitled 'Series ordinum omnium procerum magnatum et nobelium et aliorum quorumcunque infra hoc regam, tam virorum qua foeminarum, posita et distincta per nobilissimum Japerum Ducem Bedford, et alios nobiles appunctuationed domini Regis Henrici VII,' appearing in Young, "Ancient Orders," 11.

<sup>40</sup> Found in BL Harley MS 1776, f. 11r, with the inclusion of a rule that states that the order of precedence was set, unless the lower-ranking person was of the royal blood, in which case he could move up one rank in the procession.

One recension of Margaret Beaufort's text on funeral attire may have remarked upon the problem of precedence. In 1502, Arthur Prince of Wales died, followed in the next year by his mother, Elizabeth of York. There had not been a royal funeral since Edward IV in 1483, as Elizabeth Woodville had declined her queenly honours in 1492.<sup>41</sup> With increased royal funerary activity and the declining health of Henry VII himself,<sup>42</sup> Beaufort may have taken care to avoid the problems of Edward IV's funeral.

BL Additional MSS 45131, 45132, and 45133, scribed by Thomas Wriothesley, are contemporary with the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII; Additional MS 45131 has an early copy of the narrative of Arthur Tudor's funeral,<sup>43</sup> while Additional MS 45133 has an early version of the Beaufort prescriptive text.<sup>44</sup> As described in Chapter III,<sup>45</sup> Beaufort's text describes what a lady of each rank should wear during mourning, starting with the queen and descending down the court hierarchy. Historian Michael K. Jones argues that this text may have been updated c. 1507,<sup>46</sup> which would explain why some copies include more ranks and a section on barbs in the same writing style as the original. One such copy is the damaged BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII.<sup>47</sup> The Cotton MS has a unique paragraph that is not present in other copies. It is appended to the end of the description of barbs. Parts of it are still legible, referring to the wearing of the king's coat of arms and the order of precedence. The end of the fourth line of this paragraph states, "dyshonestye the wyirse might be dyshoner to hys blood."<sup>48</sup>

The paragraph continues for another two lines with the officers of arms, the corpse being led to the church, and the comings and goings of gentlewomen. The left half of all six

---

<sup>41</sup> See below, 148.

<sup>42</sup> S.B. Chrimes, *Henry VII* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1977), 313-314.

<sup>43</sup> *The Recept of Ladie Kateryne*, edited by Gordon Kipling. Early English Text Society, 296 (London: 1996), lx.

<sup>44</sup> Michael Jones and Malcolm G. Underwood, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 187.

<sup>45</sup> See Chapter III, 117-118.

<sup>46</sup> Jones and Underwood, *The King's Mother*, 187.

<sup>47</sup> *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts in the Library of the College of Arms* (London: Printed by S. and R. Bentley, 1829), 62, describes it as an earlier copy than London, College of Arms Arundel MS 35, though it is not the earliest, as discussed above.

<sup>48</sup> BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, f. 162r (old f. 203r).

lines of the paragraph has been burnt away, but the fourth line may be a reference to the disruption at Edward IV's funeral, which Beaufort likely either attended as part of the queen's household or had heard of thereafter. It would have been better for Viscount Berkeley to be in the wrong position of rank (dishonesty) than disrupt the funeral (dishonour). It appears that the text would have continued on the folio's verse, but this has been lost.

In the funerals of Anne of Bohemia and Edward IV, there is evidence that the royal prescriptive texts were strayed from, resulting in disrupted exequies. These incidents stopped the funeral and were noticeable by those outside of the most intimate royal circles. If Walsingham's version of Anne's funeral is accurate, the error was so outlandish that it was never repeated for any unfortunate king or queen; one did not need to have a codified guide to understand the problem. In the case of Edward IV's more technical disruption, the vagueness of the funerary texts created the problem, and the constantly changing order of precedence exacerbated it. Margaret Beaufort, in her addenda to the Household Articles, may have indicated that it would have been better to acquiesce to improper placement rather than argue the error. Even without the burnt paragraph, her work on mourning attire substantiated the order of precedence within the context of a funeral. The prescriptive texts grew over time as writers added solutions to problems encountered, as the texts were intended to be tools with which to handle the difficulties of a grand funeral.

In contrast to a violation that created a rule, there were also violations that proved the rule. Poor adherence to the embalming stipulations in *De Exequiis Regalibus* provided at least one example as to why they were necessary. The interval between Henry VI's death and burial in 1471 was only three days, as he died at the Tower of London. Henry was paraded with an



open visage, so that he could be identified.<sup>49</sup> According to *Warkworth's Chronicle*, Henry, while confined, left blood on the ground once at St. Paul's and once at Blackfriars.<sup>50</sup>

Present in medieval culture was the idea of cruentation, wherein a perceived victim bled in the presence of his murderer. It was considered a powerful indicator of guilt in courts until the eighteenth century. A legend associated with Henry II states that the newly deceased king bled in the presence of his son Richard, with whom he had a strained relationship and who was considered to be the cause of his death.<sup>51</sup> Henry VI theoretically bled in the presence of the pro-Yorkist courtiers and the royal house. Bleeding after death was also considered a sign of a martyr, and Henry VI quickly acquired a saintly following.<sup>52</sup>

With such loaded meanings behind the post-mortem bleeding of Henry VI, it is easy to dismiss the report of blood as pro-Lancastrian propaganda. Putting the incident into the context of medieval efforts at preservation produces a different result, however. The "bleeding" of Henry VI may have been the result of a hasty, short-shrift embalming. The royal prescriptive text had been discarded.

The costs of Henry VI's embalming were low, as most of the money designated for his funeral was for the guarding of the corpse. Only £15 3s 6½d, given to Hugh Brice, was set aside for clergy, cloth, spices (the item that implied embalming), torches for the escort to St. Paul's and to Chertsey, and other items, such as the unmentioned embalmer himself.<sup>53</sup> There was an additional payment of £9 10s 11d to Richard Martyn for twenty-eight yards of Holland linen and other items related to Henry's exit from the Tower, including the soldiers' salary for

---

<sup>49</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London*, edited by A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley (London: George W. Jones at the Sign of the Dolphin, 1938), 220.

<sup>50</sup> Thomas Warkworth, "Warkworth's Chronicle: A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth," edited by James Orchard Halliwell, in *Three Chronicles of the Reign of Edward IV* (Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1988), 43.

<sup>51</sup> Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, ii, edited by William Stubbs. RS, 51 (London: 1869), 367.

<sup>52</sup> Eamon Duffy, *Stripping the Altars: Traditional Religion of England, 1400-1580* (New York, Yale University Press, 1992), 161. See also Chapter VII, 279-288.

<sup>53</sup> *Foedera* (The Hague), v, pt. 3, 4; *Issues of the Exchequer*, 495-496; *English Historical Documents, Volume III, 1189-1327*, edited by Harry Rothwell (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1975), 318-319.

escort. In 1377, £21 had been spent solely upon the embalming of Edward III.<sup>54</sup> Considering only a portion of the abovementioned sums went toward embalming, it is clear that Henry VI's embalming cost less than Edward III's. The procession, funeral, and burial of Henry VI was a speedy affair of three days; the exequies did not stop to rectify the leaking coffin.

The hard evidence for a poor embalming lies in the eyewitness report of the opening of Henry VI's tomb at Windsor in 1910. The bones were lumped into a heap with no order. Due to this disorder in the coffin, Henry's body likely had been disarticulated when it was transferred to Windsor in 1484;<sup>55</sup> alternatively, if he was not embalmed well, he may have been falling apart after thirteen years.

The condition of the bones indicated that they had been in an earthen grave.<sup>56</sup> No mention of a lead coffin in any account of Henry VI's initial burial has surfaced; the lead coffin he was found in was likely part of the transfer process in 1484.<sup>57</sup> Thus, being interred only in a wooden coffin, Henry partially returned to earth. This would explain not only the absence of Henry's right arm bones, but also the accidental inclusion of a pig's bone in the casket.<sup>58</sup>

The poor condition of Henry's bones partially reflect the initial lack of a lead coffin – a measure recommended by contemporary medical texts<sup>59</sup> and the prescriptive texts the *Liber Regie Capelle*<sup>60</sup> and later the Household Articles.<sup>61</sup> His exposure to the populace of London, the financial accounts, and the presence of tissue and hair clinging to the skull indicate that

---

<sup>54</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, "The Exequies of Edward III and the Royal Funeral Ceremony in Late Medieval England," *English Historical Review*, 124, no. 507 (March 2009), 264. Edward III is used here due to the known exact figure. Other funeral accounts, such as those of Richard II, tend to include embalming expenses with other items. How these expenses were divided up is unknown.

<sup>55</sup> W.H. St John Hope, "The Discovery of the Remains of King Henry VI in St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle," *Archaeologia*, 62, no. 2 (January 1911), 536.

<sup>56</sup> Hope, "The Discovery of the Remains of King Henry VI," 537.

<sup>57</sup> Hope, "The Discovery of the Remains of King Henry VI," on 539 cites Account Roll xv. 34, 60, stating that Henry VI's translation cost £5 10s 2d.

<sup>58</sup> Hope, "The Discovery of the Remains of King Henry VI," 537.

<sup>59</sup> See Chapter III, 85-77, 105.

<sup>60</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 113-114.

<sup>61</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 130.

Henry VI was embalmed, though poorly.<sup>62</sup> The body did not withstand the centuries or even the days before burial.

For comparison, fellow dethroned king Richard II's bones were described as being in "near perfect" condition and dry by surgeon Charles Sangster, one of Dean Stanley's companions during the tomb's 1871 opening.<sup>63</sup> Numerous strange objects had been stuffed into the holes in Richard and Anne's shared lead casket, and both lower jaw bones had been stolen at some point.<sup>64</sup> The casket was lead, but clearly not air-tight. Despite this, Richard's bones were well-preserved, and Anne's were only remarkable by their absence. Thomas Tuttebury of the King's Wardrobe received £66 13s 4d on 17 February 1400 for the handling of Richard's corpse; this is already over double the total cost of Henry VI's initial funerary and burial expenses. Henry IV paid out further sums for the body's transport, masses, and other commemorative activity.<sup>65</sup>

The similarities between Richard II and Henry VI, two dethroned kings, have been remarked upon,<sup>66</sup> but here, they clearly differ: Richard II was embalmed far better than Henry VI. Henry VI had a low-budget embalming and a wooden coffin that did little to preserve him. If we accept this premise, then the blood seen at St. Paul's and Blackfriars may not have been a tale spun by Lancastrian partisans.

---

<sup>62</sup> Hope, "The Discovery of the Remains of King Henry VI," 537. Macalister believed that Henry had been buried in earth, which would imply he saw evidence of insect activity, fungal involvement, animal disruption, or some other contaminating factor that would accelerate decomposition.

<sup>63</sup> Arthur P. Stanley, "On an Examination of the Tombs of Richard II and Henry III in Westminster Abbey," *Archaeologia*, 45, no. 2 (January 1880), 323.

<sup>64</sup> Stanley, "Henry III and Richard II," 314-315 and 326 and 327; Aidan Dodson, *The Royal Tombs of Great Britain* (London: Duckworth and Co., 2004), 72. Richard's jaw was eventually returned in 1905.

<sup>65</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 275.

<sup>66</sup> For the problems of their extended minorities, see J.L. Watts, "The Counsels of King Henry VI, c. 1435-1445," *English Historical Review*, 106, no. 419 (April 1991), 279-298. For certain elements missing from their funerals as a sign of political disruption, see Richard Huntington and Peter Metcalf, *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 164; for an alternative interpretation, see Philip Lindley, *Gothic to Renaissance: Essays on Sculpture in England* (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995), 110. For the motives of their reburials shared by Henry V and Richard III, see C.R. Beard, "The Tomb and Achievements of King Henry VI at Windsor," in *Fragmenta Armamentaria, Volume II, Part 1*, edited by Francis Henry Cripps Day (Frome: Butler and Tanner, 1936), 351-352.

The corruption of Henry VI's corpse in public and the lack of any remedial action violated the spirit of *De Exequiis Regalibus* in its provisions for proper embalming and for giving the king a fitting funeral and burial. The ceremonies continued regardless, and the old king was interred within days of his death. Unlike the funerals of Anne of Bohemia and Edward IV, the exequies did not stop to correct the problem. The disparity between Edward I's corpse (the example used in Chapter III to illustrate compliance with *De Exequiis Regalibus*) and Henry VI's corpse bring us to the element of status when considering adherence to the royal prescriptive texts. If a king had been removed from office, what royal funerary rites should he have had? The question was not an easy one to answer.

In the medieval English royal house, there was no male analogue to the king's mother, the queen dowager. Nor was there ever a widower king whose son took the throne by virtue of his mother's claim while his father lived. Such settlements had been established for Mary I in the Act for the Marriage of Queen Mary to Philip of Spain of 1554 and for Mary II in the Bill of Rights of 1689, but their marriages were childless. In practice, those arrangements would have been alien to Plantagenet kings, who were most familiar with male primogeniture. A king who was not king at the time of his death presented a problem for those arranging his funeral. Considering that it had been felt necessary to take him out of power and strip him of his status as king in life, there was an understandable measure of uncertainty as to whether he should be awarded such honours in death. Certain changes had to be enacted to reflect his new station – whatever it was. A successful funeral was tempered by and accepting of external elements, including a king who was not the King at his death.

Not all out-of-the-normative events were as extreme as the examples above. The royal prescriptive texts were vague and flexible enough to accommodate a wide variety of events. This included breaks with the prescriptive text. The texts' function was to normalize and make royal funerals manageable, not to generate anxiety over trifles. If the change did not

compromise the dignity of the exequies or the deceased, then it was more likely to be permissible and less likely to be considered a misstep.

### *Deviant?*

The fact that Henry IV was irregularly arranged in his coffin in 1413 was hidden until his tomb opening in 1832. Upon the opening of his tomb, the king's skin had tanned rather than rotted, and it was possible to identify him by his likeness to his *gisant*.<sup>67</sup> After confirming Henry IV's presence, the tomb was closed up with no assessment of the regalia or positioning of hands or feet.<sup>68</sup> The exterior of his lead coffin, however, provided a clue. The casket was shaped to accommodate hands clasped upright in prayer. This indicates that Henry IV's body was not arranged in the manner prescribed by *De Exequiis Regalibus*. That text requires the king to hold a rod and sceptre in his hands. If those items are in the coffin, they are laid alongside the body.<sup>69</sup>

Although the arrangement of Henry IV's body in his coffin was a direct violation of *De Exequiis Regalibus*, it did not disrupt the funeral or even attract attention until the tomb was opened. The body itself was carefully embalmed, preserving the dead man's appearance for over four-hundred years and preventing any leakage. Henry's arrangement and lead coffin had no impact on his exequies. Although the prescriptive text was disobeyed in one aspect, it clearly followed the advice in another.

---

<sup>67</sup> J. Spry, "A Brief Account of the Examination of the Tomb of King Henry IV, in the Cathedral of Canterbury, August 21, 1832," *Archaeologia*, 26 (January 1836), 444. Henry's nose had been as it was in life, but due to the shifting of air from the coffin, the cartilage collapsed during the course of examination. Interestingly enough, no comment was made concerning the disfiguring ailment of leprosy that Henry IV reportedly suffered from; in fact, one of those present touched the face. For further discussions upon Henry IV's health and possible diagnoses, see Peter McNiven, "The Problem of Henry IV's Health, 1405-1413," *English Historical Review*, 100, no. 397 (October 1985), 747-772.

<sup>68</sup> Spry, "King Henry IV, 445.

<sup>69</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *Henry IV* (London: Yale University Press, 2016), 520. Given-Wilson notes that Henry IV's wood coffin was exceedingly large, possibly to accommodate the regalia alongside the king rather than in his hands.

Henry IV's status and circumstances at death must be considered. In his own lifetime, it was accepted that Richard II had met a foul end while in Henry's keeping at Pontefract in 1400, and Henry had ordered the execution of Archbishop Scrope in 1405.<sup>70</sup> Henry IV chose to be buried at Canterbury instead of Westminster, near the shrine of Thomas Becket. A myriad of reasons have been posited relating this choice,<sup>71</sup> and how much weight can be given to each one varies from historian to historian. There are more limited reasons as to why Henry IV's hands were arranged in prayer rather than holding the royal symbols of the rod and sceptre. One possibility is that either he or his executors wished to express penitence over how he acquired those tools.

Henry IV was capable of expressing regret, or at least grief, for what he perceived to be a necessary action, both on his deathbed<sup>72</sup> and in his actions relating to the funeral and burial of Richard II.<sup>73</sup> Henry V, one of Henry IV's executors, openly chose to associate himself with Richard II.<sup>74</sup> The change of Henry IV's hand arrangement suited the reputation with which the king died. It did not disrupt his exequies, and it was honourable and fitting to his station.

No narratives of Henry IV's funeral survive. The Exchequer records offer partial information about the cloth, decorations, the herse, and the candles employed.<sup>75</sup> Other information comes from the request sent by Henry V to Canterbury for accoutrements from his father's anniversary ceremonies so that they could be used to rebury Richard II at Westminster.<sup>76</sup> One can interpret the dearth of information as a historical misfortune.

---

<sup>70</sup> See Chapter II, 54.

<sup>71</sup> See Chapter V, 191-193, for further information. See also Thomas Cocke, "The Repository of Our English Kings: The Henry VII Chapel As Royal Mausoleum," *Architectural History*, 44 (2001), 213; D.M. Palliser, "Royal Mausolea in the Long Fourteenth Century (1272-1422)," in *Fourteenth Century England III*, edited by W. Mark Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell Press 2004), 13.

<sup>72</sup> See Chapter II, 55, for Henry IV's deathbed regrets.

<sup>73</sup> See below, 137, 141-144.

<sup>74</sup> Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399-1422* (London: Yale University Press, 1998), 117.

<sup>75</sup> TNA E 403/612, m. 5-7; see also Given-Wilson, "The Exequies of Edward III," 274, n. 74.

<sup>76</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 324.

Alternatively, it could have been a testament that Henry IV's funeral was immensely successful, very normative, and compliant with people's expectations; there were no complaints.

In his biography of Henry IV, Chris Given-Wilson has proposed an alternative order of obsequies to better fit with the known information and the known traditions of English ceremonies. While not stressed in this present work, the common order of events after the death of a king was the burial of the king and then the coronation of the new king. Even when there was urgency in the transfer of power, the order did not vary. John was in the ground 23 October 1216, prior to the crowning of his son Henry III on 28 October 1216. Until now, it was commonly accepted that Henry IV's funeral – a large, notable event – had taken place on 18 June 1413, Trinity Sunday. However, given that Henry V had been crowned on 9 April, this would have put the events out of proper order. The Scots were not so hamstrung by this; although they attempted at various times to preserve the order of ceremonies (royal funeral, then coronation of the new king), political expediency often dictated that the new king be crowned before the burial of the old.<sup>77</sup> The English, in contrast, were fastidious in their adherence.

Given-Wilson has postulated that Henry IV had a private funeral sometime before Henry V's coronation on 9 April, and the Trinity Sunday event was performed as a “public funeral.”<sup>78</sup> This functioned as a way of setting an anniversary on a day that was significant to Henry IV for his devotion to the Holy Trinity. In the Exchequer's issue roll for Easter term 1 Henry V, the Trinity Sunday event is not referred to as a funeral; it is referred to as an anniversary or simply exequies.<sup>79</sup> This reordering corrects the ceremonial order of Henry IV's funeral and Henry V's coronation. Henry IV's second, larger event, which created the effective

---

<sup>77</sup> Conversations between author and Lucinda Dean, 29-31 January 2016.

<sup>78</sup> Given-Wilson, *Henry IV*, 520.

<sup>79</sup> TNA E 403/612, specifically 20 May, 27 June, and 4 July. Given-Wilson also cites an entry in the patent rolls which states that a herse was to be made for Henry IV and taken to Canterbury where the king “is buried” already by 25 May 1413. *CPR, 1413-1416*, 64.

anniversary, worked as intended; this has been the event history has remembered, not the actual day of Henry IV's funeral and burial.

A few chroniclers offered the information that the body was taken from London to Gravesend<sup>80</sup> by water, then to Canterbury via land, possibly the only unusual and remarkable feature of Henry IV's exequies.<sup>81</sup> No other king to this point had travelled along a river to reach his final resting place. Henry VI was also taken by water to his burial site at Chertsey, but there were numerous other irregularities with his exequies.<sup>82</sup> Elizabeth of Woodville requested that she should be taken in haste without any pomp by water to her resting place, Windsor,<sup>83</sup> which implies that traveling by water was humbler than a procession by land. Indeed, a land procession typically entailed escorts, horses, banners, and mourners with torches along the route, while a transport by river eliminated most of these items. During Henry IV's illness in 1407, he frequently travelled by boat to maintain a lower profile.<sup>84</sup> This may have been another sign of Henry IV's penitence, but in a limited sense; he did travel to Canterbury with a land procession.<sup>85</sup> The chronicles reporting this were matter-of-fact about the transport arrangement, not offering any particular opinion.

In contrast, chroniclers were not silent when they felt things were amiss. They were quick to express concern when they believed a king had been deprived of proper liturgical rites, even if they were not partisans of the man in question. The *Liber Regie Capelle* states that a king was to receive the Office of the Dead and votive three masses at each location where he

---

<sup>80</sup> Given-Wilson, *Henry IV*, 520; although narratives state Faversham, Gravesend was the final stop on the ferry.

<sup>81</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 372; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 577; Ralph Higden, *Polychronicon, together with the English Translation of John Trevisa and of an unknown writer of the 15th century*, viii, edited by J.R. Lumby. RS, 41 (London: 1882), 547.

<sup>82</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 496, in a writ to Richard Martyn to pay "for the hire of barges with masters and sailors rowing the same [Henry of Windsor] on the river Thames to Chertsey aforesaid."

<sup>83</sup> BL Arundel MS 26, f. 29v.

<sup>84</sup> Douglas Biggs, "An Ill and Infirm King: Henry IV, Health, and the Gloucester Parliament of 1407," in *The Reign of Henry IV: Rebellion and Survival, 1403-1413*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2008), 186.

<sup>85</sup> See above, n. 80; the land procession for Henry IV likely stopped at Faversham en route to Canterbury, hence the confusion of the chronicle writers. Faversham held King Stephen's tomb, so it was a good place for a stop.



was taken in procession. This reflected the king's status and his capacity for conspicuous consumption; only a man of a certain level of power and money could afford all of this. Not having a single Mass of Requiem for the deceased was offensive; all Christians needed at least that, even a pauper. A king not having enough hours and masses was socially disturbing, as the king's status was perceived to be undermined.

Although sources state that Henry VI had a procession with torches from the Tower to St. Paul's with stops in between, these sources equally lack any mention of offices or masses for Henry VI in London. He was taken to churches to be seen, but there is no mention of anything happening at those churches. Hall reported that there were no Offices of the Dead, no masses, no tapers, no riders, and no mourners.<sup>86</sup> Others concurred, saying that there were only soldiers guarding the body, as if the dead Henry was being marched to execution.<sup>87</sup>

The Exchequer tells a slightly different story. The Carmelites, Augustinians, Dominicans, and Franciscans each received £1 and other charities, while the Brothers of the Holy Cross received £2 for masses to be said for Henry in London. The Dominicans also received £2 12s 3d for masses and obsequies at Chertsey, for a total of £8 12s 3d.<sup>88</sup> There were certainly masses said for Henry in the city of London and at Chertsey on the day of his burial, but not necessarily during the procession in the days before. In contrast, Henry IV paid £16 13s 4d for a thousand masses requested for Richard II.<sup>89</sup> Richard II's hours and masses were explicitly stated as having taken place throughout his two-week journey to and around London;<sup>90</sup> there was no such assurance for Henry VI, nor any report of St. Paul's receiving money for masses.

---

<sup>86</sup> Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, et. al., 1809), 303.

<sup>87</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London*, 220; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 662.

<sup>88</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 496

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid*, 276.

<sup>90</sup> See below, 141-142.

Henry VI's exequies were thought to be pitiful.<sup>91</sup> If we believe that Henry VI bled on the streets outside St. Paul's and Blackfriars, then we may also believe he was denied divine services in those churches; an incontinent body posed the same risk for contaminating a church as a man who bloodied another.<sup>92</sup> If Henry's corpse was leaking, then he may have been denied entry. Alternatively, if he had not bled, this may have been part of Edward IV's disregard for him; it was a distinctly royal or elite feature to have the body in the church, rather than waiting outside.<sup>93</sup> There is little evidence to suggest that Richard III, who had also lost his crown, received anything other than burial in holy ground. It is only a recent phenomenon that Richard III and his burial have been treated with sympathy, due in no small part to the visual confrontations with his grave from 2012 onward.

After his death on Bosworth Field in 1485, Richard was taken to the Church of the Annunciation in Leicester and lay in state for two days as evidence that he was dead.<sup>94</sup> He was transported to Greyfriars for burial, slung over a horse's back, tied up. Polydore Vergil indicates that Richard was buried naked, "without any pomp or solemn funeral."<sup>95</sup> David Baldwin had postulated in 1986 that despite the disgraced state of the former king, he might have been interred in the choir of Greyfriars, a traditional place of honour.<sup>96</sup>

Baldwin's theory was confirmed with the 2012 excavation of the Greyfriars' church in Leicester and the subsequent positive identification of Richard III's remains therein;<sup>97</sup> declaring the ceremony held in March 2015 to be a reburial indicates that the organizers believed that

---

<sup>91</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London*, 220; *Hall's Chronicle*, 330; and Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 662, express such sentiments.

<sup>92</sup> Rosemary Horrox, "Purgatory, Prayer, and Plague: 1150-1380," in *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, edited by Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 103.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>94</sup> Charles Ross, *Richard III* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1981), 225; David Baldwin, "King Richard's Grave in Leicester," *Transactions of the Leicester Archaeological and History Society*, 60 (1986), 21.

<sup>95</sup> Polydore Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III*, edited by Sir Henry Ellis. Camden Society, Old Series, 24 (London: 1844), 226.

<sup>96</sup> Baldwin, "King Richard's Grave in Leicester," 24.

<sup>97</sup> University of Leicester, "Richard III: Osteology," *The Discovery of Richard III*, last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.le.ac.uk/richardiii/science/osteology.html>.

Richard had received funeral rites previously.<sup>98</sup> The ground near the skeleton's sacral area revealed the presence of roundworms,<sup>99</sup> indicating that Richard was buried with his intestines and not eviscerated. His brief presentation suggests that no preservative measures were taken. He had died in August, and the body would not have kept for much longer than the two days. No evidence of a coffin or grave goods, such as cloth or jewellery, was found in the grave, which was dug too small.<sup>100</sup> If Richard had been shrouded by the friars, this would have decayed.<sup>101</sup>

Richard III's treatment resulted from the fact that he was never rightfully king from the moment he died, as he was then succeeded by a man who felt Richard's reign was completely illegitimate.<sup>102</sup> Henry VII went as far to proclaim in Parliament that his reign had started the day before Bosworth, rendering all enemy participants traitors, including Richard III. This resulted in Richard's attainder and loss of all titles, even those he naturally would have inherited, such as Duke of York. Henry Tudor the victor was ultimately under little obligation to do anything more than to see that Richard was buried in holy ground. Richard was never the true king. There was no reason to carry out the activities described in *De Exequiis Regalibus* and the *Liber Regie Capelle*. By loss of his titles, Richard would not have received the honours described in the Household Articles for princes of the blood royal, had those ordinances been in effect.

Still, it is highly unlikely that absolutely nothing was done for Richard III in 1485.

Although they had to be loyal to the new king, the Franciscan friars still had an obligation to offer care for the souls of the poor, as they were (and are) charged in their vows; Richard, at the

---

<sup>98</sup> See Chapter VII, 280-288.

<sup>99</sup> Mitchell, Yeh, Appleby, and Buckley, "The Intestinal Parasites of King Richard III," *The Lancet*, 382 (4 September 2013), 888.

<sup>100</sup> University of Leicester, "Archaeological Dig: Skeleton Found, Wednesday, 5 September Continued," *The Discovery of Richard III*, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.le.ac.uk/richardiii/archaeology/5septembercont.html>.

<sup>101</sup> University of Leicester, "Richard III: Osteology."

<sup>102</sup> *PROME*, Parliament of November 1485, item 8.

time of his burial, fit that description. As the French royal physician Mondeville remarked, there was no money in eviscerating and embalming a poor man,<sup>103</sup> nor was there anyone to pay for the Office of the Dead or three masses. The prayers for burial were probably said, and Richard III's former status was recognized by being buried in the choir.

If no offices and masses were said before Richard's interment, they may have been performed after Henry Tudor and his men departed from Leicester. An alternative order of burial presents itself in BL Arundel MS 26, the extant narrative of Elizabeth Woodville's exequies. The former queen had chosen not to have her full royal funeral as permitted by the *Liber Regie Capelle*, but rather a simpler, plainer one. Her only regal request was to be interred in the vault of Edward IV.<sup>104</sup> She was buried before any of her mourners arrived, in the dead of night, much to the horror of the manuscript's writer.<sup>105</sup> However, over the course of the following days, her hours and masses were said in the presence of her surviving children, save for Cecily and Queen Elizabeth.<sup>106</sup> There were general words of burial said for Elizabeth Woodville the night she was interred, but the Office of the Dead and three masses were executed days after; this was not liturgically unacceptable, or else those at Windsor would not have performed it.

Socially, however, this event seems to have been an oddity; the writer of Arundel MS 26 aims his objections at the nature and order of events being below Elizabeth's station as a former queen and as mother of the current queen, rather than being theologically inappropriate. His distressed tone is reminiscent of Henry VI's chroniclers in discussing his lack of liturgical hours and masses at every stop.

---

<sup>103</sup> Henri de Mondeville, *The Surgery of Master Henry de Mondeville, Surgeon of Philip the Fair, King of France, written from 1306 to 1320*, translated by Leonard Rosenman (XLibris Corporation, 2003), 736; Henri de Mondeville, *Chirurgie de Maître Henri de Mondeville*, translated and edited by E. Nicaise (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer Baillière and Co., 1893), 569.

<sup>104</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 350; the request is also recounted by the writer of BL Arundel MS 26, f. 29v.

<sup>105</sup> BL Arundel MS 26, f. 29v.

<sup>106</sup> BL Arundel MS 26, ff. 29v-30r.

The possibility exists that Henry VI and Richard III may have had their full offices and masses said privately after their bodies were interred. One must remember that the offices and masses preceding the final Requiem Mass and burial were votive; they were paid “extras” for both the safety of the deceased’s soul and an expression of the deceased’s power and money in life. Anniversaries were votive in nature, composed of hours and masses that were celebrated without a body. There was no bar that made it impossible for hours and masses at another time, such as after the interment, but those who recorded these events still expressed displeasure; this was not, in their opinion, fitting for a person of a given station.

These opinions were also present in predominantly well-done funerals. Richard II’s funeral and burial did stir comment from contemporary writers. As discussed above in relation to Henry VI, financial and physical evidence suggest that Richard’s body was well-preserved, leaving his bones in good condition.<sup>107</sup> A thousand masses were said for his soul.<sup>108</sup> His body was taken in procession from Pontefract to London, then onward toward King’s Langley.<sup>109</sup>

Eyewitnesses report that Richard II’s body, face uncovered, was placed on a chare with black cloths, surrounded by torches and the banners of Sts. George and Edward.<sup>110</sup> There were mourners in black with torches, along with additional mourners with torches to greet the procession in London; Henry IV himself attended the services at St. Paul’s.<sup>111</sup> Froissart states that after St. Paul’s, Richard lay at Cheapside for two hours before being moved to King’s Langley for his final exequies.<sup>112</sup> So far, Richard’s funeral appears to have been appropriately carried out.

---

<sup>107</sup> See above, 131.

<sup>108</sup> See above, 137.

<sup>109</sup> The location will be discussed in Chapter V, 182-183.

<sup>110</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 591; *Chronique de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Dengleterre*, edited and translated by Benjamin Williams (Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, 1964), 103 and 261.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>112</sup> Froissart, *Oeuvres*, xvi, 236.

In the chronicles, very specific reports of the liturgical elements of Richard II's exequies are present, stating that *Dirige* or the Office of the Dead took place.<sup>113</sup> No king prior to Richard had chroniclers mention the exact offices or masses. The description of exequies in the chronicles prior to 1400 are much more general, with little to no reference to the religious events; the terms "*Dirige*" or "solemn offices" are not used at all. In contrast, the chroniclers were insistent that the royal rites were clearly performed for Richard II, with Henry IV's approval and attendance.<sup>114</sup> The writers for Henry IV's funeral reverted to the old form of narrative with no mention of offices and masses. From Henry V onward, the chroniclers consistently commented upon the liturgical elements.<sup>115</sup> The chroniclers of Henry VI and Richard III proved that the opposite was also true: a perceived deficit of liturgies was also reported.

The two texts critical of Richard II's funeral were the *Chronicque de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Dengleterre* and the works of Thomas Walsingham. The *Chronicque's* author stated that Richard was buried *come un poure gentil home* or "like a poor gentleman."<sup>116</sup> Walsingham complained that the abbot of St. Albans was called upon late the night before the funeral and that the ceremonies the following morning were rushed. They were not well attended; Henry IV did not show. Those that attended the final masses were not offered a meal afterwards.<sup>117</sup> The complaints of last-minute notice, rushing, and attendance appear first in the "Annales Ricardi Secundi Regis Angliae." The additional disappointment of no dinner thereafter appears in the later "Historia Anglicana" and "Ypodigma Neustriae."<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 360; Thomas Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica majora of Thomas Walsingham*, ii, edited and translated by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011), 300. Later chronicles also state this, including *The Great Chronicle of London*, 83; Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, 276; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 577.

<sup>114</sup> Henry V's chroniclers go one better by stating that full nine-lesson Matins were carried out on his order at Richard's future anniversaries; see Chapter VII, 260.

<sup>115</sup> See Chapter III, 96-101, for Henry V's funeral procession.

<sup>116</sup> *Chronicque de la Traison*, 96 and 251.

<sup>117</sup> Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle*, ii, 301.

<sup>118</sup> See 121-125 for the varying narratives of these chronicles in relation to Anne of Bohemia's funeral, and 114, n. 7 for a discussion of the ordering of Walsingham's chronicles.

The meal is a prescribed part of the funeral in the *Liber Regie Capelle*.<sup>119</sup> The Chapel Royal, the body governed by the *Liber Regie Capelle*, was a part of the King's Household; the implication is that the Household was to supply the *convivium* after the funeral and burial. Again, it is ambiguous whether Henry IV was obliged to provide such a courtesy for his deposed predecessor, as Richard II was not king at his death and it was no longer his household. Walsingham's other complaints plausibly match up with that of the French narrative. A "poor gentleman" did not have the full exequies of his station, due to cost, and they were not so well attended. Walsingham's superior was inconvenienced by the last-minute summons, though perhaps only in retrospect.

Comparing Richard II's will<sup>120</sup> and the events of his funeral shows a mismatch, but that would not have been known to the public. Those in attendance at Richard II's final masses and burial may have been miffed at the disorganization and the lack of dinner, but again, Richard II had lost his status as king. Richard II's absence from Westminster Abbey may have been most disconcerting. Henry IV had not fulfilled Richard's wish to be placed in the double tomb in Westminster Abbey that already bore his *gisant* and held his first queen. This may well have tainted opinions regarding Henry IV and Richard II's exequies, regardless of how well they were executed.<sup>121</sup> The tomb had an innate strangeness: a man's shared resting place with his wife had become a rather odd halfway cenotaph. There were justifications for leaving a non-king out of the resting place of kings,<sup>122</sup> but Richard II and Anne of Bohemia's unshared tomb became an unsettling feature of the Confessor's Chapel.

Joel Burden believes that Henry IV had tried to hedge between continuity with Richard and breaking away to establish his own ways. He attempted to grant Richard some elements of

---

<sup>119</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114.

<sup>120</sup> See Chapter III, 87-88.

<sup>121</sup> Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 104.

<sup>122</sup> WAM 6300; Edward III ordered the translation of John of Eltham out of the Confessor's Chapel, as that place was to be reserved for the monarch and the consort, i.e., Edward, Philippa, and their successors. Richard of Bordeaux had fit that description prior to his deposition, but at the time of his first interment, he did not.

what would have been due to him, but also denied him others.<sup>123</sup> The result was a murky relationship between the two regimes, feelings of unease toward Henry's burial agenda, and ultimately a need for Henry V to "fix" things. This is a valid interpretation of events.

The status and reputation of a dead king at his burial affected how the royal prescriptive texts were interpreted. In the case of Henry IV, he or his executors were aware of his public image, as well as any "secret affairs" that had been carried out at Pontefract.<sup>124</sup> Folding his hands in prayer may have been felt to be far more appropriate than wielding the symbols of monarchy. At the other end of a deposition, the former king was unlikely to be permitted to hold these tools. Upon the exhumation of their bodies, Henry VI and Richard III were found to have no evidence of rod or sceptre buried with them. Richard II was found to have a sceptre with him at his Westminster reburial, but this may not have been included at his first burial.<sup>125</sup> The financial records surrounding the exequies of Edward II indicate that he did not have a rod and sceptre buried with him.<sup>126</sup> As these men were no longer kings, it was no longer appropriate for them to hold the prescribed items that were reserved for a king alone. Other elements of the prescriptive texts could be argued as not being appropriate to apply, such as the meal or hours and masses.

Yet, when speaking of kings that died not as kings, there is a clear divide between two camps. Edward II, who will be discussed below, and Richard II received exequies that were far more splendid than Henry VI and Richard III. More money was expended on the first pair, and their exequies had many royal features, although the handling of Richard II became a bit awkward. Why were they so different from Henry VI and Richard III?<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Burden, "How Do You Bury A Deposed King?" 50.

<sup>124</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 276, in a writ dated 20 March 1400 to William Loveday for £3 6s 8d.

<sup>125</sup> See below, 159.

<sup>126</sup> Edward II will be discussed, 148-156, but it should be noted that, while he was clothed in some of his coronation garb, the wardrobe did not issue a rod or sceptre for him. David A. Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 435; S.A. Moore, "Documents relating to the Death and Burial of King Edward II," *Archaeologia*, 50 (January 1887), 221-222.

<sup>127</sup> Joel Burden touches upon this topic in his essay, "How Do You Bury a Deposed King?" on 50.



In the Household Articles of 1494, a man was to be led into his funeral church with all his standards of rank, from least to greatest, and to have candles appropriate in number to his station.<sup>128</sup> Although this was newly committed to writing, it had been in practice for centuries. Even if a king was no longer king, the man still held some sort of station, unless he had been completely cast out. We therefore have the cases of Edward of Caernarfon and Richard of Bordeaux, no longer kings, but at least Edward was the Count of Ponthieu (through his mother), and Richard had held the titles of his father (Prince of Wales, Duke of Cornwall, Earl of Chester) for nearly a year prior to his accession. Their successors on the English throne viewed them as having been legitimate, though errant. Edward II and Richard II retained certain rights by their previous stations, and this was seen in how their funerals were conducted. They enjoyed funerals that were not kingly, but certainly noble, which is what they would have been if the crown had not passed to them. They were also subject to the deposition process; they had been legitimate upon accession.

Henry VI and Richard III received miserly funerals, because they were deemed completely illegitimate by their successors. Edward IV had long considered Henry VI's reign and that of his father and grandfather as "by fact, not by law."<sup>129</sup> Richard II had attainted Henry Bolingbroke,<sup>130</sup> and Edward IV may have considered that sentence to be in effect. Edward IV ensured that Henry VI had this status by attainting him in the Parliament of November 1461, stripping him of the duchy of Lancaster.<sup>131</sup> Although Richard III would have been the Duke of York by being his father's surviving son, Henry VII made it a point to back-date his reign prior to Bosworth, deem Richard III a traitor, and attaint him post-mortem, stripping him of whatever titles he had.<sup>132</sup> In both of these cases, the status of the deceased was completely

---

<sup>128</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 130.

<sup>129</sup> See Chapter V, 187, for additional discussion on this matter.

<sup>130</sup> See Chapter III, 89.

<sup>131</sup> *PROME*, Parliament of November 1461, items 17-28, with the loss of Lancaster due to the attainder of Henry VI in item 26.

<sup>132</sup> See above, 139.

nullified by attainder, and neither were afforded a formal process of deposition. It did not matter that Henry VI bled in the streets or that Richard III had no grave goods. They were never kings. They were not of the blood royal. They were not nobles. There was no need to apply any prescriptive text with rigour. A rule not applied cannot be broken.

Though the prescriptive texts may have been applied appropriately, funerals for kings (and queens) that did not meet expectations were negatively commented upon. Chroniclers noticed when the traditional or the critical liturgical elements were missing. Failure to meet societal expectations pertaining to the deceased's status also provoked criticism, even if the funeral had been a technical success. The writer of Arundel MS 26 was greatly displeased by the low-profile funeral and burial of Elizabeth Woodville, the queen dowager, even though it had been by her will and it was not liturgically inappropriate.

Decoding the success of a royal medieval funeral partly depends on determining how contemporaries viewed it. Henry IV's funeral received little comment from contemporaries, and his "deviant" coffin caused no problems; the exequies were a success. In contrast, the irregularities of Henry VI and Richard III's burials dominate chronicle accounts. Richard II lay somewhere in the middle. Save for Thomas Walsingham's chronicles and the *Chronique de la Traison et Mort*, the written accounts of Richard II's funeral mention no overt problem or inappropriate arrangements. They are silent, not objecting to how the man was handled and buried. This implies that they thought the deposed king had received a funeral fitting to his station.

Then again, silence may express uncertainty or fear. Ultimately, Richard II still received a reburial like Henry VI and Richard III, whose funerals and burials were very different from the rituals described in the prescriptive texts. The funerals produced by Henry IV, Edward IV, and Henry VII were ultimately viewed as inadequate, even though they were not bound to use the royal prescriptive texts. Expectations of society had great weight.

### *Cultural Transmission*

Consideration of medieval noble funerals is a necessary point in this chapter. While kings had the most opulent and impressive funerals, there were also expectations for peers, nobles, and other elites. As seen above, former kings that were still considered part of the nobility had a place, though this may have been difficult to determine. Non-regnant members of the royal family did not receive the same honours as sitting monarchs, but they were hardly fodder for the Potter's Field. Medieval funerary and burial practices were a matter of "keeping up with the Joneses;" expressions of power and status at a funeral proclaimed the deceased's rank in society in relation to his peers. Any innovation or adaptation of a higher-ranked trait by someone lower on the social ladder would result in shifts of activity for those above and below; those below wanted to live up to that standard, while those above had to improve upon it.

The innovation of an effigy has already been discussed.<sup>133</sup> By the mid-fifteenth century, high-ranking ecclesiastics used effigies as well as the royal house.<sup>134</sup> The effigy would eventually become part of the exequies for non-royal, non-ecclesiastical people, but Mark Duffy believes that this did not occur until after the issuance of the Household Articles in 1494, with the exception of the effigy employed at the reburial of Richard, duke of York, Edward IV's father, in 1476.<sup>135</sup> Elites used the effigy to illustrate their wealth and status, as they were costly to make and decorate. They also needed to keep pace and maintain their perceived position relative to the monarch. Across the Channel, French monarchs began to employ the funeral effigy as early as November 1422, for Charles VI;<sup>136</sup> one could argue that this was a direct result of the implementation of an effigy at Henry V's procession two months before.

---

<sup>133</sup> See Chapter III, 114-117.

<sup>134</sup> This could be for the same reason as to why a bishop had to embalm the king in variations of *De Exequiis Regalibus*: they shared the trait of having been anointed.

<sup>135</sup> Mark Duffy, *Royal Tombs of Medieval England* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Tempus, 2003), 184. Even then, one must remember that Richard was being promoted as the man that should have been king.

<sup>136</sup> Ralph Giesey, "Models of Rulership in French Royal Ceremonial," in *Rites of Power*, edited by Sean Wilentz (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 47-48.

The royal house also adapted innovations and styles found in noble funerals, particularly if they suited the king. Edward III has been tentatively identified as the first king to have an offering of arms and having a shield raised at his funeral.<sup>137</sup> The arms were typically a helm with a crest, a shield, banners, a tabard or cloth coat of arms, gauntlets, a sword, and a pair of spurs, or some combination thereof.<sup>138</sup> The hatchment was a coat of arms, made of either cloth or wood; it could be the same item referred to as a tabard.<sup>139</sup> After being raised over the tomb, the arms and hatchments were referred to as “achievements.”<sup>140</sup> Edward III seems to have had only a sword and shield present at his funeral.<sup>141</sup> The shield raising was a separate ceremony that symbolized the death of one king by the shield’s inversion and the continuance of the monarchy in another by the shield being righted.<sup>142</sup>

At least two men prior to Edward III had the presentation of arms performed at their funerals, as their achievements hung over their respective tombs. Both were Garter knights. The first was Sir Richard Pembridge, whose achievements hung in Hereford Cathedral from 1375 until 1822, when the helm was sold to a private collector before making its way to the National Museum of Scotland.<sup>143</sup> Pembridge’s shield and tabard (possibly his hatchment) were also displayed in the cathedral, but their fates are uncertain; they may have been stolen or destroyed.<sup>144</sup>

The second was Edward III’s own son, Edward of Woodstock, the Black Prince.<sup>145</sup> To this day, the copies of the Black Prince’s achievements hang in Canterbury Cathedral, with the

---

<sup>137</sup> Given-Wilson, “The Exequies of Edward III,” 271.

<sup>138</sup> James Mann, *The Funeral Achievements of Edward the Black Prince* (London: William Cloves and Sons, 1951), 3.

<sup>139</sup> Phillis Cunningham and Catherine Lucas, *Costume for Births, Marriages, and Deaths* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1972), 129.

<sup>140</sup> Mann, *The Funeral Achievements*, 3.

<sup>141</sup> W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 581.

<sup>142</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 113.

<sup>143</sup> “Pembridge Helm,” *National Museums Scotland*, last accessed 5 May 2016. <http://www.nms.ac.uk/explore/collections-stories/art-and-design/pembridge-helm/>.

<sup>144</sup> Toria Forsyth-Moster, “The Pembridge Helm,” *Herefordshire Through Time*, Herefordshire Council website, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://htt.herefordshire.gov.uk/1094.aspx>.

<sup>145</sup> The nickname “the Black Prince” was created during the Tudor period and not used during the man’s lifetime. However, it will be used from here on, in order to minimize confusion amongst the Edwards. Richard Barber,

original 1376 helm, shield, sword scabbard, gauntlets, and jupon carefully preserved in glass.

Edward III's military activity was a significant part of his reign. Henry V, Edward IV, and Henry VII all had their achievements raised at their funerals, and each was known for their robust military success, the latter two securing the English crown by such means.

In his article on Edward III's exequies, Chris Given-Wilson compares the offering of arms at the funerals of Edward III in 1377 and Henry V in 1422, using Thomas Walsingham's description of Henry V's exequies in the *Historia Anglicana*:

[...]three destriers with their riders were led up to the high altar of Westminster as is customary (*ut moris est*), splendidly armed with the royal arms of England and France, and there the riders were stripped [of their arms]; and, once the arms had been completely removed, they were carried, together with banners of the arms of St. George, England, and France, and images of the Holy Trinity and St. Mary, in an unbroken line around the corpse.<sup>146</sup>

Based upon the above quotation, Given-Wilson believes that Walsingham had an odd sense of tradition: considering that Edward III was the only other king known to have had such a rite performed, could the presentation of arms at the funeral of Henry V truly be considered customary?<sup>147</sup> However, Walsingham's statement can be interpreted differently. The offering to the church was already a tradition for the nobility and royalty, but not in the ritualized way in which it was performed at Edward III's and Henry V's funerals. Walsingham recognized it for what it actually was, despite the window dressing: giving the church its fee.

The increasing complexity of this part of the royal funeral requires some untangling and explanation. There were three different activities happening at the time of offertory during the funeral mass, after the oblation of cloths of gold. The first was the payment to the church. The second was the bringing to the altar of the arms, banners, and hatchments – the future

---

“Edward, prince of Wales and of Aquitaine (1330–1376),” *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/8523.

<sup>146</sup> Given-Wilson, “The Exequies of Edward III,” 272, translating Thomas Walsingham, “*Historia Anglicana*, pt. 2,” 346: “Adducti etiam fuerant ad majus altare Westmonasterii tres dextrarii cum eorum sessoribus ut moris est, armis Regis Anglaie et Franciaie optime armatis et sessoribus inibi inde expoliati. Arma vero integer ablata cexilla insuper circa corpus defuncti ferebantur, arma Sancti Georgii, Angliae, et Franciaie, ac imaginum Sanctae Trinitatis, Sanctae Mariae, continenter.” See also Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle*, ii, 778–779.

<sup>147</sup> Given-Wilson, “The Exequies of Edward III,” 274.

achievements that would be hung. The third was the bringing of the shield with which to perform the raising ceremony. The exact inclusion and order of these three events changed over time; what is recorded in the *Liber Regie Capelle* is a moment in the evolving ceremony.

In a letter close dated 14 February 1353, Edward III ordered an investigation to determine the exact disposition of the fine that was supposed to have been paid for the funeral of John of Eltham, his brother, who had died in 1336 on campaign in Scotland.<sup>148</sup> The fine was valued at £50 in lieu of the horse and armour offered on the day of John's funeral at Westminster Abbey, in part payment of £100 owed. The armour worn by the rider and the horse was part payment for the exequies.<sup>149</sup> These items could have been kept by Westminster Abbey but instead were redeemed for money, just like the cloths of gold could be; Joan, Henry IV's consort, paid £33 6s 8d to redeem twenty-four cloths of gold that she had offered at Henry V's funeral in 1422.<sup>150</sup> The physical items were given as surety against the debt owed.<sup>151</sup>

The easiest way to transport battle-ready plate and mail armour -- which usually weighed about fifty pounds or twenty-two kilograms -- was to have someone wear it. The easiest way to transport that man and a horse was for the said gentleman to ride the horse, possibly right into the church. This was delivery service for the funeral payment. In isolation, Walsingham's sentence states that at Henry V's funeral, the riders and horses were led to the high altar of Westminster Abbey, as was customary (*ut moris est*), wearing the arms of England and France, and they were stripped of those goods.<sup>152</sup> Now it was up to the royal house to redeem those items for money, if desired. That was the tradition to which Walsingham referred, not the other ceremonial activity that came after. It is unknown whether John of Eltham's rider had a

---

<sup>148</sup> *CCR, 1349-1354*, 527-528.

<sup>149</sup> Christopher Daniell offers an excellent explanation and breakdown of the church's mortuary fees, which covered not only the liturgies, but the labours of the bellringers and gravediggers; Christopher Daniell, *Death and Burial in Medieval England, 1066-1550* (London: Routledge, 1997), 52-54.

<sup>150</sup> W.H. St. John Hope, "The Funeral, Monument, and Chantry Chapel of King Henry the Fifth," *Archaeologia*, 65 (1915), 140; originally recorded in WAM 19664.

<sup>151</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, "The Funeral of Henry V," a paper presented at *Beyond Agincourt: The Funeral Achievements of Henry V*, Westminster Abbey, London, 28 October 2015, concurs with this assessment.

<sup>152</sup> Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 2," 346; Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle*, ii, 778-779.

formalized entrance and procession up to the altar like these three at the funeral of Henry V, or the one at his brother Edward III's funeral.

John of Eltham's "payment rider" likely did not bear a sword or shield, nor did he take part in any ceremony involving the raising and lowering of the shield. These were innovations for the king's funeral in 1377, granting pomp to a standard transaction and combining it with what was fashionable at the time. By 1422, the arms, hatchments, and other items that were to be hung around the tomb were carried by at least three payment riders. The riders would leave the intended achievements at the high altar, give up their armour, trappings, and horses, then exit. The presentations of arms and hatchments were a slight of hand; the actual offering to the church and payment for the funeral – the battle armour and horses – disappeared into the vestry or into the stable while attention remained on the "offered" decorated items surrounding the dead king.

Much of the decorated equipment that was offered at the funerals of Pembrokeshire, the Black Prince, Edward III, and beyond was not likely used by the original owner in the field of battle or at the tournament. In many cases, it was crafted specifically for the funeral.<sup>153</sup> It may have been deliberately created larger for display purposes, such as Edward III's seven-foot, eighteen-pound sword.<sup>154</sup> Since it did not need to face true battle, it could be made with lesser quality materials.<sup>155</sup> Henry V's funeral achievement helm is a great helm, a style used in battle around 1400, making it unlikely that it actually saw action with him in France.<sup>156</sup> The helm style was still popular at the time for tournaments usage, but Henry did not take part in jousting. The accounts for Henry's funeral also only pay for the painting of the helm and crest, not for

---

<sup>153</sup> For the Black Prince, Mann, *The Funeral Achievements*, 4; for Edward III, Given-Wilson, "The Exequies of Edward III," 275.

<sup>154</sup> Given-Wilson, "The Exequies of Edward III," 275.

<sup>155</sup> Mann expresses some of these ideas when examining the achievements of the Black Prince, *The Funeral Achievements*, 3-4, but these are more thoroughly discussed in Beard's analysis of Henry VI's helm, "The Tomb and Achievements of King Henry VI," 2-4. These were not battle-ready pieces of armour or weaponry; they would have shattered if actually struck. Ormrod calls the quality of Edward III's sword "surprisingly crude," *Edward III*, 580.

<sup>156</sup> Claude Blair, *European Armour, circa 1066 to circa 1700* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1978), 73.

the actual crafting of it, a total of 33s 4d.<sup>157</sup> Henry's achievement helm was an old-fashioned helm with new, detailed coat of paint.

Likewise, because of the rise of plate armour in England during the fourteenth century, by 1353, there was little use for a heater shield in the field;<sup>158</sup> this is the style of shield, a *scuta*, used in the surviving achievements of the Black Prince and Henry V. The preferred functional shield styles by the third-quarter of the fourteenth century were the target (a small, hand-held round shield) and the pavise (a door-like shield that could be propped up on a battlefield).<sup>159</sup> It had cost the Wardrobe 3s 4d to decorate Edward III's achievement heater shield in 1377.<sup>160</sup> The achievements were the visual reminders of the man's life and splendid career. The style of both the helm and the shield harkened back to earlier times of glory, such the prime of the military careers of Edward III and the Black Prince.<sup>161</sup> The beating of a heater shield with Henry V's arms for his funeral cost 20s in 1422,<sup>162</sup> the cost probably due to the decoration and the old style. The use of an older style helm and shield connected Henry V's accomplishments in France visually with the shield of his great-grandfather in Westminster and the achievements of his great-uncle in Canterbury.<sup>163</sup>

The painted achievements, while much lovelier in appearance, were not worth as much as the armour worn by the riders. This should be interpreted not only in monetary value, but also in the object's utility. The riders wore armour that could be worn in battle or at tournament at that time; it was serviceable and worthwhile for the family to redeem for usage again, or the church could find someone to sell it to. In contrast, the achievements were never expected to be used again. They were to be on display, and by the fifteenth century, the heater

---

<sup>157</sup> Hope, "The Funeral, Monument, and Chantry Chapel of King Henry the Fifth," 136.

<sup>158</sup> Thom Richardson, "Armour in England 1325-99," *Journal of Medieval History*, 37, no. 3 (2011), 319.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, 320. A target had cost 13s 4d in 1372-1374 and a pavise 6s 9d in 1399.

<sup>160</sup> Given-Wilson, "The Exequies of Edward III," 271.

<sup>161</sup> Blair, *European Armour*, 197.

<sup>162</sup> Hope, "The Funeral, Monument, and Chantry Chapel of King Henry the Fifth," 136.

<sup>163</sup> The conference *Beyond Agincourt: The Funeral Achievements of Henry V*, held at Westminster Abbey on 28 October 2015, discussed this and other matters. It was indicated that the conference proceedings would be published at a future date.



shield and arguably the tilting helm were out of style for practical use. Edward IV's jewelled sword from Pope Sixtus IV, which was offered at his funeral, was not meant for combat. As valuable as it may not have been,<sup>164</sup> its ornate appearance was best suited for display over the tomb rather than being purchased back in 1483. Anne Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs state that the offering of achievements was still a method of payment during this period, but it was also "an offering up to God of the arms of a knightly champion of the church, no longer able to perform his martial duties."<sup>165</sup> This statement is ornate and misses a key point: the achievements were inalienable, as they were intended to be part of the permanent monument. The family was not going to buy them back, nor could the church resell them during the lifetime of the deceased's family.

The payment riders were vastly more valuable. Between 1372 and 1374, the royal house purchased several sets of fine quality armours. One seems to have gone to Thomas of Woodstock, as he is affiliated with the following: a pair of plates with the arms of the Edward III and Thomas of Woodstock which cost £4 13s 8d, a pair of legharnesses £10 5s, arm defences 40s with a pair of gauntlets to match at 26s 8d, and a bascinet 40s. This is a total of £20 5s 4d,<sup>166</sup> and this does not include any mail that would have been worn under the plate. The inventory of Thomas' goods seized in 1397 shows that he owned a respectable amount of armour, totalling over £100 at a single residence.<sup>167</sup> If Thomas of Woodstock had had a

---

<sup>164</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs quote the editors of the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII* in stating that the value of such a sword from the pope was "not so valuable for the matter as for the mystery." *Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 29, n. 181.

<sup>165</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 27.

<sup>166</sup> Richardson, "Armour in England," 317. These figures are taken from TNA E 101/395/1 and TNA E 101/397/10.

<sup>167</sup> Viscount Dillon and W.H. St. John Hope, "Inventory of the Goods and Chattels Belonging to Thomas, Duke of Gloucester and Seized in His Castle at Pleshy, Co. Essex, 21 Richard II (1397): with their values, as shown in the Escheator's Accounts," *The Archaeological Journal*, 54 (1897), 307.

normative funeral and burial,<sup>168</sup> one or more sets of his armour would have been offered at his funeral to offset the cost of it.

There are at least three riders mentioned in the *Liber Regie Capelle* that bear the banners, the shield, and other achievements. All the men, all the horses, and all the items vanish during the course of the funeral. If we consider, conservatively, that each of those three horses had a saddle, a banner of the king's arms, and a trapper of some measure, each horse at Henry V's funeral would have had a value of £3 16s 8d, plus its own innate value.<sup>169</sup>

Christopher Dyer estimates that while a high-grade riding horse was worth about £10, it was possible that a single destrier – the type of horse used in tournaments and the one specifically mentioned by Walsingham in his account of Henry V's funeral<sup>170</sup> – could have a cost as much as £80 in the late thirteenth century.<sup>171</sup> Andrew Ayton notes that while the values of most horses fluctuated,<sup>172</sup> destriers remained particularly expensive. In 1342-1343, Sir Walter de Mauny lost a destrier valued at £100, and Sir Baldwin de Freville lost a destrier valued at £52.<sup>173</sup>

Although archers would become more effective than mounted knights on the battlefield, destriers would remain a sign of great status throughout the fifteenth century.<sup>174</sup> Most relevant to this argument, Richard II rode upon a destrier worth £200 at his coronation on 16 July 1377.<sup>175</sup> It would be reasonable to consider that, at Edward III's funeral on 5 July 1377, a horse of similar value was offered to offset the costs of his funeral and remind those present that he had been the King.

---

<sup>168</sup> Thomas of Woodstock, duke of Gloucester died under mysterious circumstances in Calais while awaiting trial for treason. The custody of his body was at one point disputed, and he was ultimately interred at Richard II's discretion with minimal honours. See Chapter V, 201.

<sup>169</sup> Hope, "The Funeral, Monument, and Chantry Chapel of Henry V," 136.

<sup>170</sup> Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 2," 346.

<sup>171</sup> Christopher Dyer, *Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages: Social Change in England c. 1200-1520*, revised edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 71-72.

<sup>172</sup> Andrew Ayton, *Knights and Warhorses: Military Service and the English Aristocracy Under Edward III* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), 194-197.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid*, 240.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid*, 22-23.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid*, 37.

In 1422, therefore, the value of the disappearing riders and horses was a much finer price for the church than Henry V's achievement helm and shield. Each destrier was likely valued toward the top of its price range, being fit for a king. A royal funeral with all the elaborate ceremonies and offerings of arms and cloths of gold was an expensive venture, but that was, in part, the point; only someone of a certain status and wealth could pay for all of this.

The use of armour and horses as payment at a funeral has a longer history than the ritualized display with which it is now affiliated. The activity progressed from the functional, necessary form of payment made in the fourteenth century to the splendid, formalized presentation of achievements found in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. Further evolution had occurred by the 1483 exequies of Edward IV at St. George's Chapel at Windsor. The achievements were brought out from the vestry, offered by the Garter King of Arms, and then handed off to various nobles.<sup>176</sup> After this was complete, an armoured knight on horseback entered the chapel, the rider offering himself at the altar while the deacon accepted the horse with its elaborate trapper.<sup>177</sup> The rider's armour, the horse, and the horse's accoutrements were payment. Here, the presentation of achievements was cut cleanly away from the armour and horse offering.

By the third quarter of the fifteenth century, the offering of arms was already becoming unaffiliated with actual military activity. It referred more to the person's status, as seen in the presentation at the funeral of Prince George, who died in 1479 at the age of two.<sup>178</sup> Richard III's hanging of Henry VI's achievements at Windsor in 1484 was also a signal that the offering was a reflection of status, not a biographical comment. Henry VI was not known for his military prowess. This trend continued as noble women also had arms and hatchments presented at their funerals, including Mary I.<sup>179</sup> In the course of Elizabeth I's reign, the presentation of

---

<sup>176</sup> See 125 above; this was when the Berkeley disruption occurred

<sup>177</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 40.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

<sup>179</sup> Cynthia Herrup, "The King's Two Genders," *Journal of British Studies*, 45, no. 3 (July 2006), 496.

hatchments and arms was deemed inappropriate and illegal for women.<sup>180</sup> The heraldic funeral became a statement of male status that would survive the Protestant Reformation and endure to the eighteenth century.<sup>181</sup>

Cultural transmission was not an insular process, happening within one culture alone; the custom of presenting achievements would cross to France by 1498,<sup>182</sup> just as the effigy had in 1422. The funeral of Edward II was influenced by both events in France and French culture. It was also complicated by Edward's status at the time of his death – a king that was no longer king. The funeral could not be too grand, but it also had to express his rank in nobility (which he retained despite losing the crown) and that he was the father of a king.

### *The Case of Edward II*

After his death 21 September 1327, Edward II was embalmed,<sup>183</sup> and he was suitably dressed; his undergarments were from his coronation, while his external garments appear to have been made for that day.<sup>184</sup> He had at least two extensively decorated hurses, standards, pennants, decorated coverings for harnesses, horses, and his coffin at Gloucester (all decorated with gold leaf), and appropriate clothing for the knights in attendance and other mourners.<sup>185</sup> These items can be placed in the contexts of the *Liber Regie Capelle* and the Household Articles; an idea of Edward II's funeral begins to form, though there are no surviving narrative accounts from those in attendance.

---

<sup>180</sup> Cunnington and Lucas, *Costume for Births, Marriages, and Deaths*, 133.

<sup>181</sup> A full discussion of the heraldic funeral is beyond the bounds of this work, but for further information, see J.F.R. Day, "The Heraldic Funeral," *Coat of Arms*, no. 190 (Summer 2000), last accessed 12 May 2016, [http://www.theheraldrysociety.com/articles/college\\_of\\_arms/heraldic\\_funerals.htm](http://www.theheraldrysociety.com/articles/college_of_arms/heraldic_funerals.htm); Philip Morgan, "Of Worms and War: 1380-1558," in *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, edited by Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 119-146; Clare Gittings, "Sacred and Secular: 1558-1660," *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, edited by Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 147-173; Jennifer Woodward, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997).

<sup>182</sup> Given-Wilson, "The Exequies of Edward III," 273.

<sup>183</sup> See Chapter III, 80.

<sup>184</sup> Moore, "Documents Relating to the Death and Burial of King Edward II," 222.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, 221-222.

Edward II was one of three kings (the other two being John<sup>186</sup> and Richard III) that did not have a procession to or from London; this is not a requirement of the prescriptive texts, but its absence was rare. Gloucester Abbey was less than twenty miles away from the site of Edward's death and far enough away from London that a procession there could be seen as impractical or at least politically unwise. Edward II was out of sight and thus hopefully out of the mind, as far as Queen Isabella and Roger Mortimer, the *de facto* rulers, were concerned.<sup>187</sup> It also may have been risky, as Isabella knew from personal experience.

In 1314, Queen Isabella's father, Philippe IV, died and was embalmed and displayed publicly within four days of his death on 29 November.<sup>188</sup> According to the embalmer himself, the king's face was not as well preserved as he had hoped;<sup>189</sup> eyewitnesses agreed, stating that the hands and face were "astonishingly altered."<sup>190</sup> Philippe had died in the palace of Fontainebleau, about fifty miles from Paris and its splendid churches.

Despite the success of Edward I's embalming at a distance of over 300 miles,<sup>191</sup> there was no assurance that the same would hold true for Edward II at a distance about 115 miles. The latter's body could have been preserved as well as his father's, or it could have gone the way of Philippe le Bel's. In the worst-case scenario, Edward II would have rotted in public, with possible interpretations that he had been poisoned or that he was undergoing extreme cruentation to implicate Isabella and Mortimer. Quite wisely, knights of Bristol and Gloucester were instead invited to view the body, probably at Berkeley, before its removal to Gloucester

---

<sup>186</sup> For John, see *English Historical Documents, Volume III*, 82; the body had an extensive escort, including William Marshal and papal legate Gualo.

<sup>187</sup> Palliser, "Royal Mausolea," 9; Seymour Phillips, *Edward II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 550-552.

<sup>188</sup> Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Gèneve, France: Librairie E. Droz, 1960) 23-24. On 15 December, Edward II ordered thirty bishops and archbishops to celebrate exequies for his wife's father, *CCR, 1313-1318*, 205.

<sup>189</sup> Henri de Mondeville, *The Surgery of Master Henry de Mondeville, Surgeon of Philip the Fair, King of France, written from 1306 to 1320*, translated from Latin by E. Nicaise, translated from French by Leonard Rosenman (XLibris Corporation, 2003), 739; Henri de Mondeville, *Chirurgie de Maître Henri de Mondeville*, translated and edited by E. Nicaise (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer Baillière and Co., 1893), 572.

<sup>190</sup> Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony*, 24.

<sup>191</sup> Joseph Ayloffé, "An Account of the Body of King Edward the First, As It Appeared on the Opening of His Tomb in the Year 1774," *Archaeologia*, 3 (January 1775), 382.

on 21 October.<sup>192</sup> Public viewing was a common element in the burial of English kings.

Edward II, on this point, was treated as any other legitimate monarch.

Edward II's procession also appears to have had at least some of the elements described in the *Liber Regie Capelle* and the Household Articles. John Smyth, steward of Berkeley Castle, published his three-volume *Lives of the Berkeleys* c. 1628. He included several excerpts from the castle financial accounts, including a settlement with the Crown relating to the death, transport, and burial of Edward II.<sup>193</sup> Listed in an accounts roll at the Berkeley Castle Muniments are the expenses for dyeing a white canvas black for the funeral chare, the trappings for horses, decorations for the chare, oblations for the soul of the king, and the expenses for the Berkeley family to accompany the body to Gloucester Abbey.<sup>194</sup>

The accounts of Edward II's exequies lack any mention of money paid toward torches and candles, which are so often described in both the wills of kings<sup>195</sup> and in the prescriptive texts. In the Household Articles, the torches were to be dictated by rank: the higher the rank, the greater the number.<sup>196</sup> What was Edward of Caernarfon's rank as a deposed king?<sup>197</sup> The lack of any lights at all, in combination with splendid herse and cloths, suggests uncertainty on the part of those planning the funeral. Any rich man could have a lovely herse, but the amount

---

<sup>192</sup> Moore, "Documents Relating to the Death and Burial of King Edward II," 220. Moore offers poisoning as a potential option for the means of death, but he acknowledges that however Edward II met his end, it was not obvious to those who viewed the body; a poison such as cyanide or bludgeoning would be evident.

<sup>193</sup> John Smyth, *The Lives of the Berkeleys, Lords of the Honour, Castle, and Manor of Berkeley in the County of Gloucester from 1066-1618*, i, edited by Sir John MacLean (Gloucester: John Bellows, 1883), 292-294.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, 293-294.

<sup>195</sup> His son Edward III was specifically asked that his tomb be well lit; see Chapter III, 85-86. Perhaps there is significance in the request based upon the lack of torches in any description relating to his father's burial.

<sup>196</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 130.

<sup>197</sup> Unlike those for Edward I and Eleanor of Castile, I have yet to find any writ issued for wax or candles to burn around the tomb of Edward II, even from Edward III. There were standing orders to provide votive masses and prayers but not candles; for example, on 16 January 1377, Edward III sent a letter close to Evesham's abbot to request his presence at Parliament, even though he had always exempted the abbot in exchange for the celebration of Edward II's anniversary "with certain monks in solemn apparel [...] in Gloucester where his body rests," *CCR 1374-1377*, 470. In contrast candles were explicitly included for Edward I's anniversary at Westminster Abbey; see Chapter VI, 224-227 for discussion of this anniversary. Richard II ordered candles to burn for Edward III's anniversary, *Issues of the Exchequer*, 211. Henry IV ordered candles to burn for the anniversary of his first wife Mary Bohun, *CCR, 1399-1402*, 328-329. Henry V ordered candles to burn for Richard II's new anniversary in 1413, *Issues of the Exchequer*, 328. Candles are never mentioned in the exequies or commemoration of Edward II; this is irregular.

of candles and torches he had would identify his rank. Edward II's exact position, at his exequies, was ambiguous.

Unlike other dethroned kings, Edward II famously had an effigy. An interesting accessory was a gilt crown, valued at 7s 8d,<sup>198</sup> but as previously mentioned, the Wardrobe did not issue a rod and a sceptre for him to hold in his coffin.<sup>199</sup> The crown was symbolic; it was just an artefact of his previous status and power, much like the coronation garb he wore. The reality was more reflected in what his hands held: nothing.

*De Exequiis Regalibus* is accompanied by an illumination in Pamplona MS 197, the *Litlington Missal*, and the *Liber Regalis*.<sup>200</sup> Each of these manuscripts has an illumination of a dead king lying on chare. The Pamplona MS king holds a gold ball in his hands. The *Litlington Missal* king holds a gold rod and ball. *The Liber Regalis* king holds a rod and sceptre. These items fit with the prescriptive text *De Exequiis Regalibus*, but they were also symbols of monarchy by the late fourteenth century, particularly in England and France.<sup>201</sup> When looking at the illuminated *Chroniques* by Froissart, in BL Harley MS 4380, the dead Richard II is seen in his procession, crowned but empty-handed.<sup>202</sup> Richard's hands had not been exposed during his procession;<sup>203</sup> their appearance in the illumination was artistic license and political euphemism. The medieval audience was culturally self-aware about the problem

<sup>198</sup> Moore, "Documents Relating to the Death and Burial of King Edward II," 221-222.

<sup>199</sup> See above, 144, n. 126.

<sup>200</sup> See Chapter I, 23-24 for an introduction to these illuminated manuscripts. The illuminations are found on Pamplona MS 197 f. 22v; *Litlington Missal*, f. 224r; and *Liber Regalis*, f. 33v.

<sup>201</sup> This is particularly well illustrated by the sceptre of Charles V, crafted no later than 1380, which is topped by a figure of Charlemagne, holding a long rod and a gold ball. It is currently on display at the Louvre as part of the French Crown jewels.

<sup>202</sup> BL Harley MS 4380, f. 197b. This is Volume IV, Part II, created in the Netherlands for a French patron, possibly Philippe de Comynnes, c. 1470-1472. British Library, "Detailed Record for Harley 4380," *Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts*, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=7232&CollID=8&NStart=4380>.

<sup>203</sup> Walsingham, *The St Albans Chronicle*, ii, 300; Froissart, *Oeuvres*, xvi, 235-236; *The Brut*, ii, 360; *Eulogium (Historiarum sive Temporis): Chronicon ab Orbe Conditio Usque ad Annum Domini MCCCCLXVI a Monacho quodam Malmesburiensi Exaratum. Accedunt continuationes duae, quarum una ad annum M.CCC.XIII., altera ad annum M.CCCC.XC. per ducta est*, iii, edited by F.S. Haydon. RS, 9 (London: 1858), 387.

of a deposed or usurped king's status during the medieval period; it was not by complete accident that these items were excluded from their funerals.

Edward II's funeral signified the importance of the deceased, yet also recognized that he was no longer the same rank as his son, the sitting monarch. Again, the goal of the funeral was never to delegitimize or negate Edward II as a king, because it was by virtue of his father's kingship that Edward III reigned.<sup>204</sup> The reality of Edward II's status had to be recognized and confirmed, however; he was no longer king. Although there were some unique features in Edward II's funeral, chroniclers never mentioned them. Close reading of the financial accounts and comparisons to other kings' exequies bring out these differences, not an eyewitness or contemporary complaining about them. The exequies were unremarkable and unobjectionable by contemporaries – they were a success. The royal prescriptive text of *De Exequiis Regalibus* and the traditions that would be codified in the *Liber Regie Capelle* and the Household Articles made this possible. Despite Edward of Caernarfon's deposition and manner of death, the elasticity of the prescriptive texts accommodated this and created a funeral that fell within the bounds of a normative English royal funeral.

Certain activities relating to the royal exequies were inconsistently carried out, mostly due to changes in fashion and what was considered acceptable behaviour. In the Berkeley Castle Muniments, in reference to Edward II, a line reports “37s 8d for silver vessel to put the kings h[e]art in.”<sup>205</sup> Heart burial was the separate interment of the heart from the body.<sup>206</sup> This custom is pan-European, though its earliest roots appear in what is now modern Germany. The practice of burying the heart separately from the body first appeared in the early medieval period as an extension to evisceration and embalming; the parts had to go somewhere. By the

---

<sup>204</sup> Ormrod, *Edward III*, 69.

<sup>205</sup> Smythe, *Lives of the Berkeleys*, i, 293.

<sup>206</sup> Much of the following section first appeared in the author's master's thesis. Anna M. Duch, “‘My Crown is in My Heart, Not on My Head’: Heart Burial in England, France and the Holy Roman Empire from Medieval Times to the Present” (Master's thesis, University of North Texas, 2013).



twelfth century, the heart had garnered its own *gravitas* independent of the royal body and was given its own funeral.

Heart burial was used to assert one's identity as an elite person. With its extra casket and other accoutrements, it was not cheap. The preservation and presentation of body parts was an act of conspicuous consumption.<sup>207</sup> Prior to 1299, English kings, queens, and royal children regularly had their hearts buried separately, and this was imitated by elites, such as landowners and bishops.

When a person had loyalties to multiple religious houses, they may have chosen to send their body one place and their heart to another. Religious houses desired these royal remains, as they attracted the continued patronage of the family of the deceased.<sup>208</sup> Benedictine Thomas Walsingham compared the Franciscan friars and their rivals to dogs fighting over table scraps when describing the squabble for the custody of Eleanor of Provence's heart.<sup>209</sup>

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the English royal house had a fairly robust habit of heart burial with monarchs such as Richard I,<sup>210</sup> John,<sup>211</sup> and Henry III,<sup>212</sup> along with their families.<sup>213</sup> In 1299, the papal bull *De Sepulturis* was issued against the division of bodies, with specific reference to *mos teutonicos*. This escalated an ongoing feud between Philippe IV of France and Pope Boniface VIII, upon which there has been much academic coverage.<sup>214</sup> To this point, the geographical area of England had had the most number of heart burials in Europe during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.<sup>215</sup> With the bull, heart burial in

---

<sup>207</sup> Danielle Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), 77.

<sup>208</sup> This facet of body capital will be further discussed in Chapter V, 166-203.

<sup>209</sup> Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 1," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1863), 38.

<sup>210</sup> See Chapter III, 73.

<sup>211</sup> Matthew Paris, *Monachi Sancti Albani, Historia Anglorum*, ii, edited by F. Madden. RS, 44 (London: 1866), 192; Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 57 (London: 1874), 668; *CChR, 1226-1257*, 468, dated 8 March 1257. For gifts given by Henry III in honour of the heart, see *CLR, 1226-1240*, 24; *CChR, 1226-1257*, 131; *CCR, 1227-1231*, 494, to name a few references.

<sup>212</sup> WAM 6318B; *Foedera* (Record Commission), i, pt. 2, 758.

<sup>213</sup> For Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III, and his family, see Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body*, 61-64. For Edmund Crouchback, brother of Edward I, see Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 92.

<sup>214</sup> See Chapter III, 76, n. 17.

<sup>215</sup> Armin Dietz, email correspondence with author, 13 June 2012.

the royal house came to a halt. French and Scottish kings,<sup>216</sup> along with nobles in England, continued to perform this rite, however. There are legends of Edward I's heart being removed, but these have not been substantiated.<sup>217</sup>

Evisceration and embalming continued in the English royal house as a part of the embalming process, but no special ceremonies such as a heart funeral were performed. The location of the organs was no longer noted by chroniclers. The exception to this was Henry V's viscera, the documentation for which comes from French chronicler Enguerrand de Monstrelet.<sup>218</sup> There was no public ceremony for the burial of Edward II's heart in 1327; rather, the heart appears to have been transferred to the custody of Edward's widow, Isabella of France, immediately. According to the London Greyfriars' registry, Isabella had his heart enclosed in her tomb topper in its container at her death in 1358,<sup>219</sup> but this was not known to be Edward II's own wish or desire. The heart had been taken from Edward's body at her request.<sup>220</sup>

Although the papal bull had been rendered null by 1351,<sup>221</sup> the practice of heart burial in England did not regain popularity. Henry VII resurrected the tradition in the sixteenth

---

<sup>216</sup> Robert the Bruce, at his death in 1329 willed his heart to go on crusade in the possession of Sir James Douglas, resulting in both their excommunications in 1330; the excommunications were lifted that same year. After the expedition failed in Spain, the heart was ultimately restored to Melrose Abbey, where it has rested ever since. At the examination of his tomb in Dunfermline in 1819, Robert's skeleton had the distinct feature of his sternum being sawn through deliberately. The sawn sternum also signifies that this was an alternative method used to get at the heart, rather than going up through the abdomen as suggested by both Mondeville and Chauliac. Henry Jardin, *Report to the Right Hon. The Lord Chief Baron, and the Hon. The Barons of His Majesty's Court of Exchequer in Scotland, by King's Remembrance, Relative to the Tomb of Robert the Bruce and the Cathedral Church of Dunfermline* (Edinburgh: Hay, Gall, and Co., 1821), 19.

<sup>217</sup> See Chapter II, 45-46, for Thomas Walsingham's dramatic and fiery deathbed speech by Edward I.

<sup>218</sup> See Chapter III, 96.

<sup>219</sup> BL Cotton MS Vitellius F XII, f. 275v; also published in *The Grey Friars of London: Their History with the Register of Their Convent and an Appendix of Documents*, edited by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford (Aberdeen: The University Press, 1915), 74-75; F. Blackley, "The Tomb of Isabella of France, wife of Edward II of England," *International Society for the Study of Church Monuments*, 8 (1983), 161.

<sup>220</sup> T.F. Tout, *The Captivity and Death of Edward of Carnarvon* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1920), 29.

<sup>221</sup> *Privilèges accordés à la Couronne de France par le Sainte-Siège*, edited by Adolphe François Lucien Tardif (Paris: Imprimerie Imperiale, 1855), 246. The indult, rendered to Jean the Good, granted him, his wife, and all their descendants and relatives perpetual release to arrange their mortuary and funerary services. Due to the nature of intermarriage in the Europe royal houses, the indult spread rapidly. Jean's grandfather, Charles of Valois, had been paternal uncle to Isabella of France, mother of Edward III; by this connection, the English royal house could bury its hearts as well, though it did not.

century. His son Arthur was rumoured to have had his heart buried separately from his body in 1502.<sup>222</sup> Henry VII and his wife Elizabeth had their hearts buried separately from their bodies, though they did not go far afield; the heart caskets were placed next to their bodies in their shared tomb at Westminster.<sup>223</sup> Henry VII may have done this as part of his quest to establish his legitimacy with the other royal houses of Europe. Heart burial had remained immensely popular in France and in the burgeoning Habsburg dynasty; if Henry Tudor was to be royal, then he had to imitate other royals. The practice then survived in the English royal family until 1820, the last heart burial being that of Queen Victoria's father, Edward, duke of Kent and Strathearn.<sup>224</sup>

Heart burial's inconsistent occurrence was a reflection of the ever-changing nature of the royal funeral and the traditions surrounding it; this is also seen in the ways that the offering of arms changed over the centuries. England's royal house was highly receptive to innovation and cross-cultural exchange in their exequies, due in no small part to its ties to other royal houses. The English royal house exported the effigy and offering of arms to France in the fifteenth century, and it had imported the practice of heart burial twice. Events at the funeral of French king Philippe IV may have influenced how the exequies of Edward II were carried out.

The English royal house was also keenly aware of its position at the top of a hierarchy in which they were not completely untouchable or separate from elites. Conspicuous consumption as well as appropriation of fitting customs assisted in maintaining their appearance as the pinnacle of society. The challenge of handling the funeral of Edward II was

---

<sup>222</sup> Ralph Houlbrooke, "Prince Arthur's Funeral," in *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death, and Commemoration*, edited by Steven Gunn and Linda Monckton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 65. The heart in the chapel at Ludlow is a traditional story; it is unconfirmed, though plausible. An excavation of the chapel floor would have to be undertaken to confirm this.

<sup>223</sup> Arthur P. Stanley, *Supplement to the Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey* (London: John Murray, 1869), 153. Instead of finding the urns of Henry and Elizabeth with their bodies, he found James I, who had been "misplaced" some years before. Stanley theorizes that they were moved out when James moved in, but to where is unknown.

<sup>224</sup> Aidan Dodson, "The King is Dead," in *The Unbroken Reed: Studies in the Culture and Heritage of Ancient Egypt in Honour of A.F. Shore*, edited by C. Eyre, A. Leahy and L.M. Leahy (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1994), 82.

met with ceremonies that emphasized the importance of the deceased to the monarchy while conveying his change in his personal status. Funerals in the English royal house had to navigate both national and international trends in order to maintain relevance to these two audiences and assert power within each sphere of influence. Conspicuous consumption and cultural appropriation aided in constructing the events and moderated the rituals carried out, with evident success, as other countries adopted English funerary features.

### *Conclusions*

Because of irregular circumstances, the rise and fall of kings, fluctuating fashion, and the challenge of maintaining prestige domestically and internationally, the English royal house used its prescriptive texts to stabilize the grand exequies it had to conduct. Over the centuries, the corpus of prescriptive texts grew in response to the need for clarification for present elements as well as expansion to cover new ones. It was meant to be useful, not burdensome, so many of the written changes took place after coping with a problem first-hand or being implemented at the request of a monarch. The goal was to have a successful, unremarkable funeral. Certain elements became cardinal to that pursuit, while others were more permissible to change. In special circumstances, the change was deemed necessary; carrying out the text as written would be inappropriate, such as a dethroned king holding a rod and sceptre.

The royal funeral was the monarch's last opportunity to assert and maintain his status among the nobility of England and with royal cousins of other countries. There was a ready interchange of symbols of wealth and power to prove the king's position. The dialogues were in a state of constant adjustment, the parties making small changes to maintain appropriate distance and yet remain within each other's orbit. There was a need for the English king to be relevant to both his subjects and other monarchs. However, the English royal funeral was not identifiable simply in comparison or opposition to noble or foreign exequies. The use of the

prescriptive texts promoted continuity between funerals, normalising funerals in which they were employed. This helped to mitigate differences between kings and emphasized their shared status as King of England. The nuances of each king's exequies distinguished one king from another, but a common, binding structure was present. This aided in the development of an English royal way of death.

In this chapter, the offering of arms proved to be an illustration of the differing pace that could occur between the practical and textual development of a tradition. The offering at Edward III's funeral was a simpler forerunner to the events of Henry V's funeral and the version documented in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. Edward IV's offering of arms was a further development of that, with little resemblance to the version in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. The version enacted in Edward IV's exequies appears to have been new, as there was confusion amongst the nobles as to how they should receive the arms.

To carry this line a step further, Garter knight inventories<sup>225</sup> and Hall's *Chronicle*<sup>226</sup> inform us that Henry VII had an offering of arms. Harley MS 3504 describes an offering ceremony that was managed by the heralds rather than the Garter King of Arms as in Edward IV's funeral. The heralds gave the item to be offered to a pair of nobles, who offered it to the Archbishop of Canterbury (then William Warham). The first item, among others, was a shield. It was then passed back down to a herald, who gave it to a knight to hold at the herse.<sup>227</sup> The achievements gradually surrounded the herse, until a horse and rider actually entered the barriers of the herse to be offered. All these items were taken away to places unknown when Henry VII's coffin was moved to its burial site.<sup>228</sup>

---

<sup>225</sup> BL Additional MS 45131, ff. 49r-50v.

<sup>226</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 506-507.

<sup>227</sup> BL Harley MS 3504, f. 257r (old 269r). The entire narrative has been published in John Leland, *Johannes Lelandi Antiquarii, De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, iv, edited by Thomas Hearne (London: Benjamin White, 1774), 303-309.

<sup>228</sup> BL Harley MS 3504, ff. 258v-260r (old 270v-272r); see Chapter VII, 258-259, for a discussion as to whether Henry VII was placed in the vault that he rests in today.

The same elements – at least one payment rider, a shield, and achievements – were present in each variation, but it appears there was freedom to implement those elements. This elasticity in the ritual, as in the prescriptive texts, did not dampen its effectiveness. The offering of arms was suitable and fitting to the status of king and a successful addition to the royal funerary tradition, as it emphasized the king's wealth and rank.

The royal funeral accommodated the individuality and the individual circumstance of the king. The coffin of Henry IV and the offerings of arms in the funerals of Edward III, Henry V, Edward IV, and Henry VII reflected the monarch's personal history. The king's status was not a permanent fixture. A king's status determined what, if any, elements of the prescriptive texts were included. In some circumstances, a deposed king was permitted to retain his noble status and receive such a funeral. If the new king chose to dissociate himself from his predecessor and deem him as never having been a legitimate ruler, then the funeral was minimal.

In this chapter, a king's status at death was discussed, with allusion to the changes in that status post-mortem that would effect a reburial. However, before that moment was reached, the king lay in his tomb for years. His reputation also endured, being commemorated, discussed, and judged. The funeral was, after all, the opening act in the king's legacy. The ruling king was able to dictate, pre-mortem, some of the activities that would take place upon his death, such as the location of his tomb, the building and maintenance of a chantry chapel, anniversaries to be kept, and putting money toward foundations that would pray for his soul. Thereafter, he was at the mercy of his successors and posterity for how his body was treated and for how his life and reign were framed and presented.

The only authority for a burial site in the period 1216-1509 is the last line in *De Exequiis Regalibus*. It states that the king should be taken to the place of his choosing with all

fitting reverence and rites due to him.<sup>229</sup> For the most part, there was little conflict between the new king and the old king on this matter. Edward I, Edward II, Henry VI, and Richard III did not have surviving wills that revealed their wishes regarding this, so their successors made the decision. All other kings had their wills followed, save for Richard II, which has been discussed in this chapter. Even then, whether Henry IV was required to consider Richard's wishes is debatable; Richard of Bordeaux was no longer a king who belonged in the Confessor's Chapel. The next chapter will discuss the selection and meaning of the king's initial burial location.

Unlike the funerary and burial ceremonies, there is no set of prescriptive texts for how a king's memory should be kept. Still, the opinion and commentary of others directed at the new king or regime could affect how the old king was commemorated. On a more personal level, how the new king commemorated the old one was heavily dependent upon the nature of the relationship between the two and how closely the new king wished to be affiliated with his predecessor. When the two kings were of rival houses, this was a tricky venture. Chapter VI will discuss traditionalized and individualized commemoration.

---

<sup>229</sup> *Missale ad Usus Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, ii, edited by John Wickham Legg. Henry Bradshaw Society, 5 (Bury St. Edmunds: Boydell Press, 1999), columns 734-735.

## Chapter V: Location

The site of a king's burial represented not only the deceased king's values, but also those that his successor wished to impose upon his memory. The prescriptive texts indicate that the king should be buried in a place of honour of his choosing, with the implication that the site should be fitting to the king's station.<sup>1</sup> However, the texts do not specify what a fitting place for a king was. As such, these texts were interpreted quite broadly by the king or those that chose his burial site. It is uncertain whether Edward I actively chose Westminster Abbey in life or if the decision was entirely that of Edward II and Edward I's executors. Aside from this outlier, the location of the king's initial burial tended to be choice of the deceased, unless he had been dethroned. This trend is clearly illustrated in Appendix Nine. However, the selection process was far more nuanced than this (and earlier historiography) suggests. The king's relationship with others, both living and dead, must be considered.

In the greater context of this work, this chapter settles the corpse after the funeral. For most, their initial burial location was their eternal repose, but for others, this was only a midpoint between their death and final rest. The accumulation of opinion about the resting place affected how the king was remembered, both in the imagination and in how his anniversaries were carried out. Chapter VI discusses the commemoration that came after the burial, but Chapter VII addresses the dissatisfaction with the initial funeral location for one reason or another; on rare occasions, this triggered disinterment and reinterment at what was considered a more suitable place.

In this chapter, the motivation and meaning behind the selection of initial burial sites will be discussed. In the modern day, Westminster Abbey in London and St. George's at Windsor Castle are considered the royal "necropoli" due to their high population, but upon

---

<sup>1</sup> *Missale ad Usus Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, iii, edited by John Wickham Legg. Henry Bradshaw Society, 12 (Bury. St. Edmunds: Boydell Press, 1999), columns 734-735; *Liber Regie Capelle*, 115; *A Collection of Ordinances*, 131.



closer examination, it becomes clear that these sites were not monolithic. In turn, the choices for sites outside of Westminster and Windsor were not as isolated and fragmentary.

All of these sites were in England. The kings of England from John onward were all buried in England, but one must make note that this was not the only option available. The Angevin burial church of Fontevraud in Anjou remained open to bodies or parts. English territory on the continent fluctuated, but it was not until the fifteenth century that all was lost. The exact borders of Wales and Scotland were also mutable. Regardless of the stability of the region, a conscious choice was made either by the dying king or by his executors that he was to be brought back to England. This desire was also expressed in the lengths to which kings went to have family members repatriated.

Along with intentions, the practical elements of transport and the actual political messages transmitted must be considered in the context of both the times and the parties making these decisions. The elements of the masses and the Office of the Dead under each Use will also be compared. Discussed previously in Chapters III and IV, the “way things went” liturgically speaking will be further discussed here. The soundscape and scriptural content will be compared in relation to the various burial churches. One must also keep in mind that even if the ritual elements of Chapter III were somehow frozen, the patterns in the masses and in the hours changed with the season. No royal funeral was ever the same.

### *Westminster Abbey*

Examining liturgical activity in Westminster Abbey reveals its mixed heritage.<sup>2</sup> All Uses devolved from the Roman Rite, and there were always similarities. However, in the case of Westminster, both location and administration played a role in what was seen and heard at the Abbey during royal exequies. Although it principally followed the Roman Rite in its Vespers

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendices One to Seven, 311-322.

and Mass of the Trinity, the Westminster Use differed occasionally, perhaps reflecting a unique musical arrangement. For example, while all Uses derived the gradual for the mass of the Holy Trinity from Tobit 12 (*Benedictus es domine qui intueris abyssos*), Westminster used the Song of Three Holy Children, derived from the Book of Daniel, chapter 3, as the verse (*Benedictus es infirmamento caeli et laudabilis*) instead of simply continuing the selection from Tobit.<sup>3</sup>

Not all of Westminster's variations from the Roman Rite were unique. The Mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary revealed the diversity of influences at work at Westminster during the medieval period. The mass itself had rotating scripture and music based upon the life of the Virgin throughout the year. Westminster abided by a mix of its own elements and those of the Roman Rite, but there were clear Sarum and Benedictine influences during certain times of the year. This reflects the Benedictine heritage of Westminster, but also its location in southeastern England. Sarum had enhanced ritual activity at certain points of the Mass, which catered to the high status of its principal patrons.<sup>4</sup> The Benedictines had a particularly strong tradition of liturgical hours; in Matins and Lauds, when Westminster strayed from the Roman rite, the variation often appeared in the Benedictine Rite. Conversely, in the Requiem Mass, Westminster followed Sarum variations, some of which were also seen in the English Benedictine rite; the Roman Rite and Dominican Rite differed from these three. Westminster was a crossroads of these influences and catered to its own individual situation in the capital city as a favoured church of the royal family. As a result, services there may have had a broad appeal, as the diversity – a blend of Roman, Sarum, and Benedictine elements and its own unique properties – provided some familiarity at different points of the masses and hours.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Mass of the Trinity's texts draw on themes predominantly found in the apocryphal section of the book of Daniel, specifically the Song of the Three Holy Children after Daniel 3:23. Similar themes are expressed in the apocryphal book Tobit and are utilized by all Uses, but as seen in the case of Westminster Abbey, there were differences in how the texts were selected.

<sup>4</sup> See below, 191.

The majority of English kings and queens after the Conquest rest in either Westminster Abbey or St. George's Chapel at Windsor. Despite their royal patronage, neither site immediately became a comprehensive necropolis. Henry III originally intended to be buried at the New Temple of London, run by the Templars.<sup>5</sup> While still maintaining good ties with the Templars, Henry had funded works at Westminster in his houses, his chapels, and the Abbey. His devotion to St. Edward became earnest by 1237. In that year, Henry began a yearly offering of candles at the Confessor's Shrine, culminating in a series of gifts in honour of the Confessor in 1240.<sup>6</sup> In 1246, Henry changed his preference to Westminster, due in part to his devotion to St. Edward the Confessor.<sup>7</sup> In his will of 1253, Henry emphasized that he had chosen the New Temple formerly, but now his choice was Westminster Abbey.<sup>8</sup>

Due to Henry's expenditures on Westminster Abbey, some historians consider him the creator of a royal necropolis. They conclude that Henry's cousin, Louis IX of France, had influenced him in terms of the Abbey's purpose and appearance; Westminster was a conscious effort at emulating Saint-Denis in function, but Notre Dame and the Sainte-Chapelle in terms of design.<sup>9</sup> However, more recent assessment suggests that Henry elected to be buried at Westminster due to the centralization of the English government. The Abbey had also functioned as the coronation church since 1066; rather than operating solely upon its merits as

---

<sup>5</sup> *CChR, 1226-1257*, 235, charter dated 6 July 1231.

<sup>6</sup> *CLR, 1226-1240*, 263, writ dated 20 April 1237. The candles are given again in late April of 1238 (307) and 1239 (375), with a supplement for this added in late 1239 (399, dated 30 June), and continuing in 1240 (460). On 5 July 1240, there was a large offering made to St. Edward (478). This included gold, fabric, and candles at the Abbey and a new altar, icons, a marble font, and two basins for St. Stephen's Chapel. The gift of the candles continues throughout Henry's reign, typically in April and then April and October, in the Liberate Rolls.

<sup>7</sup> *CChR, 1226-1257*, 306, dated 23 October 1246.

<sup>8</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 15.

<sup>9</sup> R. Allen Brown, H.M. Colvin, and A.J. Taylor, *The History of the King's Works, Volume I: The Middle Ages* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963), 145-146, 151; Robert Branner, *Studies in Architecture, Volume VII: St. Louis and the Court Style in Gothic Architecture* (London: A. Zwemmer, 1965), 124-125; Elizabeth Hallam, "Royal Burial and the Cult of Kingship in France and England, 1060-1330," *Journal of Medieval History*, 8 (1982), 372.

a burial church, as Saint-Denis did, Westminster possessed the ability to serve throughout a king's entire reign.<sup>10</sup>

On a more personal level, Henry may have intended that Westminster Abbey would be the resting place for his immediate family only. Henry III buried at least one daughter in Westminster Abbey.<sup>11</sup> Katherine, although disabled in some way,<sup>12</sup> was much beloved by her parents; Henry arranged an elaborate funeral<sup>13</sup> and for a silver *gisant* - a tomb topper with a recumbent image of the deceased - to be placed over her tomb in 1257.<sup>14</sup> Henry also laid the heart of his nephew, Henry of Almain, at the shrine.<sup>15</sup> Henry did not make any motion to remove his father King John from Worcester, nor his mother Isabella of Angoulême from Fontevraud; instead, he funded improvements to the monastic foundations they were in.<sup>16</sup> Richard of Cornwall, his brother, predeceased him in April 1272. Richard was buried at his foundation of Hailes. As observed by Danielle Westerhof, Richard had buried his predeceased children and wives primarily at Cistercian locations, founded by himself and his father, King John.<sup>17</sup> Henry felt no compulsion to gather those predeceased relatives at the

---

<sup>10</sup> Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power, 1200-1400* (London: Yale University Press, 1995) 3, 7; David A. Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 453; D.M. Palliser, "Royal Mausolea in the Long Fourteenth Century (1272-1422)," in *Fourteenth Century England III*, edited by W.M. Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 1-3.

<sup>11</sup> Margaret Howell, "The Children of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence," in *Thirteenth Century England IV: Proceedings of the Newcastle-Upon-Tyne Conference 1991*, edited by Peter Coss (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1992), 57-72. The existence of five children (Edward, Edmund, Beatrice, Margaret and Katherine) can be confirmed by chronicle and Chancery sources, as well as existing monuments. The evidence for four others (Richard, John, William, and Henry; Matilda is only mentioned in one source, the unpublished Hailes Chronicle) is limited. Howell handily makes the point that Katherine was known to be handicapped by chroniclers, as she had lived to the age of three. The others, in the accounts that mentioned them, did not live past the age of two. Two options exist: one or more of these children never existed or they died too young to be adequately documented. If the latter is true, it is quite possible that they had similar or more severe defects than Katherine.

<sup>12</sup> Matthew Paris uses the words *muta et inutilis* - mute and useless - but also *pulcherrima* - beautiful - to describe her. Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, v, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 57 (London: 1880), 632.

<sup>13</sup> *CLR, 1251-1260*, 373, writ dated 16 May 1257 for £51 12s 4d.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, 376, writ dated 28 May 1257 for 2 marks to begin construction. However, this does not appear to have been fully paid for. Within a few weeks after the death of Henry III, Chancellor Walter Merton ordered an investigation into William of Gloucester and his executors, due to certain accounts, including that of Katherine's *gisant*, not being rendered, despite Gloucester receiving the money for it. Gloucester had died in 1269, and his executors had made repeated excuses to Henry III to delay the audit. The latest answer to Merton for the delay was that the king had just died, thus prompting the writ dated 14 December 1272, *CCR, 1272-1279*, 3.

<sup>15</sup> Danielle Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2008), 58.

<sup>16</sup> See Chapter VII, 255-256, for John's travels. See n. 46 below for Isabella.

<sup>17</sup> Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body*, 63-64.

shrine of St. Edward. Henry III was buried in the Confessor's Chapel at Westminster on 20 November 1272, as per his will, four days after his death.

In contrast, Edward I actively decided to bury his wife, children, extended family, and in-laws and rebury his brother in or near the Confessor's Shrine; by these actions, not those of Henry III, the Confessor's Shrine and the area around it became a royal mausoleum.<sup>18</sup> Edward I outlived the majority of his children by Eleanor of Castile.<sup>19</sup> At the time of his death in 1307, only Margaret of England, Mary of Woodstock, Elizabeth of Rhuddlan, and Edward of Caernarfon (later Edward II) still lived. Out of the couple's predeceased children, at least six that were under the age of twelve were buried at Westminster Abbey: Katherine (1264),<sup>20</sup> Joan (1265),<sup>21</sup> John (1271),<sup>22</sup> Henry (1274),<sup>23</sup> Berengaria (1277),<sup>24</sup> and Alphonso (1284).<sup>25</sup> Although half of these children were buried while Henry III still lived, agency should be attributed to their father, Edward, rather than their grandfather; Henry III was not aggressive in populating Westminster Abbey with royal bodies. Edward's firstborn daughter, Eleanor of England, later Countess of Bar, died in her late twenties after her marriage and her bearing of two children,

---

<sup>18</sup> Thomas Cocke, "'The Repository of Our English Kings': The Henry VII Chapel As Royal Mausoleum," *Architectural History*, 44 (2001), 212; Palliser, "Royal Mausolea," 4-5, 7; Hallam, "Royal Burial and the Cult of Kingship," 375. Hallam rests between the two views, believing Henry was heavily influenced by Louis IX but crediting Edward I with the actual creation of Westminster as necropolis.

<sup>19</sup> Two children are very ill-documented. Unlike the "extra" children of Henry III, however, the children were not said to have been granted a burial place in Westminster Abbey. Others are named inconsistently, particularly the daughters. The number of children of Edward I varies from sixteen to twenty-one, depending upon the sources used. In terms of the records, the boys are easiest to track, as, at the time of their deaths, they were each the heir apparent. Alphonso and Henry are doubly easy to track, as they received two interments; their hearts were buried separately at Blackfriars (see n. 27 below) and Guildford Priory, respectively; John Carmi Parsons, "The Year of Eleanor of Castile's Birth and her Children by Edward I," *Medieval Studies*, 46 (1984), 259.

<sup>20</sup> Confused with Henry III's daughter Katherine by Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Historiarum*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 95 (London: 1890), 474; *CLR, 1260-1267*, 143.

<sup>21</sup> *CCR, 1264-1268*, 70-71. In this entry, Henry offered a cloth of gold in remembrance of his recently deceased granddaughter Joan, daughter of Edward.

<sup>22</sup> "Annales de Oseneia," *Annales Monastici*, iv, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1869), 245-6; "Annales de Wigornia," *Annales Monastici*, iv, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1869), 460-461.

<sup>23</sup> "Chronicon de Thomas Wykes," *Annales Monastici*, iv, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1869), 261.

<sup>24</sup> John Carmi Parsons, "The Year of Eleanor of Castile's Birth," 258-259. Carmi also argues for a daughter born and deceased in Palestine named Blanche, but these references are probably about Joan of Acre or Juliana.

<sup>25</sup> "Annales de Oseneia," 296, 297-8; *The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds, 1212-1301*, edited by Antonia Gransden (London: Nelson, 1964), 81; Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 1," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1863), 26.

but she too was said to have been buried in Westminster in 1298.<sup>26</sup> All of his children by Margaret of France survived him.

Eleanor of Castile died on 28 November 1290 at Lincoln. Her bowels were buried there, her heart at London Blackfriars to rest with her son Alphonso's heart, and her body at Westminster Abbey.<sup>27</sup> Along with his immediate family, Edward included his half-uncle and cousins in his burial scheme. William de Valence (d. 1296) was a uterine half-brother to Henry III and died in Bayonne. Edward buried his half-uncle in Westminster Abbey. Valence's two predeceased children, John (d. 1276) and Margaret (d. 1277), and his adult son Aymer (d. 1324) were ultimately buried in the Abbey as well.<sup>28</sup> After the death of his brother Edmund at Bayonne in 1296, Edward I was "left desolate."<sup>29</sup> Edmund was buried in Westminster Abbey next to his first wife, Aveline, who had died in 1274. In 1298, Edward I found himself to have outlived his parents, his first wife, at least half of their minor children, and all of his brothers and sisters. Such was the price of successfully building a royal family mausoleum.<sup>30</sup> The dead buried by Henry III and Edward I are clustered in a rough horseshoe around the shrine of Edward the Confessor, invoking the saint's protection.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Palliser, "Royal Mausolea," 5, makes the confusing statement that "Edward I's daughter Eleanor" was buried at Beaulieu. Edward I had two daughters named Eleanor. The first daughter Eleanor was the child of Edward I by Eleanor his first wife; she became Countess of Bar and later died in 1298. See discussion below, 196-197; see also John Carmi Parsons, "The Year of Eleanor of Castile's Birth," 258. The second daughter Eleanor was born in 1306, the daughter of Margaret of France by Edward I. She was named in honour of her father's first wife, died as a child, and was buried at Beaulieu; *Issues of the Exchequer*, 123.

<sup>27</sup> "Annales de Dunstaplia," *Annales Monastici*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1866), 362; "Annales Londonienses," *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, i, edited by William Stubbs. RS, 76 (London: 1882), 99.

<sup>28</sup> William de Valence may have been moved from the Confessor's Chapel in order to make room for the joint tomb of Richard II and Anne of Bohemia. John's and Margaret's graves were overrun by the chantry of Henry V. Aymer, who lived into Edward II's reign, died abroad and was buried to the north of the high altar; see J. R. S. Phillips, "Valence, Aymer de, eleventh earl of Pembroke (d. 1324)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/942. Sally Badham, "Whose Body? Monuments Displaced from St. Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Westminster Abbey," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 160 (2007), 140-143, argues for William de Valence's tomb being moved at this time.

<sup>29</sup> *CChR, 1257-1300*, 512, writ dated 15 July 1296.

<sup>30</sup> The close arrangement of the dead is also noted and commented up on by Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, 93.

<sup>31</sup> See Chapter VII, 256, for further discussion of being buried near saintly bodies.

Westminster Abbey, through the work of Edward I, had garnered a great deal of royal body capital in a fifty-year period. “Body capital,” as I have termed it, is the influence accumulated by a given location based upon the status and number of people of that status buried there. As indicated above, Westminster Abbey was not a burial church for post-Conquest royal family members or monarchs until 1257. Within fifty years, however, there were at least seventeen royal bodies or parts of bodies in the vicinity of the Confessor’s Shrine.

Margaret Howell believes that Manchester Chetham Library MS 6712, which contains a copy of Matthew Paris’ *Flores Historiarum*, was altered during the latter part of the thirteenth century or possibly the early fourteenth century. The manuscript had been moved from St. Albans to Westminster during this period. This editing manoeuvre included an additional four children of Henry III, three of whom were said to be buried in Westminster Abbey.<sup>32</sup> These children do not exist in other manuscript sources.

One can interpret these additions to Westminster’s dead as “bodysnatching.” Churches and orders actively competed with each other for bodies and body parts of both saints and elites. Pilgrims came to visit saints, and family members often made offerings or paid for prayers to be said for the dead; both were significant sources of income to a church.<sup>33</sup> By acquiring more royal children, Westminster increased its body capital: the children (fictitious or not) were valuable to the prestige of the Abbey, and with them came income and patronage. The alterations to Chetham MS 6712 also support Abbey’s perceived claim to the bodies of royal family members. As seen below, kings typically wanted to be buried among kings or members of the royal family, but this connection was not familial or personal in nature.

Rather than looking at Westminster as a monolithic mausoleum, however, perhaps we should examine the Abbey as a fragmented necropolis. Literally translated, a necropolis is “city of the dead.” A city is a large concentration of people in a relatively small geographic area. An

---

<sup>32</sup> Howell, “The Children of Henry III,” 59; see above, 172, n. 11 for Howell’s argument.

<sup>33</sup> Binski, *Medieval Death*, 58, 74.

individual person in the city may care very little for those beyond his immediate sphere. The other occupants in the city also desire to live there because it offers a certain status; a good person comes from (or goes home to) a certain neighbourhood. That does not mean personal attachment to the other denizens.

During the medieval period, elites were initially attracted to burial inside of churches for the safety of their corpses from the elements and as a means of cementing their social status in life and death.<sup>34</sup> A person could parlay their power and influence to gain a burial site close to the church's or abbey's relics. As mentioned above, the presence of the Confessor's Shrine at Westminster Abbey was strong incentive for Henry III and Edward I to bury themselves and their families in close proximity to it. At St. George's, Windsor, the Chapel held a piece of the True Cross, gifted by Edward III.<sup>35</sup> However, the more powerful pull was the opportunity to be buried among other kings and princes of the blood. Once that king had elected to be buried there, the site gained even more pull, as it had increased its number of kings. Edward III stated in his will of 1376 that he desired to be buried among his progenitors, the kings of England.<sup>36</sup> At that time, the kings present were Edward the Confessor (who had dual status as a saint), Henry III, and Edward I. The addition of Edward III increased the Abbey's attractiveness to future kings.

By the mid-fourteenth century, the Confessor's Chapel was considered to be an exclusive resting place for monarchs and their consorts; there was very little interest in making a sprawling, interconnected mausoleum including family members. Edward III reburied his younger, predeceased brother, John of Eltham, outside the Chapel of Edward the Confessor; the locations nearest to the shrine were reserved, in his mind, for kings and their consorts.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body*, 65.

<sup>35</sup> W.M. Ormrod, "The Personal Religion of Edward III," *Speculum*, 64, no. 4 (October 1989), 856.

<sup>36</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 60.

<sup>37</sup> WAM 6300. There is reference to John initially previously being buried in the Chapel of St. Thomas the Martyr at Westminster Abbey in the chronicle of John of Reading. The same source states that he was then moved to the Confessor's Chapel seven years later, then removed back to the Chapel of St. Thomas at the behest of his mother, dowager queen Isabella; *Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis, 1346-1367*,



Edward III and his wife Philippa of Hainault both chose the Confessor's Chapel as their final resting place.<sup>38</sup> However, later kings continued to bury minor children in the Chapel, and others buried close affiliates in the Chapel. Thomas of Woodstock, duke of Gloucester, died under mysterious circumstances and was reinterred by Henry IV in the Confessor's Chapel;<sup>39</sup> this was not the choice of the deceased nor that of his parents, Edward III and Philippa.

As observed by Palliser, Richard II imitated the phrasing of his grandfather's will, requesting that he be buried among the kings of England, his ancestors.<sup>40</sup> The Confessor's Shrine took a distant second place as motivation for burial there. After Anne of Bohemia's death in 1394, Richard II ordered that work start on a double tomb in 1395. Just as new residents displace old ones, Richard did not hesitate to order the sacrist, Master Peter to "[remove] [...] a tomb near the tomb of the said queen, also for painting the said tomb so removed," to make room.<sup>41</sup> By removing a tomb from the holy protection from the Confessor, Richard II reinforced his statement in his will: he would be buried among the kings of England, not among their various relations. However, like Edward III, he did not remove these royal bodies completely from the Abbey. The bodies themselves added to the prestige of

---

edited by James Tait (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1914), 81-82; see also Mark Duffy, *Royal Tombs of Medieval England* (Stroud: Tempus, 2003), 124-125. This timeline presents considerable problems; WAM 6300 was issued in 1339, two years after John of Eltham was buried initially in January 1337, not seven. It is clear from the text that John was certainly in the Confessor's Chapel by this time. The body being moved from St. Thomas' Chapel to the Confessor's Chapel and then back in less than twenty-four months would suggest some sort of confusion or discord within the royal house.

<sup>38</sup> Edward had once said he wanted to be buried at Cologne at the Tomb of the Three Kings, but this seems to have been some grandstanding on his part; see John of Reading, *Chronica*, 132-133; for fuller context, see W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 201.

<sup>39</sup> See below, 201.

<sup>40</sup> Palliser, "Royal Mausolea," 10; *A Collection of Wills*, 60 for Edward III's statement, and 192 for Richard II's.

<sup>41</sup> *Issue Rolls of the Exchequer*, 262. Joan Tanner believes this to be the Cosmati tomb of Henry III and Edward I's predeceased children, but J.G. O'Neilly has argued that the tomb moved was that of the Bohun children. O'Neilly, after examining both the tomb and the shrine, concludes that the "Cosmati tomb" is actually the original altar for the shrine of Edward the Confessor. The remains of Henry III's and Edward I's children may have been placed in there, but this is uncertain. The Cosmati tomb was likely moved to its present location during at the Dissolution of the Monasteries, when the shrine was dismantled. See Joan Tanner, "Tombs of Royal Babies in Westminster Abbey," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 16 (1953), 29; Parsons, "The Year of Eleanor of Castile's Birth," 250; J.G. O'Neilly and L.E. Tanner, *The Shrine of St. Edward the Confessor* (Oxford: Vivian Ridler for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1966), 148-150. Most recently and convincingly, Sally Badham has theorized that this tomb was actually that of William de Valence, "Whose Body?" 129. See also 174, n. 28.

Westminster Abbey, but they did not belong in the location known as the Chapel of the Confessor. Given the decline of the Confessor's cult by the third quarter of the fourteenth century, the shrine had become merely a location in a church, like the choir, that was honourable. It had become a geographical marker more than a devotional sign or belief in protective powers.<sup>42</sup>

The need to move tombs and memorials reflects another issue: limited space. The king's ability to choose a burial site for his wife or minor child was a significant unifying factor in royal burial sites, but it also filled up Westminster Abbey quickly. Minor children that predeceased their father, the king, were the most likely and consistent bellwethers for his own burial. Like Henry III and Edward I, Edward III opted to bury children who died young in the Abbey: Blanche of the Tower (1342) and William of Windsor (1348). Henry VII also buried three of his own children in Westminster Abbey: Elizabeth (1495), Edmund (1500), and Katherine (1503), all of whom died under the age of five and are likely in the Confessor's Chapel.<sup>43</sup> In contrast, predeceasing adult children typically chose their own burial sites. Edward the Black Prince, adult son of Edward III, chose his own burial site at Canterbury.<sup>44</sup> Wives also were indicators for where their husbands would rest. Like Eleanor of Castile, Philippa of Hainault predeceased her husband, Edward III, and was mother of the heir apparent at her death in 1369.<sup>45</sup> She was buried in Westminster Abbey, and Edward III would take his place in the next bay in 1377. Wives that survived their husbands were free to choose

---

<sup>42</sup> Binski *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, 52, 92.

<sup>43</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 179. Duffy makes no mention of Katherine, but considering she died within days of her mother, Elizabeth of York, one may suggest that the infant was entombed with her. Westminster Abbey believes the baby to have been interred separately with her predeceased siblings Edmund and Elizabeth in the Confessor's Chapel. "Henry VII and Elizabeth of York," *Westminster Abbey* official website, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.westminster-abbey.org/our-history/royals/henry-vii-and-elizabeth-of-york>.

<sup>44</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 66.

<sup>45</sup> Froissart offers an over-the-top death scene for Philippa, who, in the text, makes Edward vow to be buried next to her; see Jean Froissart, *Chroniques*, vii, 181-183.

burial elsewhere, as in the cases of Isabella of Angoulême,<sup>46</sup> Eleanor of Provence,<sup>47</sup> and Margaret of France.<sup>48</sup>

Although some claim it would make dynastic sense to be buried with the mother of one's heir,<sup>49</sup> this is not necessarily so. Henry IV rests next to his second wife and queen consort, Joan, even though his first wife, Mary Bohun, was the mother of his heir, Henry V.<sup>50</sup> There is no evidence that Mary was ever considered for reburial; she was never queen. However, Henry V did place a metal *gisant* on her tomb at St. Mary's Leicester.<sup>51</sup> The marriage between Richard II and his first wife, Anne of Bohemia, was childless. Their double tomb effectively left out Richard's second wife, Isabella, who was expected to eventually produce an heir to continue the Plantagenet dynasty.<sup>52</sup>

The next two kings to be buried in Westminster Abbey after Richard II's reinterment in 1413, Henry V and Henry VII, found themselves in the predicament that room was lacking in the Abbey. The solution for both was to found and build extensions to the Abbey in the form of chapels. Again, in their wills, they indicated that Westminster was the place of kings first, then the shrine of St. Edward.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Matthew Paris *Chronica Majora*, v, 475. Per Matthew Paris, Isabella was initially interred in the cemetery (*cimiterio*) of Fontevraud, and Henry III insisted that she be moved indoors. The *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* states that she was interred initially in the Chapter House; Nicholas Vincent, "Isabella, suo jure countess of Angoulême (c.1188-1246)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/14483.

<sup>47</sup> Eleanor took the veil and became a nun at Amesbury, a daughterhouse of Fontevraud Abbey, where she died 21 June 1291. Among others, "Annales Londoniensis," 99.

<sup>48</sup> BL Cotton MS Vitellius F XII, f. 274r; Margaret was interred at Greyfriars London in 1318.

<sup>49</sup> Both J.L. Laynesmith, in her talk, "The Women in Richard III's Life," talk given 26 November 2013 at the University of York, and John Ashdown-Hill, *The Last Days of Richard III and the Fate of His DNA* (Stroud: The History Press, 2013), 52, have postulated that Richard III would have done this if he had lived.

<sup>50</sup> J. Spry, "A Brief Account of the Examination of the Tomb of King Henry IV in the Cathedral of Canterbury, August 21, 1832," *Archaeologia*, 26 (January 1836), 443.

<sup>51</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 321.

<sup>52</sup> There is a contemporary precedent for a man being buried between his two wives. John de Meriet, most famous for being excommunicated for permitting a heart burial for his first wife, is buried between his first wife Mary and his second wife at St. Peter and Paul's in Combe Florey, Somerset. See Brian and Moira Gittos, "Motivation and Choice: The Selection of Medieval Secular Effigies," in *Heraldry, Pageantry, and Social Display in Medieval England*, edited by Peter Coss and Maurice Keen (Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2002), 159-160.

<sup>53</sup> Patrick Strong and Felicity Strong, "The Last Will and Codicils of Henry V," *English Historical Review*, 96, no. 378 (January 1981), 89. In his first will of 1415, his final will of 1421, and the codicils of 1422, Henry V declared Westminster Abbey, specifically his chantry chapel, as his final resting place. When describing the location in 1421, he did not refer to the Confessor by name: "inter sepulturas regum in loco in quo modo continentur reliquie sanctorum," 89. Likewise, in his will of 1509, Henry VII does mention the Confessor, but not as the

Henry VII initially contemplated Windsor because of the space issue at Westminster. He also sought a geographical connection to the Henry before him, Henry VI.<sup>54</sup> Richard III had removed Henry VI from Chertsey in 1484, burying him opposite Richard's own brother, Edward IV.<sup>55</sup> As such, the works at Windsor resumed after an extended hiatus dating from Richard III's death, with the busiest period being 1494 to 1498.<sup>56</sup> Henry VII's mother, Margaret Beaufort, also arranged for her own chantry chapel to be at Windsor.<sup>57</sup> At the point of actually constructing Henry VII's tomb, the plan fell apart. Two reasons were immediate.

First, the dean of Westminster presented evidence to Henry VII that Henry VI had wished to be buried in Westminster Abbey. According to a series of interviews with old servants and workers carried out in the late fifteenth century and recorded at Westminster Abbey, Henry VI contemplated being buried next to his father, Henry V, despite the problem of there being little room left in Westminster Abbey.<sup>58</sup> The solution settled upon was to move the relics of Edward the Confessor "to their present location" in order to make room for Henry VI. The interviews contain inexact details and inaccurate timelines; these may have been employed and manipulated in order to not only ensure Henry VII's burial at the Abbey, but also to bolster the request to translate Henry VI from Windsor to his perceived rightful place at Westminster.<sup>59</sup> The interviews indicate that the relics were moved so that Henry VI could lie

---

primary motivation. *The Will of King Henry VII*, edited by Thomas Astle (London: T. Payne and B. Whit, 1775), 3, refers to Westminster as "the common Sepulture of the Kings of this Reame" firstly, then as the location of St. Edward the Confessor and, surprisingly, Catherine of Valois.

<sup>54</sup> Tim Tatton-Brown, "The Constructional Sequence and Topography of the Chapel and College Buildings at St. George's Chapel," in *St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages*, edited by Colin Richmond and Eileen Scarff (Leeds: Maney Publishing 2001), 16.

<sup>55</sup> *Baptism, Marriage, and Burial Registers of St. George's Chapel*, edited by Edmund H. Fellowes and Elisabeth R. Poyser (Windsor: Oxley and Son for The Dean and Canons of St. George's Chapel in Windsor Castle, 1957), xiv.

<sup>56</sup> W.H. St. John Hope, *Windsor Castle: An Architectural History, Collected and Written by Command of Their Majesties Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V, Part II* (London: Country Life 1913), 497-498.

<sup>57</sup> SGC XV.58.C13, dated to 1498.

<sup>58</sup> For the interviews, see WAM 6389\*, published in Arthur P. Stanley, *Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, Third Edition (London: John Murray, 1869), 506-515. WAM 6389\*\* is a copy of the investigation proceedings, published in Stanley, *Historical Memorials* (1869), 515-518. WAM 6389\*\*\* is the official arrangement to disinter Henry and move him to Westminster Abbey, Stanley, *Historical Memorials* (1869), 518-522. A copy of this document group is at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, as SGC XVII.61.2. It is an eighteenth-century copy of the proceedings, dated within the document to early 1498.

<sup>59</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 245.

by his father. One could infer from this that Henry VI desired to lie with other kings more than he desired the benefits of lying closest to holy relics. This not only reflects the decline of the cult of the Confessor, but also the large amount of royal body capital Westminster Abbey had. Chertsey's claim was dismissed on the grounds that the abbot had assisted in digging up Henry, and Windsor had stated that it was willing to back off of its claims if the testimonies of Westminster could be published.<sup>60</sup>

The second reason for the failure of the Windsor tomb was recent history. Henry VII wanted to be seen as a legitimate successor to the English throne. Henry VII theoretically was free to choose to be buried anywhere he wanted, but he was conscious of the political weight of the decision. Within that century, Henry IV and Edward IV – usurpers – had freely chosen to be buried outside of Westminster Abbey, almost flaunting the break in primogenital continuity.<sup>61</sup> Neither dynastic break had lasted more than three generations. Considering this and the strong claim of Westminster Abbey, Henry VII changed his own plans and decided to be buried in a to-be-constructed Lady Chapel in Westminster Abbey and translate the remains of Henry VI there.

Henry VI was ultimately never moved to Westminster despite the Abbey paying £500 for the privilege.<sup>62</sup> One may interpret this loss of interest as a sign of Henry VII's security on the throne; he no longer needed Henry VI's canonization. Yet, Henry VII stated in his 1509 will that, "that we by the grace of God, p'opose right shortly to translate into the same the bodie and reliquies of our Vncle of blisshed memorie King Henry the VIth."<sup>63</sup> Henry VII may

---

<sup>60</sup> SGC XVII.61.2

<sup>61</sup> Ralph Griffiths, "Succession and the Royal Dead in Later Medieval England," in *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c. 1000-c. 1600*, edited by F. Lachaud and M. Penman (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 108-109.

<sup>62</sup> Margaret Condon, "God Save the King! Piety, Propaganda and the Perpetual Memorial," in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 60.

<sup>63</sup> *The Will of King Henry VII*, 3.

have intended this, but by 1512, Henry VIII had placed his parents' tomb where the planned shrine for Henry VI was meant to be,<sup>64</sup> indicating he did not intend to move the Holy King.

Thomas Cocke believes that it was “the insecurity of Henry VII on the throne that led to such a grandiloquent statement of royal status in his tomb.”<sup>65</sup> This statement refers to the tomb described in Henry VII's will, which was never constructed, but it still applies to the Lady Chapel that Henry VII did build. The design of the chapel mirrored the Confessor's Chapel, making visual references to the Plantagenet mausoleum at the Confessor's Shrine.<sup>66</sup> Henry VII recreated a shrine for Henry VI and for himself to assert his status as a king of England who belonged in Westminster Abbey. He also separated himself from previous kings. Mark Duffy remarks that Henry VII never made future arrangements for anyone else to be buried in his chapel with him, other than his predeceased wife, Elizabeth of York.<sup>67</sup> While he did bury three children within the Abbey, he did not move them to the Lady Chapel, nor did he leave orders that this should be done. However, Cocke notes that the floor of the chapel is vaulted; one must go up a short flight of stairs opposite the tomb of Henry V to reach it. The lift created more than adequate basement space for future burials.<sup>68</sup> Henry VII had left the option open for future Tudors to choose Westminster, creating room where there had been none.

Although Westminster Abbey has a great deal of body capital, it is difficult to consider it, as a whole, a single mausoleum. Those buried in a mausoleum are of close association, such as members of a family, and they are in extremely close proximity; the use of one reflects the intimacy between family members. The French royal burial church, Saint-Denis, was highly unified. The Benedictines there asserted a right to the bones of the kings of France, claiming

---

<sup>64</sup> See Chapter VI, 243.

<sup>65</sup> Thomas Cocke, “The Repository of Our English Kings,” 214.

<sup>66</sup> Mark Duffy, “Arthur's Tomb and Its Context,” in *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death, and Commemoration*, edited by Steven Gunn and Linda Monckton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 78.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> Thomas Cocke, “The Henry VII Chapel: The Royal Connection,” in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 317.

to hold all but three.<sup>69</sup> Queens consort were also consistently – albeit not universally – buried there, and in the seventeenth century, children and other family members began to be buried at Saint-Denis with increasing frequency. However, Saint-Denis was, undisputedly, where kings' bodies were laid to rest. The kings of France had liberty to send their hearts and organs elsewhere, but their bodies were considered to belong to Saint-Denis.<sup>70</sup> This ended at the ousting of Charles X in 1830. Similarly, the Kaisergruft in Vienna contains nearly 150 members of the Habsburg dynasty, with interments from 1633 to 2011. The sprawling Habsburg dynasty had one unifying factor: their necropolis; almost all family members had some part of themselves buried with their family.<sup>71</sup>

England's monarchy was fragmented in death, its population comparatively small. Reigning monarchs and their spouses came to rest in Westminster, at times burying predeceasing family members within the Abbey at their discretion. Adult siblings and children were left to choose their own burial place. Westminster was also not exclusive to the royal house. By numbers, Westminster was a city of the dead, but rather than being a singular mausoleum for the royal house, it was composed of many mausolea, some royal and some not, all attracted by the presence of kings.<sup>72</sup> It lacked the unified front of Saint-Denis and the Kaisergruft. For the Capetians and the Habsburgs, there was only one place a body could go. For the Plantagenets and their successors, the options were far less limited. Kings of England could and did bury their bodies beyond Westminster Abbey.

---

<sup>69</sup> Binski, *Medieval Death*, 58-59; Murielle Gaude-Ferragu, "Le Coeur 'Couronné': Tombeaux et Funérailles de Coeur en France à la Fin du Moyen Age," *Micrologus: Natura, Scienze e Società Medievali*, 11 (2003), 251.

<sup>70</sup> There is an extensive body of literature on this concept. See Elizabeth A.R. Brown, "Death and the Human Body in the Later Middle Ages: The Legislation of Boniface VIII on the Division of the Corpse," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 12 (1981), 221-270; Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in France* (Gêneve, France: Librairie E. Droz, 1960); Alexandre Bandé, *Le Coeur du Roi: Les Capétiens et les sépultures multiples XIIIe-XVe siècles* (Paris: Tallandier, 2009).

<sup>71</sup> The Habsburg necropolis is quite literally a city of the dead within the city of Vienna. It is composed of the Kaisergruft (bodies), the Herzgruft (hearts), and the Stephanskirche (viscera and a few bodies). For more information, see Armin Dietz, *Ewige Herzen: Kleine Kulturgeschichte der Herzbestattungen* (Munich: Medie & Medizin Verlagsgesellschaft mbh, 1998); Brigitta Lauro, *Die Grabstätten der Habsburger: Kunstdenkmäler einer europäischen Dynastie* (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2007).

<sup>72</sup> Richard II had opened Westminster to his favoured courtiers by the end of his reign. Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, 93.

Westminster Abbey was, however, the indisputable coronation church of the kings of England from 1066 onward. Its first burial of a monarch did not occur until Henry III in 1272. The Angevin dynasty established itself at Fontevraud in France during the late twelfth and early thirteen centuries. Henry II died at Chinon in 1189, and he was buried at the Abbey of Fontevraud, one of the many churches and houses he left money to in his will of 1182.<sup>73</sup> The burial fit the pattern of his predecessors: Fontevraud was the closest royal foundation to Chinon, with only thirteen miles separating the two locations. Thereafter, it appears that Henry's burial location became a precedent; his children Richard I (d. 1199) and Joan (d. 1199) and his wife Eleanor (d. 1204) all joined him at Fontevraud in sepulchre. Burial of kings in England only began again in 1216 with the exequies of John.

### *Worcester Priory*

In 1216, John of England<sup>74</sup> found himself facing a dual invasion by Louis the Lion from France and Alexander II from Scotland. At his death,<sup>75</sup> John issued written and verbal wills.<sup>76</sup> The abbot eviscerated and embalmed John, keeping the heart and viscera for his own abbey,<sup>77</sup> and prepared him for transportation to Worcester Priory, the location specified in his will. Despite his sudden illness, Worcester was not a desperate manoeuvre.

The journey amounted to seventy-five miles, but it served a two-fold purpose. Firstly, Worcester was further southwest than Newark, meaning it was further away from both Scottish and French forces. Secondly, it brought his body closer to his heir, Henry of Winchester, who was at Devizes at the time of his father's death.<sup>78</sup> The boy travelled northward approximately

---

<sup>73</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 8, referred to as Fontis Ebraldi.

<sup>74</sup> For the complete tale of restless King John, see Chapter I, 33-37.

<sup>75</sup> See Chapter II, 41-43.

<sup>76</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 13-14; Stephen Church, "King John's Testament and the Last Days of His Reign," *English Historical Review*, 125, no. 514 (June 2010), 12-14.

<sup>77</sup> *CChR, 1226-1257*, 468, dated 8 March 1257.

<sup>78</sup> *L'Histoire de Guillaume Le Maréchal*, iii, edited by Paul Meyer (Paris: Librairie Renouard for the Société de L'Histoire de France, 1901), 214.



fifty miles to Gloucester Abbey for his coronation, bringing him within thirty miles of his father's body. The royal presence consolidated in the west of England, in preparation for a counter-campaign to retake the kingdom. John's burial at Worcester typified pragmatism in adverse circumstances. The Barnwell Chronicler, writing contemporaneously, also assessed this as a pragmatic move, rather than one of desire or penitence.<sup>79</sup> At the time of John's burial, the Use of Sarum was slowly coming into practice; it is more likely that John was buried under Benedictine rites.<sup>80</sup> The commemorative activities later performed for him were shaped by both the spread of Sarum and the canons of Lateran IV.<sup>81</sup>

What is particularly notable about the Benedictine Use, as indicated in previous chapters, was its jealously guarded liturgical hours. This was a staple of the Benedictine Rule. The hours retained Benedictine elements, though it took Lateran IV to bring it more in line with the Roman Rite. Their masses were more adaptable to local influences. In several breviaries from English monasteries, there are elements of Sarum entering the Masses of Trinity, the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Requiem. Although the proliferation is not as extensive as it is in the Use of Westminster, it is clear that geography had impact on the evolution of Benedictine liturgies in England, though the extent to which varies from house to house; there is no central Benedictine authority.

John was the first king of England to be buried in England in over sixty years. The uncertainty about his final resting place did not manifest as a dispute between Worcester and Fontevraud, the resting place of the Angevins. Rather, John's foundation of Beaulieu in Hampshire, which had been in the hands of the French at the time of his death, encouraged Henry III to petition for the body's removal.<sup>82</sup> Fontevraud, which held the bodies of John's

---

<sup>79</sup> *The Historical Collections of Walter of Coventry*, ii, edited by William Stubbs. RS, 58 (London: 1865), 231-232.

<sup>80</sup> Richard Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 384-386.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 209. In 1219, William de Blois, bishop of Worcester, issued instructions pertaining to the celebration of obsequies in the context of Lateran IV.

<sup>82</sup> TNA SC 1/2/106.

father, mother, sister, and brother, did not stake a claim to his body. John also did not make any arrangement for his heart to be sent there; it went with the abbot of Croxton. Henry III promised his own heart to Fontevraud but failed to have it delivered, resulting in the abbess visiting England to demand the heart from a bemused Edward I in 1290.<sup>83</sup> John could have done this, but elected not to. John consciously made the choice to be buried completely in England, not divided up between England and its continental holdings. At the time, Westminster Abbey was the royal coronation church, not a burial church. Any suggestion that John desired burial in Westminster Abbey would be anachronistic; while John did consolidate the treasury in Westminster,<sup>84</sup> the centralization of English government in that city was not achieved in his reign. However, the importance of the broader location of England should not be discarded.

Of his successors through 1509, all were buried in England. Only two others chose to be buried outside of Westminster Abbey, though not under similar duress as John was. Three others were buried away from the Abbey, not of their own volition.

### *Leicester Greyfriars and Chertsey Abbey*

Like John, Richard III died on campaign on 22 August 1485. Unlike John, Richard died intestate, and the enemy soon possessed his body. Leicester was within a day's march of the battle site; it was practical to dispose of the dead former king there. Despite the disgraced state of the former monarch, Richard was found to have been buried in the choir of Greyfriars, a traditional place of honour in a church, typically only surpassed by the high altar or next to a

---

<sup>83</sup> WAM 6318B

<sup>84</sup> Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, 5.

shrine.<sup>85</sup> The Greyfriars utilized the Roman Rite and carried complete copies of the necessary masses in their breviaries. As such, any words said for Richard would have followed that form.

While recognising his former status, Richard had lost his crown in battle. The burial site at Leicester was a very loose interpretation of being suitable to the honour of a king, as it had no royal connections; it was a pragmatic selection near the battlefield. However, with Henry VII's complete rejection of Richard's reign as legitimate, it symbolized the fragmentation of the prior regime.

As discussed in Chapter IV,<sup>86</sup> the tie that binds Henry VI and Richard III is that their usurping successors – Edward IV and Henry VII, respectively – considered their reigns never to have been valid in the first place. Throughout Edward IV's early entries in his Chancery rolls, the following phrase recurs in reference to Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI: king by fact not by law.<sup>87</sup> If Henry VI was not the true king, then there was no incentive to bury him with the typical accoutrement or in any place connected to the kingship. As such, he was deposited at Chertsey Abbey, a rather obscure Benedictine foundation west of London. This disconnection also served Edward IV in his own quest for legitimacy. He made it a point to associate himself with chivalry, St. George, and the previous Edward, Edward III. He sought continuity with the long-lived, stable monarch, so he elected to be buried at Windsor.<sup>88</sup>

Henry VII would take a similar tact, but far more cautiously and in a limited fashion; he reverted to Westminster Abbey.<sup>89</sup> Henry VII was quite careful to isolate his objections to Richard III's reign alone due to the fact Edward IV, Richard's brother, was his father-in-law,

---

<sup>85</sup> David Baldwin, "King Richard's Grave in Leicester," *Transactions of the Leicester Archaeological and History Society*, 60 (1986), 24; University of Leicester, "Archaeological Dig: Skeleton Found, Wednesday, 5 September Continued," *The Discovery of Richard III*, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.le.ac.uk/richardiii/archaeology/5septembercont.html>.

<sup>86</sup> See Chapter IV, 144-146.

<sup>87</sup> This is seen, for example, in *CChR, 1427-1516*, 139-167, the earliest charter rolls in the reign of Edward IV. See also Chapter IV, 145, for Henry's attainder.

<sup>88</sup> D.A.L. Morgan, "The Political After-Life of Edward III: The Apotheosis of a Warmonger," *English Historical Review*, 112, no. 448 (September 1997), 869.

<sup>89</sup> See above, 180-181.

and support for his reign came from Elizabeth of York's partisans.<sup>90</sup> Henry VII was quick to revoke *Titulus Regius*, which proclaimed Richard III's superior claim over Edward V by reason of the boy's parents' invalid marriage.<sup>91</sup> This same act had also bastardized Henry VII's betrothed, Elizabeth of York. The Tudor-period historiography for Richard III is well-known, and the debate over the legitimacy of Richard III's taking of the crown continues;<sup>92</sup> what matters here is that his burial by Henry VII reflected the new king's stance on Richard III's right to take the crown, just as actions of Edward IV toward Henry VI conveyed similar sentiments. This resulted in their low-budget burials and purposely disjointed locations from other royalty.

### *Gloucester Abbey and King's Langley*

Irregular locations were also employed for Edward II and Richard II, but completely disowning or denying these kings was impossible. There were no questions of illegitimacy or illegal seizure of title.<sup>93</sup> Edward II was the sole surviving son of Edward I by his first wife, Eleanor. The succession was clear by 1290;<sup>94</sup> Prince Edward was to reign after his father. Upon the death of Edward the Black Prince in 1376, his son Richard of Bordeaux had been marked as heir by Edward III, the boy's grandfather.<sup>95</sup> The formal basis of their depositions was that although they were kings by right, they had grossly erred and no longer deserved the

<sup>90</sup> As such, only Richard III was attainted for anti-Lancastrian activities, see Chapter IV, 145.

<sup>91</sup> *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations: 1459-1486*, edited by Nicholas Pronay and John Cox (London: Alan Sutton for Richard III and Yorkist History Trust, 1986), 161; *PROME*, Parliament of 7 November 1485, item 23.

<sup>92</sup> For those in support of Richard III's claim, see Paul Kendall, *Richard III* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1955); Ashdown-Hill, *The Last Days of Richard III and the Fate of His DNA*; for those who are more sceptical, see Charles Ross, *Richard III* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1981); Mortimer Levine, "Richard III—Usurper or Lawful King?" *Speculum*, 34, no. 3 (June 1959), 391-401. The discovery of Richard III's remains has only escalated the output of academic and popular literature on him and his reign.

<sup>93</sup> Paul Strohm points out that Lancastrian propaganda cultivated a variety of rumours concerning Richard II's legitimacy as son of the Black Prince and various portents regarding his "pre-ordained" fall from power. Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399-1422* (London: Yale University Press, 1998), 5. However, at the time of his accession, at the age of eleven in 1377, these items had not yet been concocted. These accusations are also not formally recorded in the abdication signed by Richard II on 30 September 1399.

<sup>94</sup> *Foedera* (Record Commission) i, pt. 2, 742.

<sup>95</sup> See Chapter II, 49-50.

crown.<sup>96</sup> As such, while their locations were irregular, the accoutrements of their funerals were not.<sup>97</sup>

Edward II died at Berkeley Castle 21 September 1327. Rather than being transported to London for display and burial, he was buried almost three months later at Benedictine Gloucester Abbey (now Cathedral). Some have taken this lack of procession and burial away from Westminster as a potential sign that Edward II was not truly dead.<sup>98</sup> As previously discussed in Chapter IV, there were dangers in moving a body such a long distance in the early fourteenth century.<sup>99</sup> That said, Queen Isabella and Roger Mortimer had not chosen a completely unsuitable location for a royal burial. Gloucester Abbey was the coronation church of Henry III in 1216; Westminster Abbey had also been coronation church before becoming a burial church. It was also the burial site of Robert Curthose, son of William the Conqueror.<sup>100</sup> The duration of three months between death and burial was also not uncommon; Edward II's own father Edward I lay in his coffin outside of his grave for 113 days (died 7 July 1307, buried 27 October 1307). Later, Edward III waited to bury Philippa of Hainault, his consort. She died in mid-August 1369, and her burial in her structurally finished tomb at Westminster occurred on 3 January of the following year.<sup>101</sup> Given the detail and quality of the items described in the wardrobe accounts for the funeral, it is clear that Edward II was not quickly, quietly, or unceremoniously buried like Richard III or Henry VI.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> For Edward II, see 'The Articles of Accusation against Edward II, according to Adam of Orleton from Winchester Cathedral Archives, Winchester Cartulary, no. 234, fos. 5v-6,' Appendix in Claire Valente, "The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II," *English Historical Review*, 113, no. 453 (September 1998), 879-881. For Richard II, see *PROME*, Parliament of October 1399, items 10-14.

<sup>97</sup> See Chapter IV, 141-146 for Richard II and 156-164 for Edward II.

<sup>98</sup> Ian Mortimer, "The Death of Edward II in Berkeley Castle," *English Historical Review*, 120, no. 499 (December 2005), 1175-1214.

<sup>99</sup> See Chapter IV, 157.

<sup>100</sup> Ormrod, *Edward III*, 68.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid*, 469.

<sup>102</sup> T.F. Tout, *The Captivity and Death of Edward of Carnarvon* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1920) 30-33.

Richard II experienced similar treatment. Unlike Edward II, however, Richard II had expressed clearly where his burial site should be: with Anne of Bohemia in Westminster Abbey, in the shared tomb he had constructed for them.<sup>103</sup> This detail, probably more than anything else, created problems for Henry IV.<sup>104</sup>

King's Langley was the site of a royal palace, and Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III had all spent significant time at that location. On a more personal level, it had been one of Richard's favoured royal residences in life, and he was known to the Dominicans at the priory.<sup>105</sup> During his lifetime, Richard had requested and was granted a dispensation from the Pope which allowed mass to be celebrated in the Dominican Rite, as it differed from the Roman Rite.<sup>106</sup> The Dominican Rite had marked changes in all areas of the hours and masses, most prominently at Matins. Although the dispensation was unneeded (the Dominicans were indisputably in communion with Rome), it did reflect the reality of that the Dominican Rite in England was different from all other rites; Westminster had some individual features but was also highly derivative of the Benedictines and Sarum. Similarities among the three were far more common than similarities with the Dominican rite.

Richard's elder brother, Edward, had died as a child and had been reburied at King's Langley.<sup>107</sup> It was not the site of a coronation, nor a burial church, but King's Langley had very strong connections to the royal house and to Richard II personally; he had not been buried in a strange place. The state of Richard's bones over 450 years later indicate that Henry IV had taken the care to embalm, plumb, coffin, and bury his rival in a manner fitting a former king.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 192.

<sup>104</sup> See Chapter IV, 143.

<sup>105</sup> J.H. Wylie, *History of England Under Henry the Fourth*, i (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1884), 117.

<sup>106</sup> Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England*, 318.

<sup>107</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 244; Richard ordered a tomb to be placed over the body of his brother, who was buried in Children's Langley. He put 100 marks (about £66) towards this endeavour, a fair amount for a stone gisant tomb.

<sup>108</sup> Arthur Stanley, "On an Examination of the Tombs of Richard II and Henry III in Westminster Abbey," *Archaeologia*, 45 (January 1880), 323; *Issues of the Exchequer*, 275.

Neither Edward II nor Richard II were buried in unsuitable locations, though the rationale for such locations is not immediately clear.

This leaves the two kings who voluntarily went to other sites, Henry IV and Edward IV. Both were impacted by the lack of room in Westminster Abbey. Both had usurped the throne, thereby creating new branches to the Plantagenet line. Rather than compete with political and logistical problems, Henry IV and Edward IV chose to go elsewhere.

### *Canterbury Cathedral*

Canterbury Cathedral employed the Use of Sarum. This variation of the Roman rite proved to be the most resilient of forms, surviving the Reformation to be the basis for the original Book of Common Prayer. Sarum was the common Use for collegiate and parish churches in southern England that were not affiliated with a religious house, and it ultimately spread and overtook the popularity of other Uses. Sarum's individual elements appear between the offertory and the post-communion response, wherein there was an elevated level of ceremony and ritualized activity around the Eucharist compared to other Uses. Sarum's antiphons and other psalmody differed due to these longer, more involved masses. As such, the sound of Sarum was unique. The amount of additional music and the consistent formality of high ritual within the Use formed a synergy with royal ceremonies. The Westminster Use worked as well as it did for the royal house because the Sarum elements catered to the rituals, and the Benedictine monastic house thrived because of the services it was able to offer, such as the Office of the Dead, anniversaries, and other commemorative elements.

As planned burial churches of kings, Canterbury and St. George's Chapel, Windsor, were expected to have a higher level of prestige than other churches; Sarum was useful and appropriate for this. Henry IV's selection of Canterbury was a multi-faceted one.<sup>109</sup> The site

---

<sup>109</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 203.

had to have sufficient prestige, reflect his own achievement in gaining the throne, but also address what he had done to gain the throne; as shown in Chapter IV, there were highly penitential elements to Henry IV's arrangement in his coffin.<sup>110</sup> It is doubtful that Henry IV intended to found a royal mausoleum;<sup>111</sup> he made no provision for any of his children, nor did he move his predeceased first wife Mary.<sup>112</sup> The more commonly accepted theory is two-fold: the penitent Henry IV devoted himself to St. Thomas Becket, whose shrine was there, and he had realized that Westminster Abbey was almost out of room.<sup>113</sup> The fact that he, like Henry II, had executed an archbishop made St. Thomas' site particularly weighty.

Henry's own personal relationships swayed his decision as well. D.M. Palliser offers the idea that Henry sought association with the man who would have been king, the Black Prince – not only Richard II's father, but Henry IV's uncle who had a similar devotion to St. Thomas Becket.<sup>114</sup> Christopher Wilson believes this to be a way to edge around the uncomfortable fact that Henry had usurped the Black Prince's son.<sup>115</sup> However, given the martial success of both the Black Prince and Henry IV, the attempt to shape a continuity between the two men is not overwhelmingly artificial. The effort simply was not nearly as successful (or ironic) as Richard II's efforts to connect himself with Edward II.

Considering Richard II's steadfast devotion to Westminster Abbey and his aborted plans for his initial burial, Henry IV may have felt it inappropriate to seek space there. As stated in Henry IV's will, his cousin, Thomas Arundel, was also the archbishop of Canterbury

---

<sup>110</sup> See Chapter IV, 133-134.

<sup>111</sup> Joel Burden offers this idea in his article, "How Do You Bury a Deposed King?" in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2003), 38.

<sup>112</sup> What his half-siblings decided to do, however, is another matter.

<sup>113</sup> Palliser, "Royal Mausolea," 13; Duffy, *Royal Tombs of Medieval England*, 179.

<sup>114</sup> Palliser, "Royal Mausolea," 13.

<sup>115</sup> Christopher Wilson, "The Medieval Monuments," in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, edited by Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, and Margaret Sparks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 499.



at this time and had been the person to crown Henry.<sup>116</sup> Henry IV was ultimately buried across from the Black Prince in the Trinity Chapel behind the high altar of Canterbury Cathedral.

### *St. George's Chapel, Windsor*

As this chapter began with one necropolis, it will end with another. St. George's Chapel at Windsor did not become a royal necropolis until the nineteenth century. During the Middle Ages, it was not considered to be akin to Westminster, although its prestige steadily grew from the fourteenth century onward due to its association with the popular St. George and Edward III's establishment of the Order of the Garter.

Edward IV came to the throne in 1461. As stated above, the first Yorkist king strove to associate himself with Edward III.<sup>117</sup> Most scholars date Edward's interest in Windsor to the early to mid-1470s, but Edward had shown favour toward the collegiate foundation very early on his reign. An early entry in his charter rolls, dated 20 November 1461, renewed two charters of Edward III for St. George's Chapel and requested that the chapel pray for Edward's soul and that of his predecessors and successors.<sup>118</sup>

Despite this favour, Edward buried his infant daughter Margaret of York in Westminster Abbey in 1472.<sup>119</sup> He had been on the throne for the second time for less than a year; perhaps there was no time for him to have endowed Windsor to be the proper resting place for a princess. By the time he made his will in 1475 before his expedition to France, he had decided that St. George's Chapel at Windsor was to be his burial site.<sup>120</sup> In that will, he also made extensive endowments to the college, ordered construction on the building itself, and outlined its governance.<sup>121</sup> In 1477, he named his third son George (possibly after his brother,

---

<sup>116</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 203.

<sup>117</sup> See above, 187.

<sup>118</sup> *CChR, 1427-1516*, 141.

<sup>119</sup> BL Additional MS 6113, f. 49v. Joan Tanner refers to this manuscript as Additional MS 106113 in "Tombs of Royal Babies in Westminster Abbey," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 16 (1953), 36, n. 1.

<sup>120</sup> *Excerpta Historica*, edited by S. Bentley (London: Samuel Bentley, Dorset Street, 1831), 366.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid*, 367, 372-376.

possibly after the saint, or both), and when the boy died in 1479, he was interred as the Chapel's first royal occupant. George's sister Mary followed him in 1482. No motions appear to have been made to reunite Margaret with her siblings. Much like Henry III, Edward IV may not have planned for Windsor to become a sprawling necropolis,<sup>122</sup> but instead the crypt for his immediate family.

Windsor was under-utilized by the royal house for the next three centuries after the burial of Elizabeth Woodville in 1492. Although Richard III had moved Henry VI to Windsor in 1484, another king would not freely choose Windsor until Henry VIII in 1547 and then George III in 1820; Charles I had hastily been smuggled into Windsor the night after his beheading in 1649.<sup>123</sup> Richard III had chosen Westminster Abbey for his wife Anne's burial in March 1485,<sup>124</sup> as had Henry VII for his wife Elizabeth in 1503 and then for his own repose in 1509. Westminster simply had greater body capital, making it far more attractive for burial in the royal house, and Henry VII's vaulted Lady Chapel had eased the crowding issues. That said, intimates and relatives of the royal family, such as William Hastings (d. 1483), Anne St. Leger (d. 1526), and Charles Brandon (d. 1545), were periodically buried in St. George's Chapel.

Vaults were also constructed by elites such as George III's brother, Henry, duke of Gloucester and Edinburgh. Per the burial register of Windsor, the Duke of Gloucester (d. 1805) and his wife Maria (d. 1807) were buried in Windsor in their own vault "in the choir near the Sovereign's Stall," separate from the one under construction by George III.<sup>125</sup> When

---

<sup>122</sup> Anne F. Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs with R.A. Griffiths. *The Royal Funerals of the House of York at Windsor* (London: Richard III Society, 2005), 2.

<sup>123</sup> Aidan Dodson, *The Royal Tombs of Great Britain: An Illustrated History* (London: Duckworth & Co., 2004), 91.

<sup>124</sup> Robert Fabyan, *The New Chronicles of England and France*, edited by Henry Ellis (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, et. al., 1811), 539; Richard Grafton, "Continuation of Thomas More," in *Richard III: The Great Debate*, edited by Paul Kendall (Chatham: The Folio Society Limited, 1965), 129.

<sup>125</sup> *Baptism, Marriage, and Burial Registers of St. George's Chapel*, 243-244.

the royal vault's capacity was finally exhausted at Westminster,<sup>126</sup> George III's daughter Amelia (1810),<sup>127</sup> sister Augusta (1813),<sup>128</sup> granddaughter Charlotte (1817),<sup>129</sup> and consort Charlotte (1818)<sup>130</sup> gave St. George's Chapel at Windsor adequate body capital to succeed Westminster as royal necropolis. George III was buried there in 1820.<sup>131</sup> His son Edward, duke of Kent and Strathearn (1820)<sup>132</sup> and his granddaughter Princess Elizabeth of Clarence (1821),<sup>133</sup> soon followed him. Windsor finally experienced the same rapid accrument of bodies as Westminster did in the second half of the thirteenth century, transforming a royal peculiar into a royal necropolis. Of significance is that the burial register also reports, at the interment of George III,

Likewise were departed in the new Royal Vault on Friday the 11<sup>th</sup> day of February the coffins containing the remains of their late Majesties Sons, Prince Alfred and Prince Octavious, having been removed from the Royal Vault in Westminster Abbey on the evening of the 10<sup>th</sup> of February.<sup>134</sup>

The act of moving predeceased children to the final resting place of the monarch and reburying them there reflected the intent that royal family members should continue to be buried at St. George's Chapel rather than at Westminster Abbey. The entry marks the transition of the Chapel from a royal burial church to *the* royal burial church, succeeding Westminster Abbey.

---

<sup>126</sup> Non-reigning royal family members continued to be buried in Westminster Abbey after George II's death in 1760. However, due to space concerns, no further royal monuments could be erected nor any further royal vaults constructed; once George II's vault as full, that was the end of it. This was achieved by the 1805 burial of Henry, duke of Cumberland and Strathearn at Windsor.

<sup>127</sup> *Baptism, Marriage, and Burial Registers of St. George's Chapel*, 245.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid*, 246.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid*, 248. See also Olivia Bland, *The Royal Way of Death* (London: Constable, 1986), 114-115. Her sudden death in childbirth triggered great mourning within the kingdom, as she was the only child of the Prince Regent and her son was stillborn. Not only did her death temporarily resurrect the practice of heart burial, it also forced her bachelor uncles to marry. Edward, duke of Kent and Strathearn, died in 1820, but not before fathering the future Queen Victoria.

<sup>130</sup> *Baptism, Marriage and Burial Registers of St. George's Chapel*, 248.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid*, 250.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid*, 248.

*England*<sup>135</sup>

All of the abovementioned burial sites were in England. A king of France was expected to be buried in Saint-Denis, but as discussed above, there was no such limit on English kings. Their burial sites were to be appropriate to their status, but even for the most derided monarch, a burial in England was a common, unifying factor.

The intensity and aggressiveness with which Edward I consolidated royal burials at Westminster Abbey must be considered. It is important to observe that Eleanor, countess of Bar, William de Valence, and Edmund, earl of Lancaster had spouses and children that survived them; the Abbey was not the only place they could have been buried. All three were also repatriated from the continent; Edward I actively and consciously brought them back to England.

William de Valence had four children buried in other places. He had married Joan Munchensy, granddaughter of William the Marshal, and she was buried in Gloucester in 1307.<sup>136</sup> As the Countess of Pembroke in her own right, Joan could have buried her husband in any of her holdings, yet she ceded him to Edward I's mausoleum, though he now rests in the Chapel of Sts. Thomas and Edmund.

It is popularly suspected that Eleanor, countess of Bar died in Ghent, but there is no named place of demise on record.<sup>137</sup> She died 29 August 1298 per her sister Elizabeth's psalter.<sup>138</sup> According to a sixteenth-century tomb survey, Eleanor was laid to rest in the Chapter

---

<sup>135</sup> Parts of this section first appeared in conference papers delivered at the Leeds International Medieval Congress 2015, "Revised and Edited: Reburial in the House of Plantagenet," and at the Death in Scotland Conference 2016, "Many Miles Before I Sleep: The Transport of Royal Bodies Out of Scotland."

<sup>136</sup> *Registrum Henrici Woodlock, Diocesis Wintoniensis A.D. 1305-1316*, edited by Anthony Goodman. Canterbury and York Society, 44 (Oxford: 1941), 708-709.

<sup>137</sup> This supposition seems to originate in Mary Anne Everett Green's *Lives of the Princesses of England*, ii (London: Henry Colburn, 1852), 312-314; the last location Eleanor was known to reside in was Ghent, as she hosted her father Edward for Christmas in 1297.

<sup>138</sup> G. Evelyn Hutchinson, "Attitudes Toward Nature in Medieval England: The Alphonso and Bird Psalters," *Isis*, 65, no. 1 (March 1974), 32. The psalter is now known as the Alphonso Psalter, BL Additional MS 24686, with the date of Eleanor's demise on f. 8v.

House of Westminster Abbey, a strange location for a princess of England.<sup>139</sup> Eleanor had at least two children that survived her, as well as her husband, Henry, count of Bar. Yet again, for some reason, the family gave her back to Edward I to bury. If Eleanor was buried in Westminster Abbey, it meant that her father had invested time and money in repatriating her remains. It is one thing to bury minor children and one's own spouse in a desired location, but there must have been considerable negotiation to have a body not only repatriated but also separated from still-living relations.

Edmund, earl of Lancaster was buried, repatriated and buried, and then buried again. Edmund died 5 June 1295, and per his will, he was to be buried at the behest of his executors, but not until his debts were paid. The Dunstable Abbey Chronicler stated that he was prepared with aromatic spices and kept at Bayonne with the Friars Minor until his brother, Edward, wished to bring him to England.<sup>140</sup> At some point, the body was transported to the Friaresses Minor at Aldgate, according to one London chronicle.<sup>141</sup> The location was not alien to Edmund; he and his wife had founded it in 1293.<sup>142</sup> It was not until 1301 that Edmund was transferred to Westminster Abbey, in a tomb near the Confessor's Chapel.

Chronicle narratives imply Edmund's final resting place at Westminster was a foregone conclusion. It was not. Although Edmund's first wife Aveline was laid to rest there after her death in 1274, he remarried soon after. Blanche of Artois had three children by him, including his heir, Thomas of Lancaster.<sup>143</sup> She survived him and died in 1302. Her resting place is unknown, but she was not interred at Westminster Abbey with her husband.

---

<sup>139</sup> BL Harley MS 544, ff. 65v-67v; also BL Additional MS 38133, f. 98.

<sup>140</sup> "Annales Dunstaplia," *Annales Monastici*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1866), 58-59.

<sup>141</sup> *De Antiquis Legibus Liber: Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londiarum et quedam, que contingebant teporibus illis ab annos MCLXXVIIIo ad annum MCCLXXIV cum Appendice*, edited by Thomas Stapleton. Camden Society, Old Series, 34 (London: 1846), 249.

<sup>142</sup> Simon Lloyd, "Edmund, first earl of Lancaster and first earl of Leicester (1245-1296)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/8504.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*

The result of Edward I's machinations was that he had gathered his family at an easily accessible location so he could walk among them as he pleased. He had made Westminster Abbey into a site of royal continuity and consolidation; Edward I moved those who had died overseas back to England. At his own death by camp disease in 1307, Edward I's body was brought over 300 miles back from the Anglo-Scots border. Edward I had left no written wishes as to the site of his interment. If Walsingham's account of his death was true, Edward I desired his bones to be taken into battle against the Scots until they were conquered.<sup>144</sup> That would have been much easier if Edward I had been buried in the borderlands or York Minster. Instead, he was brought back to the capital of England, to Westminster Abbey, to lie with his first wife, their children, and his extended family. The northern border was likely deemed too insecure to permit Edward's burial there; it would have been disastrous for the king's body to fall into the hands of the enemy.

Similarly, John of Eltham, the younger brother of Edward III, was repatriated from Perth after his death on 13 September 1336.<sup>145</sup> Only twenty years old, the young prince died in military service, though, like Edward I, more likely of disease than combat. John's body was kept at Perth from his death until 8 December 1336.<sup>146</sup> John of Eltham was buried in Westminster Abbey 13 January 1337, four months after his death.<sup>147</sup> The location was likely at the behest of his mother, Isabella of France;<sup>148</sup> when Edward III's son William of Hatfield died in 1337, he was interred at York Minster,<sup>149</sup> a place where John of Eltham could have been laid

---

<sup>144</sup> See Chapter II, 45.

<sup>145</sup> In the BL Royal MS 13 E IX version of "Historia Anglicana," appended in "Historia Anglicana, pt. 2," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1864), 378.

<sup>146</sup> Tom Beaumont James, "John of Eltham, History and Story," in *Fourteenth Century England II*, edited by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), 74-75, citing the wardrobe book BL Cotton MS Nero C VIII, Wardrobe Book 4 Edward II - 11 Edward III, f. 233.

<sup>147</sup> "John of Eltham, Earl of Cornwall," *Westminster Abbey* website, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.westminster-abbey.org/our-history/people/john-of-eltham>. Tom Beaumont James discusses the difficulty in dating John of Eltham's death and burial, "John of Eltham, History and Story," 72-76, but most historians concur on the dates presented here.

<sup>148</sup> See above, 176-177 n. 37, for Isabella's involvement with John of Eltham's placement within Westminster Abbey.

<sup>149</sup> W. M. Ommrod, "Edward III (1312-1377)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/8519.

to rest. Whereas Edward III had no qualms about burying his son in the north, Isabella may have insisted on a burial in the capital for reasons related to her own access to the tomb, for security, and for the young man's own prestige as the brother of the king.

Richard II was involved in moving several corpses in the last decade of the fourteenth century. Nigel Saul has theorized that Richard's encouragement regarding the selection of Westminster Abbey as a burial site among his favourites, as well as his almost forcible burial of others, reflected his theatrical desire to illustrate his power over them, even after death.<sup>150</sup> This is a valid interpretation, given Richard's strong assertion of the royal prerogative and his eagerness to admit servants of the Crown to Westminster Abbey. However, in observing Richard's actions in the 1390s, a pattern emerges. Much like Edward I, Richard II gathered his family members – both by blood and by chosen association – into a limited number of places so he could more easily visit them and keep anniversaries. Although he primarily moved bodies within England,<sup>151</sup> there were three bodies he repatriated: his brother Edward of Angoulême, Robert de Vere, earl of Oxford, and Thomas, duke of Gloucester.<sup>152</sup>

Edward of Angoulême died in 1370 in Bordeaux, likely of plague. Shortly thereafter, his parents, the Black Prince and Joan of Kent, left with their surviving son, Richard of Bordeaux. The funeral arrangements were left to the boy's uncle and the Black Prince's replacement in Aquitaine, John of Gaunt.<sup>153</sup> Upon his brother Richard II's majority, Edward

---

<sup>150</sup> Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 462.

<sup>151</sup> For example, William Courtenay from Maidstone to Canterbury Cathedral; Joseph Dahmus, *William Courtenay: Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966), 228, 267-268. Richard convinced John Golafre and John Waltham to agree to be buried in Westminster Abbey. For Golafre, see Nigel Saul, "Fragments of the Golafre Brass in Westminster Abbey," *Transactions of the Monumental Brass Society*, 15, no. 1 (1992), 24-25; for Waltham, see Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 2," 218. Richard supposedly ordered the burial of Isabella of Castile at Langley; Thomas Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica majora of Thomas Walsingham*, i, edited and translated by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011), 963. Considering that that was likely going to be her resting place as Edmund of Langley's wife, the story may be spurious.

<sup>152</sup> Although it is popularly claimed that Richard II repatriated John Hawkwood, biographer William Caferro has produced evidence that John was still in his tomb in Italy as of 1405; *John Hawkwood: An English Mercenary in Fourteenth Century Italy* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 327.

<sup>153</sup> J.R. Wright, "The Accounts of John de Stratton and John Gedeney, Constables of Bordeaux, 1381-1390," *Mediaeval Studies*, 42 (1980), 240.

was brought back to England sometime in the twelfth year of Richard's reign (1388-1389) by Bishop Robert Waldeby. Per Constable of Bordeaux John Gedeney's accounts, this effort cost £600 *nigrorum*,<sup>154</sup> meaning the currency had been debased; this was not the same value as £600 in England, but the repatriation was still an expensive venture. The order had come to Gedeney, dated 5 October 1388, with Richard's private seal on it. When exactly the body was moved is uncertain, but Richard II ordered a tomb to be erected over it 27 April 1391 at Children's Langley, for a sum of £66 13s 4d,<sup>155</sup> or 100 marks; this was a nice sum for an alabaster tomb with a *gisant*. Chroniclers of the period do not remark upon this incident; their silence is notable, considering their complaints regarding Richard II's other burial and reburial activity. The closeness of blood may have excused Richard from scrutiny in this matter. As discussed above,<sup>156</sup> Richard II was very familiar with King's Langley and stayed there frequently; burying his brother in Children's Langley would have significantly improved his access to his brother's tomb.

However, there were other repatriations that earned scorn. Robert de Vere, Richard II's favourite, had gone into exile in 1388 due to his perceived disruptive relationship with Richard. After his death and repatriation in 1395, according to Walsingham, Richard ordered the coffin opened so he could see and touch his friend one last time.<sup>157</sup> Nigel Saul refers to this as Richard's actions "taking a macabre turn."<sup>158</sup> There is a rational explanation for Richard's actions, however. Bringing a well-embalmed body back from overseas was expensive; it would be profoundly frustrating to find that the wrong one had been retrieved. It is not impossible that Edward I verified or had someone verify his brother Edmund's body as well when it was repatriated, though the incident was not recorded in the chronicles.

---

<sup>154</sup> Wright, "Accounts," 304.

<sup>155</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 244.

<sup>156</sup> See above, 190.

<sup>157</sup> Thomas Walsingham, "Annales Ricardi Secundi," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, iii, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1866), 184-185.

<sup>158</sup> Saul, *Richard II*, 461.



De Vere was reburied at his family church of Earl's Colne. The move made de Vere's tomb in England more accessible to Richard II. In addition, de Vere's divorce from Philippa, Richard's first cousin, had been declared invalid in 1389;<sup>159</sup> it was not impossible that Philippa herself would choose to be buried there with her husband and her mother-in-law, to whom she was close.<sup>160</sup> Richard II may well have anticipated further burials at Earl's Colne; consolidation there seemed logical.

Thomas of Woodstock, duke of Gloucester, youngest child of Edward III, and uncle to both Richard of Bordeaux and Henry Bolingbroke, had died under suspicious circumstances in Calais in 1397 while awaiting trial for treason.<sup>161</sup> There is some confusion as to where the body went after its repatriation. According to Froissart, the corpse was buried at Pleshy at a foundation of Thomas and his wife, Eleanor Bohun.<sup>162</sup> The official paperwork states that Richard, having repatriated the body, ordered Eleanor to keep the body "at her peril" at Bermondsey until further notice;<sup>163</sup> there is no indication that the body was actually buried there. The body was interred at some point in St. Edmund's Chapel at Westminster Abbey. Henry IV would later move Thomas into the Confessor's Chapel to lie next to his parents, Edward III and Philippa. Despite Thomas's state of disgrace, Richard II still endeavoured to bring his uncle back to England. It may have been, as Saul postulates, Richard's ego and desire for control, but Thomas was a member of the English royal family; he belonged in England.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>159</sup> Anthony Tuck, "Vere, Robert de, ninth earl of Oxford, marquess of Dublin, and duke of Ireland (1362-1392)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/28218.

<sup>160</sup> This ultimately did not happen; she was buried at a nunnery in Bruisyard, Suffolk. This action may have been penitent in nature due to Maud's involvement with a conspiracy against Henry IV in 1404; see Thomas Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica majora of Thomas Walsingham*, ii, edited and translated by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011), 415. For her pardon, see *Chronique de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Dengleterre*, edited and translated by Benjamin Williams (Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, 1964), 273-276.

<sup>161</sup> Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres*, xvi, 76-77, reports the murder as a rumour. Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 542-543, treats the murder as fact. Orders pertaining to the arrest and death of Thomas appear in *Foedera* (The Hague), iii, pt. 4, 132-141.

<sup>162</sup> Froissart, *Oeuvres*, xvi, 77.

<sup>163</sup> *Foedera* (The Hague), iii, pt. 4, 139.

<sup>164</sup> Another known case of repatriation is that of Lionel of Antwerp from Italy; W.M. Ormrod, "Lionel, duke of Clarence (1338-1368)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/16750. However, there are

The desire to be buried in England or to have others buried in England when other options were available is most visible in the deathbed decisions of Henry V.<sup>165</sup> Henry V had won the crown of France, being named heir of Charles VI over the Dauphin.<sup>166</sup> By his marriage to Catherine of Valois, Charles VI's daughter, Henry and his heirs would be kings of England and France. France was to be his inheritance. St. Louis had proclaimed Saint-Denis to be the resting place of kings; surely Henry fit this description. Even burial as heir apparent elsewhere in France, such as the esteemed royal foundation of Royaumont, was viable. According to Thomas Walsingham, the people of France were distraught, as they had "had experienced the equitable and discerning governance of the king of England after the turbulent and monstrous tyranny of others."<sup>167</sup> The people of Paris and Rouen offered vast oblations in order to secure Henry V's burial within France, but "this was not possible, for in his will he had from the beginning stipulated that he should be buried at the monastery of Westminster."<sup>168</sup> And so, despite having an entire new kingdom at his feet and the opportunity to stake his claim in the French royal necropolis, Henry V returned home. He was firstly the King of England.

### *Conclusions*

During the medieval period, Westminster Abbey was the most attractive site for burial for kings, but it was not the only suitable site. Westminster Abbey shifted from a saintly site to a kingly one; the shrine of Edward the Confessor was quickly overshadowed by the royal presence of Henry III and Edward I. Edward I was the key ruler to consciously strive for a united royal necropolis, inclusive of consorts, children, in-laws, and those dearest to the royal house, akin to the much later Kaisergruft in Vienna. Thereafter, however, rulers were

---

questions as to when the repatriation occurred, the agency of the repatriation, and what exactly was repatriated; a full discourse on Lionel's remains would be off the topic of the thesis.

<sup>165</sup> See Chapter II, 56-58, for his deathbed narrative.

<sup>166</sup> Christopher Allmand, *Henry V* (London: Methuen London, 1992), 140-141.

<sup>167</sup> Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle*, ii, 775.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*

increasingly conscious as to who deserved burial in the chapel of kings, rather than the Confessor's Chapel. Like calls to like. At Arthur Tudor's death in 1502, Worcester Priory was chosen for his burial site. It was not for the bodies of Sts. Wulfstan and Oswald that it was chosen. Rather, it was one of the two closest churches, and most importantly, it had the body of King John. Royalty should be buried with royalty.<sup>169</sup>

Arthur had died at Ludlow, which was considered to be part of Wales at this time. Despite the fact Arthur could have been interred there or in a nearby church, he was repatriated and buried in Worcester. It was a conscious choice on the part of Henry VII to bring his son back to England, but not necessarily all the way back to Westminster Abbey or St. George's Chapel, Windsor. He was in England, and that appears to have been enough. As evidenced by similar decisions by Edward I and Richard II, kings believed that England was the most appropriate burial location for those of close affinity to the English royal house. John and Henry V actively decided to have their bodies interred in England in preference to other options. The heart and viscera, the by-products of embalming, tended to stay where the person died, but the main body came back to England. Within England, the choices were limitless, though there were clear favourites.

Sites with royal connections or those that were familiar to the late monarch were consistently utilized. If the king had come to or left the throne by usurpation, the king tended to be buried away from Westminster Abbey; the exception to this was Edward III, but he had not been the ringleader of his father's deposition. The level of honour and suitability of the site accorded to a dethroned king was fully dependent on whether it was politically prudent for his successor to acknowledge him as a legitimate king of the realm. In the cases of Edward II and Richard II, denial of the king would have stretched the limits of willing disbelief. Henry VI and Richard III found themselves vestigial to the new ruling house, and their initial burials reflected

---

<sup>169</sup> Ralph Houlbrooke, "Prince Arthur's Funeral," in *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death, and Commemoration*, edited by Steven Gunn and Linda Monckton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 67.

this. Those who freely chose a different site to Westminster Abbey may have done so for practical issues of space, but also political connections to the predecessor's line; although Henry VI was safely buried in Chertsey, Edward IV still faced the problem of Henry V and his great chantry chapel in Westminster Abbey.

The varying locations of initial burial and the equally varied processional routes resulted in a wide variety of masses and hours being utilized for each king. While this chapter has focused upon the differences among the burial churches and their Uses, it is important to realize that there were probably multiple Uses utilized in the procession to the place of burial. Recognizing the differences provides context to the royal prescriptive texts and lends some reality to the ceremonies themselves. The sounds and pacing of the exequies are often summarized by chroniclers and narrative accounts; by laying out potential orders of service, the duration and involvement of these ceremonies are much clearer.

There has been an ongoing subtext of desacralization for Edward the Confessor's shrine in this chapter. Rather than retaining its prestige as a holy container of relics, the Confessor's Chapel became a geographic location synonymous with the burial site of kings and consorts. Sanctity was no longer the primary attraction for burial. Rather, it was the increasing number of bodies that basked in royal eminence that made burial in or near the Confessor's Chapel at Westminster Abbey appealing. The income from royal anniversaries far outstripped the offerings made by pilgrims;<sup>170</sup> by the end of the fifteenth century; the foundations made by Edward I and Richard II for their queens were extensive, totalling at least £400 per year, and there were other smaller anniversaries that brought money in.<sup>171</sup>

However, this is only reflective of one saint's cult. The churches and abbeys were still alive and active, celebrating masses daily for holy feast days, mortal anniversaries, and the Church calendar. The continuing importance of having masses and hours for the deceased

---

<sup>170</sup> Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, 52.

<sup>171</sup> See Chapter VI, 227.

continued throughout the entire medieval period. The prayers and masses offered benefited the souls in Purgatory, expediting their way to Heaven. Westminster was, in part, attractive because of the sheer volume of prayers and bequests for souls. According to a contemporary, Philip I of France elected to be buried at Fleury in 1108 rather than at Saint-Denis. The prayers in a church were thought to be divided among the dead; it was better to be the only king in a church than one of many kings in a church.<sup>172</sup> Given that usurped kings did not know the time and place of their demise, preparations for death may have been limited. As such, being buried alone in the church allowed them the most benefit from prayers. Likewise, those who had usurped the king - a transgression against the law of man and the law of God - were also in dire need of such prayerful intervention and often chose to lie alone. The usurpers and the usurped thus rest in prayerful - not hopeless - solitude.

---

<sup>172</sup> Elizabeth Hallam, "Eleanor Crosses and Royal Burial Customs," in *Eleanor of Castile, 1290-1290: Essays to Commemorate the 700<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Her Death, 28 November 1290*, edited by David Parsons (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1991), 12.

## Chapter VI: Status and Agency in Commemoration

In Chapter V, the initial burial sites of kings were discussed. The interpretation of the royal prescriptive texts' demand for an honourable place was flexible and ever-changing, save for the fact that the king was always buried in England. That said, several places developed “pull” over time, a phenomenon termed in this work as body capital. This resulted in a concentration of royal bodies and body parts that attracted other royal family members and elites, creating the necropoli of Westminster Abbey and St. George's Chapel, Windsor. There was also a conscious effort at forming a tradition of burial in England through repatriation of royal and affiliated remains.

With the body *in situ*, the soul of the deceased was commemorated by his successors and descendants. The prescriptive texts do not discuss ways in which a king should be remembered. Because there are no prescriptive texts, there is no need to check for adherence. There were no quantified or qualified minimum expectations for royal commemoration, nor was there an “incorrect” way to perform such acts. Likewise, there was also no unacceptable way in which a king could commemorate others. However, the king and the royal family were at the top of the social hierarchy of England; whatever they did to commemorate others had to be more extravagant in order to express and confirm their station.

In this chapter, comparisons between kings and those of high station will be employed in order to determine what commemorative activities were oft-repeated, or traditional. The actions that stand out from these “normative” events will be considered as individualized commemoration, keeping in mind that kings always had to do more than the nobility. Much like the evolution of the prescriptive texts, some innovations unique to one person became custom in later periods. Because there are no commemorative prescriptive texts, the process of accretion, seen in parts of the royal funerary ceremony, occurred much faster. Still, certain

elements of commemoration survived the entire period of 1216-1509, while others were phased in and out.

The question of agency in royal commemoration must be discussed. It is not always clear who made the decisions regarding how a king's tomb appeared or which good deeds were done in his name. Some kings arranged for their own post-mortem commemoration, while others, by choice or by fate, left these decisions to their successor. Private conversations among family members, lost paperwork including wills and codicils, and the destruction of monuments have led to uncertainty as to what actually transpired and whose agency it was. Multiple influences can make it difficult to determine the exact instigating factor. Commonly, commemorative activity has been evaluated as a binary value: whether it was the wish of the old king or the new king, the dead or the living. Along with the input of family members, another value has emerged in the present research: the church that contained the body.

The ecclesiastical hierarchy at the burial church controlled what went on and what was constructed within the building, including the commemorative acts celebrated and the tomb erected over the body. Much like the talent of embalmers featured in Chapters III and IV, the physical layout of the church, the manpower it had, and the items required for its various functions played a significant role in determining what could be carried out within the church. The authorities of a given church were best suited for providing this information and determining its most efficient utilization.

Because disputed or questionable agency is one of the key concerns of this chapter, large well-known collegiate foundations will be excluded or have very brief reference.<sup>1</sup> This includes the collegiate foundations of Edward III at St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster,<sup>2</sup> and at

---

<sup>1</sup> The references provided aim to be relevant to the immediate circumstances of the foundation and the religious activity therein; discussions of the architecture and the individual lives of the deans and canons are not included. *The Late Medieval English College and Its Context*, edited by Clive Burgess and Martin Heale (Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2008) is a collection that grants the reader a well-rounded understanding of colleges.

<sup>2</sup> Ongoing at present is the AHRC-funded project, *St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: Visual and Political Culture, 1292-1941*, headed by John Cooper, Tim Ayers, and Miles Taylor, <http://www.virtualstephens.org/>.

St. George's Chapel, Windsor, with Edward IV's later endowments and chantry;<sup>3</sup> the collegiate foundations of Henry VI at Eton<sup>4</sup> and King's College Cambridge, along with their later affiliation with Henry VII;<sup>5</sup> Margaret of Anjou's foundation of Queens' College Cambridge and its re-foundation by Elizabeth Woodville;<sup>6</sup> Margaret Beaufort's foundations at Christ's College and St. John's College Cambridge;<sup>7</sup> and other similar royal foundations and their later endowments. While secular elements have taken precedence (such as the Order of the Garter at St. George's Chapel and education at the various colleges), these foundations were initially created to provide votive prayers to assist the founder through Purgatory. Due to their high profile and academic coverage, these establishments are being excluded in order to examine less visible foundations and less researched aspects of commemoration.

Over the course of three centuries, certain activities became traditional, but the extent and degree to which they were executed expressed individuality. The first section of this chapter addresses good deeds performed for the living; commemorative activity was not solely limited to the dead. The continuing legacy of a king post-mortem also hinged on what was done for the living in his honour. The care of servants, the new foundation or continued maintenance of churches and chantries, and other actions conveyed messages regarding a given regime. A king could install these arrangements during his life, but his successor could also

---

<sup>3</sup> CPR, 1348-1350, 144; A.K.B. Roberts, *St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, 1348-1416: A Study in Early Collegiate Administration* (Windsor: Oxley, 1947); Clive Burgess, "St. George's College, Windsor: Context and Consequences," in *St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Fourteenth Century*, edited by Nigel Saul (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 63-96; Charles Farris, "The New Edwardians? Royal Piety in the Yorkist Age," in *The Yorkist Age: Proceedings of the 2011 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Hannes Kleineke & Christian Steer (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2013), 44-63.

<sup>4</sup> J.L. Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 167-171, questions the extent of Henry VI's agency in the project, but concedes that the final outcome at Eton and King's would have been the same.

<sup>5</sup> Bertram Wolfe, *Henry VI* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1981), 135-145; Magnus Williamson, "The Early Tudor Court, the Provinces, and the Eton Choirbook," *Early Music*, 25, no. 2 (May 1997), 229-243; Ralph Griffiths, *King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461* (London: Ernest Benn, 1981), 242-248; Simon Walker, "Between Church and Crown: Master Richard Andrew, King's Clerk," *Speculum*, 74, no. 4 (1999), 956-991.

<sup>6</sup> Griffiths, *King Henry VI*, 257-258. John Twigg, *A History of Queens' College Cambridge, 1448-1986* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1987), 1-12, offers some insight on the endowments of King's during Yorkist rule.

<sup>7</sup> Michael K. Jones and Malcolm G. Underwood, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 202-231, 239-248. Twigg, *A History of Queens'*, 17-19, also observes Margaret's interest in Queens' alongside her foundations.



enact these types of provisions for the sake of the old king's soul. At that point, there is a necessary question of agency as to whether this was the will of the old king or the new king. Alternatively, the undocumented influence of another family member, such as the king's mother, may have weighed in on the proceedings. Additionally, the impetus for certain charities lay external to the royal house; kings often granted licenses at the pleading or request of a church, parish, or religious community.

After reviewing deeds done for the still living, the celebration of divine services in churches and chantries in honour of the deceased will be examined. The kings' changing requirements and methods of implementation for these religious rituals will be set in contrast. Again, while there was no incorrect way of celebrating an anniversary or obit, there are several examples that are remarkable and stand out among more traditionalized execution of anniversaries.

A more tangible commemorative act was the construction of a tomb. Although individual kings had unique, identifying features on their tombs, many royal tombs shared several prominent characteristics. However, several kings ordered the construction of tombs that did not abide by tradition, whether for themselves or for others; the motivations for this must also be discussed. Again, the question of agency arises. Although some tombs, such as those Philippa of Hainault and Richard II at Westminster Abbey, were clearly constructed on the order of the future occupant, most royal tombs were built by someone other than the deceased. A tomb's appearance would have been affected by the wishes of the deceased, but even more so by the finances and desires of the living.

The commemoration of any given king was mostly deemed satisfactory. For the majority of monarchs during the 1216-1509 period, there were no public objections to how the monarch was commemorated, nor to how he wished to commemorate a predeceased relative. Nothing was unacceptable, as there were no written standards. However, in several exceptional

cases, public and political pressure resulted in permanent, lasting changes in how a king was remembered. Something in the funerary, burial, or commemorative aspects of the king was unsatisfactory, and the parties voicing such complaints had enough influence to stir dramatic action: a reburial.

### *The Care of the Living*

Upon the death of a member of the royal family, his or her household was generally kept intact until the last things were settled, typically marked by the interment of the corpse and the expenses thereof. Edward IV's and Henry VII's Households demonstrated this visually at their funerals, when they broke their staves and cast them into the grave atop the coffin.<sup>8</sup> This is a rather late innovation to the theatre of the royal funeral, but the practice it represented was in effect long before its dramatization at the funeral. It is, in this way, comparable to the presentation of arms.<sup>9</sup>

Because the old household remained intact, handling the living servants and officers of the deceased was the first priority of the monarch. They were key to the maintenance of the physical house and, as discussed in Chapter III, they likely cared for the corpse.<sup>10</sup> Henry VII died on 21 April 1509, and his son, Henry, continued to act and dress as a prince for two days after. On the night of 23 April, he dined with the King's Household, including the Lord Chamberlain, Charles Somerset. Henry still acted in the guise of a prince. After the meal, he released the news of his father's death.<sup>11</sup> Henry VII's Household continued to function until

---

<sup>8</sup> For Edward IV, see Anne Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs with R.A. Griffiths, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York at Windsor* (London: Richard III Society, 2005), 45, their transcription of London, College of Arms Arundel MS 51 f. 17v; for Henry VII, see Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle, containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, et al., 1809), 506; BL Harley MS 3504, f. 260 (old f. 272), printed in John Leland, *Joannis Lelandi Antiquarii, De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, iv, edited by Thomas Hearne (London: Benjamin White 1774), 309.

<sup>9</sup> See Chapter IV, 148-156.

<sup>10</sup> See Chapter III, 80.

<sup>11</sup> BL Additional MS 45131, f. 52v.

his funeral on 9 May 1509. The officers of the Royal Household broke their staves and cast them into the open grave onto the casket, symbolizing the dissolution of the deceased king's household.<sup>12</sup> These men included the Lord Steward George Shrewsbury, Lord Chamberlain Somerset, Treasurer of the Household Thomas Lovell, and Comptroller John Hussey.<sup>13</sup> All but Hussey would return to their posts upon the formation of Henry VIII's household.<sup>14</sup>

The maintenance of the deceased's household was an elite feature, as those lower on the social scale lacked such complex households. The household of a king was particularly unique as the Household and the King always had to exist, although the mortals within those stations did not. During the stave breaking mentioned above, the king's death would be proclaimed, but immediately thereafter, the proclamation of a new king rang out; the King and the Household never ceased to be.

When a non-regnant family member died, the household dissolved permanently and the servants had to be reassigned elsewhere; there was no successor to take office. Isabella of France, widow of Edward II and mother of Edward III, died 22 August 1358. BL Cotton MS Galba XIV E records her household's final year of expenses, which stretch beyond her death. As noted by Edward A. Bond, this document covers financial expenditures starting in October 1357 and extends to 4 December 1358, a week after Isabella's interment on 27 November.<sup>15</sup> After her death, payments were made to servants as well as doctors and apothecaries hired to care for her in her last days, as well as those hired to watch her corpse as it lay in state.<sup>16</sup> The household was responsible for the body and its procession out of Hertford Castle, where

---

<sup>12</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 507.

<sup>13</sup> J.C. Sainty, "Officers of the Green Cloth: Provisional Lists 1485-1646," *Institute of Historical Research* website, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.history.ac.uk/publications/office/greencloth.html>.

<sup>14</sup> *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume I: 1509-1514*, edited by J.S. Brewer (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1920), 238. Hussey's name appears on a pardon roll, dated 18 May 1509.

<sup>15</sup> Edward A. Bond, "Notices of the Last Days of Isabella, Queen of Edward the Second, drawn from an Account of the Expenses of her Household," *Archaeologia*, 35 (January 1853), 455. Like many of the other Cotton manuscripts, this has been severely damaged by fire, albeit restored.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 463; BL Cotton MS Galba E XIV, f. 15.

Isabella had died.<sup>17</sup> After 4 December, the household was dissolved, over three months after the death of its mistress. There was no “next” queen mother to take Isabella’s place, so her office and its household disappeared. However, the cost of the audit of Isabella’s estates, as well as the debts thereof, continued to be charged to the now defunct household and were managed by Richard Ravenser, the administrator of her estates and her receiver.<sup>18</sup>

Taking care of servants was a long-term obligation of the surviving monarch. Many times, kings made gifts to retired servants, particularly if they had served until the death of one of their former masters. Edward I’s involvement in the burial of his family has been previously discussed, but his concern for the dead did not end there.<sup>19</sup> Although each of his heirs apparent died (save Edward), he made no new chantry foundations or offerings for their souls. Rather, he provided for the servants of the boys. In July 1285, Edward I gave Felicia de Shorteford £20 of the rents from his wardships. Felicia had been the nurse of Alphonso, Edward’s son who had died in August 1284.<sup>20</sup> Three years later, Edward I made a similar gift of £10 of rents of the king’s wardships to Amice de Derneford, the former nurse of Henry, Alphonso’s elder predeceased brother.<sup>21</sup>

After Eleanor of Castile’s death, a significant increase in votive activity at Westminster Abbey occurred in 1291, beginning with Edward I’s highly specific instructions as to the celebration of the queen’s anniversary and the conduct of the religious celebrants.<sup>22</sup> But it likely was not the loss of Eleanor alone that spurred this sudden interest; Eleanor of Provence, Edward I’s mother, had taken the veil and was buried in her nunnery at Amesbury in 1291.

---

<sup>17</sup> F.D. Blackley, “Isabella of France, Queen of England 1308-1358 and the Late Medieval Cult of the Dead,” *Canadian Journal of History*, 14 (1980), 30-31.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>19</sup> See Chapter V, 173-174, 196-198.

<sup>20</sup> *CCR, 1279-1288*, 324. Alphonso was Edward’s third son (preceded by John and Henry in death) and had died shortly after the birth of his brother, Edward of Caernarvon (the future Edward II), in 1286.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 520, dated 7 November 1288. Henry had died in 1274.

<sup>22</sup> *CChR, 1257-1300*, 411, charter dated 10 January 1292.

Edward remembered her death through prayers,<sup>23</sup> maintained physical monuments,<sup>24</sup> commemorated her sister Margaret when she died,<sup>25</sup> and cared for Eleanor of Provence's surviving servants.<sup>26</sup>

The care of servants was not strictly a thirteenth-century phenomenon. William de Lupton had served John of Eltham, Lionel of Antwerp, and Queen Philippa, and, having survived all of them, he was rewarded with 2d a day for wages, and 10s and 4s 8d per year for his gown and shoes, respectively, in 1378.<sup>27</sup> The royal house and its officers did not forget long-term service. Richard II remembered his servants in his will of 1399, ordering that their wages be paid, though to a limit of 10,000 marks.<sup>28</sup> Henry V, in his will of 1422, left a variety of silver and gold cups and horses to those members of his household of a certain station.<sup>29</sup> Various accoutrements for the chapel of his wife Catherine were also assigned.<sup>30</sup> For lower servants – valets, grooms, and pages, for example – Henry left at least 4,000 marks, with a maximum of 10,000 marks to compensate them.<sup>31</sup> Most interestingly, Henry dictated that those who had become imbeciles or invalids during their service to him were to have their share of the abovementioned money, especially Thomas Bresyngham, who should receive 200 marks.<sup>32</sup>

Elites also tended to their servants. Upon his accession in 1461, Edward IV utilized his royal privileges to place his retired and aged servants in various religious houses. Beginning in May 1461 and ending in February 1462, he sent orders that forty-nine of his servants should be admitted to various religious houses and provided with corrody (food, clothing, and other daily

---

<sup>23</sup> *CCR, 1288-1296*, 503.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid*, 352.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*, 507.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*, 250 and 282.

<sup>27</sup> *CCR, 1377-1381*, 61.

<sup>28</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 196.

<sup>29</sup> Patrick and Felicity Strong, "The Last Will and Codicils of Henry V," *English Historical Review*, 96, no. 378 (January 1981), 95.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid*, 93.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid*, 95.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid*, 96.

necessities) for the remainder of their lives.<sup>33</sup> These men were highly unlikely to have solely served Edward in his reign; it is far more likely that these men had served Edward's father, Richard, duke of York, prior to his death in battle on 30 December 1460. This stirs the question of agency. Whether Richard had discussed arrangements for his servants with his eldest son is uncertain. How much influence Cecily Neville, Richard's widow and Edward's mother, had over her son in this matter is also unclear. Regardless of the exact informant, a list of servants had been kept by a noble family, with the intent of providing for them. The provisions may have been less generous if Edward was simply the Duke of York rather than the King, but still extant in some form.

The vast number of installations suggests that someone in Edward's service spent considerable time researching vacancies for his men. Many of these requests supply the names of those who previously held such charities, appointed during the reign of Henry VI and deceased in the interim. For example, Thomas Eyre had received his position at Mulcheney in 1438, twenty-three years before Edward IV sent Henry Upton to replace Eyre, who had died at some point in the intervening years.<sup>34</sup> Edward IV's will showed similar efforts, mimicking many structures of previous royal wills.<sup>35</sup> Edward IV had a fastidious researcher in his employ

As will be discussed below, great sums of money were invested in the keeping of anniversaries, but religious houses also received special favours or performed special activities for the sake of the deceased's soul. As seen above, a religious house accepting the men and their accompanying maintenance from the king could have been part of the commemoration of the dead. There were other ways of securing swift passage through Purgatory. Henry III was known for granting charities for the sake of the soul or heart of his father John. In 1257, Henry accepted a fine of 60 marks from the abbot of Croxton "for the purchase of gold to secure the

---

<sup>33</sup> *CCR, 1461-1468*, 81, 99, 101-105.

<sup>34</sup> For Henry Upton's placement, see *CCR, 1461-1468*, 81; for Thomas Eyre's placement, see *CCR, 1435-1441*, 250.

<sup>35</sup> See Chapter III, 91-92.

king's confirmation of gift of land." Henry added a further concession "for the sake of the heart of King John," which was buried at the abbey.<sup>36</sup> Richard II granted, at the request of William Courtenay, Archbishop of Canterbury, four fairs per year to Christchurch Canterbury. This was done not only in honour of the Holy Trinity and St. Thomas Becket, but also for the soul of Richard's father, the Black Prince.<sup>37</sup>

These two examples reflect the fact that kings were not always the originators of commemorative activity. The abbot of Croxton and the archbishop of Canterbury approached their kings with requests for help. In the case of William Courtenay's request, we know through the original grant, held at Canterbury Cathedral, that it was Richard II who attached the good deed to the Black Prince. Courtenay had not invoked the name to sway the king in the original petition; he simply asked for the four fairs.<sup>38</sup> The abbot of Croxton's request may have followed the same pattern, or it may have used language to plead for the favour "for the sake of the heart of John, late king of England" or something along those lines. This would have been a bolder approach, but the abbey of Croxton had offered another service beyond holding John's heart: one of the previous abbots had been John's confessor on his deathbed and then his embalmer. In either case, the favour granted was first requested by the institution, the act itself becoming commemorative only if the king wished it.

In the fifteenth century, the formation of a fraternity or guild was utilized to arrange prayers for the deceased, but also to enable other good deeds for the living. In letters patent issued 20 February 1484, Richard III enabled the founding of the Fraternity of the Holy Cross of Abingdon-upon-Thames, with permission for it to acquire lands or money to the value £100 yearly. This was to be used for the repair of the road between Abingdon and Dorchester, as

---

<sup>36</sup> *Henry III Fine Rolls Project*, website. Roll 54, no. 463, dated 5 March 1257, last accessed 12 May 2016, [http://www.frh3.org.uk/content/calendar/roll\\_054.html](http://www.frh3.org.uk/content/calendar/roll_054.html); correlating commentary at "Henry III's Fine Rolls Blog Sunday 25 February to Saturday 10 March 1257," last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://blog.frh3.org.uk/?p=809>.

<sup>37</sup> *CChR*, 1341-1417, 287.

<sup>38</sup> Canterbury, Canterbury Cathedral Archives DCc-ChAnt/C/92.

well as the daily care and feeding of thirteen poor people and two chaplains celebrating daily votive masses for Richard and his family, living and dead.<sup>39</sup> The religious element of this patent letter was typical, but the road repair was an individual feature, pertaining directly to the community at hand; doing good for the living was part of caring for the dead. Whether Richard III was privy to the road conditions in Abington is unknown. What is far more likely is that the confraternity members of Abington specified what was needed in the community. They bartered their prayers and the credit for good deeds in exchange for the permission and support of the king.

Edward IV's foundations of chantries, chantry chapels, and fraternities became somewhat mechanical by the latter years of his reign; they often ended with "for the support of other charges" or "for the support of other works of piety" instead of specifying particular works.<sup>40</sup> Henry VI's foundations are similarly bland throughout his entire reign. The grants themselves reflect that these fraternities did approach the king initially, but the lack of specificity may indicate that the king himself was not particularly interested in the activities of the group. Henry VI and Edward IV in his later reign may have been more concerned with founding a large number of these groups for the benefits of their prayers, a reduction of time in Purgatory for themselves and their families. The dead were more important to the king than what exactly was done by the living beyond prayers. However, earlier on in his reign, Edward had been more diverse in his foundations, which also included almshouses.<sup>41</sup> This rendered prayers but also charity for the living poor.

Care for the living began at home. Servants were a valued part of the household, and, if it were possible, the family who employed them tried to take care of them in retirement or to find alternative placement. This occurred both in the royal house and in elite households, but

---

<sup>39</sup> *CPR, 1476-1483*, 386.

<sup>40</sup> For example, *CPR 1476-1483*, 255-256.

<sup>41</sup> For example, *CPR, 1467-1477*, 113.



the king typically was more generous, due to his superior resources; Edward IV may have provided for his servants whether or not he was king, but being king enabled him to access royal records to find placements and the coffers to bankroll each man's corrody.

Although there are examples from the thirteenth and early fourteenth century of caring for the living, Jeremy Catto has suggested that elite piety became a more formed, distinct trend with the expansion of the nobility during the reigns of Edward III and Richard II. New men ennobled by the king felt pressure to act out their new station in the hierarchy; this included conspicuous consumption, a certain level of piety, and interest in the arts.<sup>42</sup> Although not every single person of station was pious, there was pressure to conform and advance up the societal ladder. This was to preserve one's position in the hierarchy, all relative to the top: the king.<sup>43</sup> This may explain the expansion of the royal will in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries to encompass more ground and more detail than previous royal wills had; an expanded nobility was manoeuvring for positions in the pecking order. The king had to remain above it all, yet not disconnected from it. This trend follows in both the creation of anniversaries and the manufacture of tombs.

### *Anniversaries*

Chantries were masses and prayers sung or chanted for the dead. The parameters for chantries involve space and time. In terms of space, chantries could have been performed at chantry chapels, which were constructed for the express purpose of praying for the deceased, such as that of Henry V. Alternatively and more often, they could have been performed at pre-existing altars or chapels.

---

<sup>42</sup> Jeremy Catto, "Religion and the English Nobility in the Later Fourteenth Century," in *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper*, edited by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl, and Blair Worden (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1981), 54.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 46-47.

Obits and anniversaries were the enactment of chantries at certain times. Obits could be celebrated at any time of the year, though they typically were performed on a regular schedule. This is perhaps best illustrated by an entry in the patent rolls under Henry VII, where it is stated that his obit should be celebrated yearly “at some convenient time about Michaelmas.”<sup>44</sup> This specified a general time of year, but left the exact execution to the convenience of the priory. When the obit was celebrated on a specified day, such as the date of death or burial, it was an anniversary.

These religious celebrations were often created throughout the lives of the monarch, for himself, his predecessor, his consort, or another close family member. They were crucial for not only the king’s relationship with the clergy but also for the continued devotion to the deceased. The care for the soul was more important than construction of a tomb; as such, these spiritual gifts were often in place long before a tomb was completed.

The anniversary of Eleanor of Castile draws together commemorative elements of both anniversaries and tombs. Eleanor’s own tomb was completed no later than 1293, in a style similar to that of her father-in-law, Henry III.<sup>45</sup> Edward I’s tomb, in contrast, was a plain Purbeck marble slab. The categorization of Edward II as the wilful, wasteful son resurfaces in historiography when it comes to the flat tomb chest of Edward I. Arthur Stanley, dean of Westminster, devoted serious thought to this in *Memorials of Westminster Abbey*. He interpreted the carved inscription, “Pactum Serva” as having two meanings. The first interpretation relied upon the testimony of Thomas Walsingham that Edward I, on his death bed, did not wish to be sealed in his tomb. He wanted his bones to march against the Scots on short notice, and he wanted his heart sent on Crusade.<sup>46</sup> Never finishing the tomb would

---

<sup>44</sup> *CPR, 1494-1509*, 25, dated 5 December 1494.

<sup>45</sup> See below for discussion of Edward I’s agency, 243-245.

<sup>46</sup> Thomas Walsingham, “Historia Anglicana, pt. 1,” *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1863), 114.

permit Edward II to keep this promise.<sup>47</sup> Alternatively, Stanley believes that the “unfinished condition of the tomb of his father is the continued witness of the wasteful of the unworthy son, who spent on himself the money which his father had left for the carrying of his great designs, if not for the completion of his monument.”<sup>48</sup> Later biographers do not theorize such reasons, as the inscription is believed to be a Tudor addition, but there is a lingering question as to the lack of *gisant* on the tomb.<sup>49</sup>

In recent scholarship, there has been a trend to see the large block tomb of Edward I as deliberate,<sup>50</sup> but the reasons are unknown. Duffy has speculated that the flat nature of the tomb may have allowed it to be decorated with cloth and devotional items.<sup>51</sup> A critical piece of evidence to consider is the sheer number and weight of candles Edward had demanded for the anniversary of his queen, Eleanor of Castile. In 1292, Edward issued a charter to Westminster Abbey for a number of manors and services in return for the celebration of Eleanor’s anniversary.<sup>52</sup> The request included candles in specified amounts:

100 cierges being lighted about the queen’s tomb each being 12 pounds of wax, which cierges the said abbot, prior and convent shall find and renew yearly upon the anniversary of the said queen [...]and of the aforesaid cierges, there shall remain all the year 30 about the queen’s tomb, until the renewal of the cierges upon the anniversary aforesaid, which 30 cierges shall be lighted on the greater feasts and at the coming of great persons or otherwise as shall be thought fit; and the said abbot, prior, and convent shall maintain 2 cierges, each of 2 pounds weight, continually burning before the tomb of the said queen [...]<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Arthur Stanley, *Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, Third Edition (London: John Murray, 1869), 143-144. This particular edition has been selected due to its concurrent publication with the *Supplement to the Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey* (London: John Murray, 1869), which details the opening of various tombs in order to find the missing body of James I.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.

<sup>49</sup> Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 566.

<sup>50</sup> Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power, 1200-1400* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), 130; Seymour Phillips, *Edward II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 131.

<sup>51</sup> Mark Duffy, *Royal Tombs of Medieval England* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Tempus, 2003), 131.

<sup>52</sup> *CChR, 1257-1300*, 424-426.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 425.

The twelve-pound candles were extremely large, both in circumference and height. At the time of Eleanor's death, only the shrine, its altar, and Henry III's tomb, sans *gisant*, were in the Confessor's Chapel; there was ample room for candles.

The shrine of St. Edward, in order to function, had to have enough room for pilgrims to kneel within it. Priests also had to navigate it and offer mass, without tripping over candles. By the time of his accession in 1307, Edward II likely anticipated that the Chapel would continue to be used in the future, whether or not his own personal plans included a Westminster Abbey tomb. As such, it would not be far-fetched to think that, as Duffy speculates, Edward I's tomb design was a deliberate and purposeful choice. It would have been used for devotional images and to display splendid cloths, but it would also alleviate some of the space issues posed by Edward I's elaborate anniversary for Eleanor. The candles would be placed on the flat top of Edward's tomb.

In this case, the commemoration of a queen affected the memorialisation of a king. The relationship between the living and the dead must always be considered in commemoration. While Edward I's tomb did not match that of his father or that of his first wife, it performed a suitable function for the anniversary of his wife during the reign of their son.

To gauge how extravagant Eleanor of Castile's anniversary was, it must be compared to what other monarchs did for the dead. Much like royal wills, there is a divide at the reign of Richard II. Prior to 1399, simple orders for obits and anniversaries without specific demands were made. On 17 February 1227, Henry III gave to Ralph Neville, bishop of Chichester, a garden in frankalmoin in exchange for two chaplains, one to celebrate divine service for the soul of King John and one to celebrate for the soul of King Henry and his heirs.<sup>54</sup> In 1265, Henry III founded an anniversary at Westminster Abbey for himself and for his queen Eleanor

---

<sup>54</sup> *CChR, 1226-1257*, 16.

of Provence, using £100 from lands confiscated from traitors. In the grant of lands, there are no exact instructions for how the anniversary was to be carried out.<sup>55</sup> In one charter roll entry later vacated, Edward III granted a hermitage to Garendon Abbey in exchange for finding a hermit to pray for the king in life and his soul after death, as well as for his progenitors and successors.<sup>56</sup>

In comparison, then, Edward I's detailed instructions for Eleanor of Castile's anniversary were clearly beyond these "normal" arrangements. He specified the dates on which these celebrations should be performed, the numbers of candles, and the contents of religious celebrations; he ordered *Placebo* and *Dirige* with nine lessons, along with certain, preferred prayers. As seen in Chapter III, this meant he wanted the full Office of the Dead with nine-lesson Matins; Matins was typically celebrated in a three-lesson-per-day cycle throughout the week, with one day of rest.<sup>57</sup>

Prior to the fifteenth century, a king normally left the specifics of the anniversary celebrations to the church. This neatly mirrors the tendency of kings to leave the details to their executors until the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century. As discussed in Chapter III, the king gave broad, general directions to his executors, leaving the exact means of enacting the will flexible and open-ended. Then, in both the personal will and the celebration of anniversaries, a shift occurred at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries. The king began to micro-manage the details of both the will and the enactment of anniversaries.<sup>58</sup>

How much knowledge did a medieval king have about liturgical matters? It is one thing to attend mass or a funeral, another to celebrate these services and manage the day-to-day

---

<sup>55</sup> WAM 1692. The grant appears to have been created after the Battle of Evesham (August 1265), the anniversary formed for thanksgiving along with a good measure of spite, given the funding source.

<sup>56</sup> *CChR*, 1327-1341, 486.

<sup>57</sup> See Chapter III, 102-104.

<sup>58</sup> See Chapter III, 94-95.

functions of the chapels, church, abbey, and the religious housed therein. The detail expressed in several fifteenth century and sixteenth century royal wills, as well as the anniversary charters of Edward I for Eleanor of Castile and Richard II for Anne of Bohemia, suggests two possibilities: either English kings were extremely well-educated in religious life, or they consulted or were coached by ecclesiastics.

As discussed in the previous section, ecclesiastical entities could initiate commemorative activity through requests to the king, who could choose to attach a deceased person's name to his fulfilment of the request. The capabilities of a given institution to keep anniversaries were best known by the men who managed them, as well as what supplies were needed. Edward I's charter for Eleanor's anniversary specifies the weight and size of candles to be burned,<sup>59</sup> a mundane detail that would probably escape anyone other than the person responsible for acquiring and using the said candles. The practical elements of gifts, foundations, anniversaries, and even tombs had to be reviewed by the abbots or bishops before being finalized. The mechanics had to be functional for the grant to be effective. In short, the agency of the religious and their institutions cannot be discounted in the discussion of royal commemoration. When a king created a chantry, for example, he typically provided money for the upkeep of a chaplain; someone had to inform him of the sum necessary. As seen in the abovementioned examples of Henry III and the abbey of Croxton, Richard II and Canterbury Cathedral, and Richard III and Abingdon, the religious community instigated the commemorative activity by petitioning for what they needed

The reign of Edward II provides a more overt example of a spiritual house initiating such a relationship with the king in hopes of financial support and patronage. According to *The Red Book of The Exchequer*, in 1315, the dean of Lincoln Cathedral granted to Edward II a chaplain to pray for him, Isabella his queen, his son Edward, and for his parents, Edward I

---

<sup>59</sup> *CChR*, 1257-1300, 424-426.

and Eleanor of Castile.<sup>60</sup> Eleanor's viscera were buried at Lincoln at her death in 1290, and 1315 was the twenty-fifth anniversary year. This appears to be a voluntary, unprompted action on the part of the dean, Henry de Maunsfeld. The maintenance for this chaplain, however, followed more traditional development over time. In 1316, Edward II issued letters patent granting the chaplain 40s from the farm of the city of Lincoln to celebrate these services and nominating Adam de Heslai for the position.<sup>61</sup> Edward III's letters close indicate that the king was very concerned with the maintenance of this chaplain by 1348, when he settled alms in arrears.<sup>62</sup> The maintenance of 40s for a chaplain at Lincoln for the souls of the king, his predecessors, and successors was continued at least as late as 1475. Henry IV had confirmed the letters patent via a letter close in 1401.<sup>63</sup> Edward IV confirmed the original letters patent in a letter close in 1466,<sup>64</sup> and in 1475, he nominated Thomas West to be the chaplain after the death of William Muskam in a letter patent.<sup>65</sup>

The chantry at Lincoln functioned for at least 160 years. De Maunsfeld was very assertive in gaining the king's favour, almost strong-arming Edward II with the spiritual gifts for his family, living and dead, in a key anniversary year. How the anniversary was kept is not stated; there are no proclamations as to how many prayers were said, how many candles were present, or how many masses were sung. That was left to the discretion of the chaplain nominated by the king and likely the dean. This is typical of anniversaries prior to Richard II.

Edward I's formation of an anniversary for Eleanor of Castile was remarkable in the thirteen century. It continues to generate interest among scholars, both what it was originally and what it became, and whether this shift was by accident or by design. There is a long series of letters close that refer to the renewing of wax about the body of Edward I. There have been

---

<sup>60</sup> *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, i, edited by Hubert Hall. RS, 99 (London: 1896), lxxxiii-lxxxiv.

<sup>61</sup> *CPR, 1313-1317*, 398.

<sup>62</sup> *CCR, 1346-1349*, 561. Edward III intervened in Lincoln at least twice more during his reign in regard to restoring alms and reappointing vicars.

<sup>63</sup> *CCR, 1399-1402*, 337, dated 19 May 1401.

<sup>64</sup> *CCR, 1461-1468*, 295.

<sup>65</sup> *CPR, 1468-1477*, 559.

debates as to what these entries actually meant. The story from St. Albans indicated that Edward demanded to be taken on march against the Scots.<sup>66</sup> When Edward III began to order the renewing of wax around his grandfather, it coincided with difficulties with Scotland and near Edward I's anniversary. As a result, some antiquarians, including Arthur Stanley, believed that Edward I was rewrapped frequently to keep him fresh for such an excursion.<sup>67</sup> By 1775, however, Sir Joseph Ayloffe had determined that Edward I had not been disturbed since his interment in 1307.<sup>68</sup>

Edward's extensive orders for candles for his wife's anniversary was likely what "renewing the wax" referred to. The controller's account book of 17 Edward II reveals two different anniversaries: one for Eleanor on 28 November,<sup>69</sup> and one for Edward I on 7 July.<sup>70</sup> However, it is plausible that the more extensive arrangements for Eleanor of Castile's anniversary were applied to Edward's anniversary by monarchs after Edward II, whether deliberately creating an anniversary tradition for Edward or by accidentally conflating the two. While Richard II ordered that Anne's anniversary be combined with his, Edward I made no such order, but this may have occurred anyway. Eleanor of Castile's anniversary was reassigned to Edward I by his successors from 1339 onward.

The keeping of anniversaries was the responsibility of the Westminster monks. They were expected to be honest and comply so that they could collect their £200 yearly from the Exchequer for Eleanor of Castile's anniversary. Any order from the king was insurance that the anniversary was being carried out in a given year; the absence of orders does not equate to the absence of an anniversary. Eleanor of Castile's anniversary ceased to be celebrated at court

---

<sup>66</sup> See Chapter II, 45.

<sup>67</sup> See above, 218-220.

<sup>68</sup> Joseph Ayloffe, "An Account of the Body of King Edward the First, as It Appeared on Opening His Tomb in the Year 1774," *Archaeologia*, 3 (January 1775), 376-377.

<sup>69</sup> TNA E 101/379/19, f. 3v.

<sup>70</sup> TNA E 101/379/19, f. 15r.



after the reign of Edward II,<sup>71</sup> but that did not mean that the monks of Westminster stopped performing her anniversary. By the 1330s, observers may have believed that the opulent anniversary was for Edward for several reasons: the two tombs were close in proximity; Edward I's tomb was used to hold the candle overage; Edward I became increasingly popular during the course of the fourteenth century; the monks merged the two anniversaries, etc.. As such, when Edward III first ordered the renewal of wax around Edward I in 1339, he may well have thought this was the way Edward I was remembered at Westminster, not realizing that the original anniversary had been for Eleanor of Castile. Given the history of Edward I with both Scotland and France, the sitting king ensured that the anniversaries were kept, in hopes that Edward I could offer intercession, as any good soul in Heaven could. This remarks upon the changing status of the deceased; while her identity as Queen of England was never questioned, Eleanor of Castile's relevance to Edward III paled in comparison to that of her husband.

The first such occasion of the renewal dates to 6 July 1339.<sup>72</sup> This correlates to the siege of Perth, which resulted in the English-backed pretender, Edward Balliol, having to abandon the city to pro-Bruce supporters on 7 July 1339. The next occasion was far more auspicious. On 28 June 1340, Edward III sent word to the bishops and archbishops of England that he had won a naval victory over the French fleet at Sluys four days prior.<sup>73</sup> On 2 July, the king then ordered the wax around Edward I to be renewed.<sup>74</sup> From this point, Edward III never missed more than one year in renewing Edward I's wax until 1357. The Treaty of Berwick (1357) resulted in the release of David II from English custody in exchange for a ransom and the naming of Edward III as David's heir. Edward III's renewal of wax ceased at

---

<sup>71</sup> W.M. Ormrod, "Queenship, Death, and Agency: The Commemorations of Isabella of France and Philippa of Hainault," in *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval England: Proceedings of the 2008 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Caroline M. Barron and Clive Burgess (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2010), 90.

<sup>72</sup> This is the earliest occasion I have found in my research, and it is corroborated by W.H. St. John Hope in his article, *On the Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England* (London: John Murray, 1907), 13.

<sup>73</sup> *Foedera* (Record Commission), ii, pt. 2, 1084.

<sup>74</sup> *Foedera* (Record Commission), ii, pt. 2, 1130.

this point. Ultimately, the Scots did not hold up their end, failing to pay the ransom and declaring Robert Stewart king in 1371 upon David's death.

The renewal of wax started again at the advent of Richard II's reign.<sup>75</sup> Given the close proximity of the anniversary of Edward I (7 July) and the funeral of Edward III (5 July 1377), it was sensible to light the candles for both men. Thereon, the wax tended to be renewed at least every two to three years. This stopped after 1389 and did not begin again until the reign of Henry IV.<sup>76</sup> In 1388, Richard II's minority had ended; he, not a council, was now responsible for the duties of the king. The abrupt cessation of the renewal orders soon after may indicate that it was a member of his council, rather than Richard himself, that had encouraged the yearly enforcement of the anniversary of Edward I.

Henry IV ordered the renewal of the wax around Edward I on 10 December 1400,<sup>77</sup> but this seems to have been only a brief renaissance in the tradition. Despite the increase in Auld Alliance activity against England at land and sea in 1402,<sup>78</sup> Henry stopped enforcing the anniversary in that year. The reasons for this are not immediately evident, as it was not until 1406 that Henry IV gained custody of James, heir to the Scottish throne. Nor were there significant developments with France during this period. One might speculate Henry IV doubted the effectiveness of the enforced renewal, as 1402 also marked the beginning of the Percy Rebellion, but this cannot be confirmed. The patterns of enforcement by Edward III and the reasons thereof are far clearer than those of Richard II and Henry IV. It does not seem that any of these men realized that the practice originally belonged to the anniversary of Edward I's queen, not Edward himself. If they did, the fact was conveniently ignored.

---

<sup>75</sup> *Foedera* (Record Commission), iv, pt. 1, 4.

<sup>76</sup> *CCR, 1385-1389*, 409.

<sup>77</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 280.

<sup>78</sup> A. L. Brown and Henry Summerson, "Henry IV (1367-1413)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/12951.

Chantries and other remembrances established during the reign of Richard II and later tended to be more concerned with the day-to-day operations. Richard II's anniversary for Anne of Bohemia, established in 1394, plagiarized significant parts of Edward I's anniversary orders for Eleanor of Castile, right down to the price tag of £200 from the Exchequer plus lands at the king's discretion.<sup>79</sup> The principal difference between these two orders was that Richard wanted his own anniversary to combine with and override that of Anne upon his death. The detail in these orders reveal some consultation with the dean of Westminster as to what would be possible, and what sort of complications there could be; Richard made contingencies if he died during Easter, probably on the advice of the dean.<sup>80</sup>

The desire for greater control over anniversaries and commemoration increased with Richard II and his successors. Henry IV was preoccupied with establishing and maintaining anniversaries for those who had already died, not so much his own. He established an anniversary for Mary Bohun, his first wife, in 1401 at St. Mary Graces by the Tower of London, a Cistercian abbey, with detail as to how it was to be celebrated.<sup>81</sup> In another letter close, he upheld the anniversary of Richard II and Anne at Chertsey Abbey. Within the same letter close, he ordered an anniversary for Mary there as well, identical to Richard and Anne's, plus daily mass with a specially chosen collect for her, *Quesumus domine miserere anime famule tue*, the same as at St. Mary Graces.<sup>82</sup> Rather than having his anniversary override his wife's, as Richard had done, Henry ordered that once he died, he should have his own anniversary, just like Mary's, but with the collect *Inclina domine aurem tuam ut animam famuli*

---

<sup>79</sup> For Edward I, see *CChR*, 1257-1300, 461; for Richard II, see *CChR*, 1341-1417, 347.

<sup>80</sup> Anne of Bohemia had died on 7 June 1394. Her anniversary would have been very easy to keep, as it fell a month before Edward I's. As discussed above, by 1339, Eleanor of Castile's anniversary had been "reassigned" to her husband, typically celebrated in early July. As such, the orders for candles did not overlap; the two sets of vast candles did not inhabit the small space at the exact same time. Had Richard died within a week of 7 July (Edward I's death date), the dean and abbot may well have appealed to Richard's successor for a means of either spacing out the anniversaries or amending the number of candles required in the Confessor's Chapel for both anniversaries.

<sup>81</sup> *CCR*, 1399-1402, 325-326, dated 12 March 1401.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid*, 499, dated 5 February 1402.

*tui Regis Henrici*. The collect should also be said at Mary's anniversary masses, but the wording of the letter does not suggest Henry wished for the anniversaries to be combined.

Henry IV's specifications were made in direct response to those made by Richard II, and he attempted to have his and his wife's anniversaries outshine the shared anniversary of Richard and his consort. However, he did not discontinue Richard's anniversary there. Maintaining an anniversary and not allowing it to lapse was just as important as creating new ones. In a letter patent, Edward IV referred to Henry V as his kinsman and maintained the prayers that were to be said for him at a certain foundation.<sup>83</sup> In several letters patent over the course of his reign, Edward IV appointed successive chaplains to the chantry of the Black Prince.<sup>84</sup> While the former may be surprising, as Henry was the father of Edward IV's rival, the latter is not; Edward had identified himself as "the true heir of Edward III and Richard II" in 1462.<sup>85</sup>

Henry V elected to legally bind parties in organising anniversaries and chantries for his soul. Formal indentures between the king and other parties for foundations began to be recorded on the close rolls. Indentures for physical items, such as tombs, had been in use for centuries, but to create indentures for intangible items, such as prayers, was new. A typical example of Henry's indentures comes from Chichester in 1414.<sup>86</sup> This indenture included the fees to be paid to the chaplain; what moneys Henry would send for the upkeep of the building and others resident at the church in which the chantry was; which masses were to be said, as well as what days of the week these masses were to be said; if there was to be anyone else to be prayed for; and if the chaplain died, what qualifications Henry and his council would look for

---

<sup>83</sup> *CPR, 1461-1467*, 110.

<sup>84</sup> *CPR, 1467-1477*, 388; 415; *CPR, 1477-1483*, 12.

<sup>85</sup> *CPR, 1461-1467*, 93. See D.A.L. Morgan, "The Political After-Life of Edward III: The Apotheosis of a Warmonger," *English Historical Review*, 112, no. 448 (September 1997), 869-870.

<sup>86</sup> *CCR, 1413-1419*, 89-90.

in a new candidate. For Henry V's foundation at Chichester, "a virtuous man and a graduate in the schools" was the ideal chaplain.<sup>87</sup>

The requirements described above were highly-informed demands, centring on the daily life of the church and chantry. Only an authority local to Chichester – such as the bishop or the dean – would have been able to supply Henry with this information. The upkeep of the building was an ever-pressing need. The weekly structure of masses to be said would have fit around the other scheduled masses, anniversaries, obits, and high feast days. The chaplain would have ultimately had to fit in with the community, which may have influenced his specific requirements, truly pious and well-educated.

The specificity of Henry V's desires for religious commemoration also appear in his will of 1422, wherein he dictated which masses for each day of the week should be said at his chantry chapel altar and that masses of the day should go by the Use of Sarum.<sup>88</sup> The Use of Westminster was a combination of Sarum and the Benedictine rite, so it was not a completely wayward deviation. However, it was a request that would have had to be approved by the abbot of Westminster Abbey, as it would have disrupted the rhythm of Benedictine life at the Abbey, even if only for a single monk.

Indentures for intangible items were employed to their fullest by Henry VII. His close rolls are densely populated by such agreements, including a septipartite one, between the king, William Warham archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Foxe bishop of Winchester, John Islip the abbot and the prior and the convent of Westminster Abbey, Edmund Martyn the dean and canons of St. Stephen's Westminster, Richard Sherborne the dean and the chapter of St. Paul's London, and Sir William Capel lord mayor and the commonalty of the city of London in

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid, 90.

<sup>88</sup> Strong and Strong, "The Last Will and Codicils of Henry V," 90.

1504.<sup>89</sup> This particular indenture was only a part of the foundation across multiple churches. Henry VII created the foundation for himself and his mother Margaret Beaufort while they lived, and for the dead: his father Edmund Tudor, his wife Elizabeth, and their children. In a quadripartite agreement, similar anniversaries were established at St. George's Chapel, Windsor in 1505.<sup>90</sup> In both of these long indentures, Henry VII specified which collects were to be said at each of the canonical hours and at each mass during each anniversary of the deceased. Henry VII controlled the manner in which the anniversaries of those dear to him were celebrated. He also managed how his soul was to be cared for during his life, with penalties to those who did not live up to his demands.

There were no missteps with the anniversaries presented here: no prescriptive text, no expectation of adherence. As seen with the development of the personal will, kings became more controlling over the details of how, when, and where their anniversaries and those of their relatives were celebrated. Edward I's requests for Eleanor of Castile's anniversary were exceptional in his own time but ultimately became mundane by the end of the fourteenth century. The enforcement of the anniversary changed from a yearly writ from the chancery to a series of legally binding documents that ensured the continuation of the anniversary, an intangible item. That said, it did not mean that the anniversaries were not being kept unless paperwork was constantly being issued; the monks and canons were expected to be honest with those they prayed for.

### ***Tombs***

Tombs were often the last things established to commemorate the dead. Taking care of the living and establishing foundations for the soul of the deceased took precedence, as these

---

<sup>89</sup> This vast indenture series begins on *CCR, 1500-1509*, 138, no. 389; no. 392 is the septipartite agreement. The Lord Mayor of London came to office at Michaelmas of a given year, so although Capel was elected in 1503, he served the majority of his term in 1504.

<sup>90</sup> *SGC IV B 3*, ff. 219-225.

arrangements needed to take effect immediately upon death. The decorative aspects of tombs could wait years, and even the functional aspects that would contain the coffin could be delayed for months by an excellent embalming. As such, from the beginning of any given king's reign, documentation is typically present for religious foundations that prayed for the good estate of the king in life and for his soul after death. Establishments for old servants also show up frequently.

The late fourteenth century and early fifteenth century mark a transition in attitude toward the construction of a monument. Prior to this point, very few monarchs and members of the royal family left specific instructions as to the appearance of their tombs, and only a small number of those even started construction during their lifetime; Philippa of Hainault is a prominent exception.<sup>91</sup> Richard II, after the death of Anne of Bohemia, completed their joint tomb by the time of his deposition in 1399. It was not until Henry V in 1422 that a royal will specified the layout of a tomb and chantry. The tombs of kings prior to 1399 and of Henry IV, therefore, have innate questions of agency surrounding their appearance and construction.

From 1422 onward, kings attempted to better control the appearance of their tombs by describing them in their wills and even starting construction on them prior to their deaths. This did not guarantee completion of the project envisioned in the king's mind; the end result of Edward IV's and Henry VII's tombs are markedly different from the monuments described in their wills. As such, the agency of the tomb most often fell to or was taken by the living.

When a king died suddenly, unless he had made prior provision, the responsibility for the tomb fell often to his successor or his representatives, but not always. John's sudden death in 1216 resulted in a slab tomb lying atop his remains for sixteen years. The *gisant* was likely

---

<sup>91</sup> TNA E 403/425 indicates that Jean Liege was paid money for the construction of Queen Philippa's tomb on 20 January 1366; this transcribed and translated is in *Issues of the Exchequer*, albeit in the wrong year, 189. This would suggest there was already a plan in place; see also Ormrod, "Queenship, Agency, and Death, 96-97. Philippa died in August 1369.

placed on the plain, low slab tomb in 1232.<sup>92</sup> Such a tomb was not at all inappropriate, however; prior post-Conquest kings buried in England (William II, Henry I, and Stephen) had slab tombs. *Gisants* were a French custom.<sup>93</sup> John's immediate predecessors, his father Henry II and his brother Richard I, as well as his mother Eleanor of Aquitaine, all had *gisant* tombs at Fontevraud in Anjou. John's tomb was the first of its kind in England during the thirteenth century. However, it was not at the behest of Henry III that John's tomb was improved.

Worcester Priory (now Cathedral) did not receive a great deal of support from Henry III until 1232,<sup>94</sup> after the movement of John from his initial resting place in the old Romanesque church to his present location in the middle of the new Gothic choir.<sup>95</sup> Worcester had undertaken an extensive rebuilding program, and the first major high point was the reburial of John in the newly completed choir. Ute Engel suggests that, because there are no expenses recorded in the royal records for John's tomb,<sup>96</sup> it is highly likely that Worcester paid for John's new tomb and *gisant* in a high-risk high-gain manoeuvre.<sup>97</sup> The gambit worked: Henry III became one of Worcester's most generous patrons, supplying accoutrements for celebrating mass, construction materials, and encouraging those near to him to support Worcester's fabric.

Gloucester Abbey (now Cathedral), which lies less than twenty-five miles away from Worcester, may well have taken heed of this precedent when they received the corpse of Edward II in 1327. Gloucester knew that the body was a desirable piece of capital. Despite Gloucester's self-propagated tales of humbly taking in the poor rejected Edward of Caernarfon

---

<sup>92</sup> Ute Engel, *Worcester Cathedral: An Architectural History*, translated by Hilary Heltay (Chichester: Phillimore and Co., 2007), 114.

<sup>93</sup> Jane Martindale, "The Sword on the Stone: Some Resonances of a Medieval Symbol of Power (The Tomb of King John in Worcester Cathedral), in *Anglo-Norman Studies XV: Proceedings of the XV Battle Conference and of the XI Colloquio Medieval of the Officina di Studi Medievali*, edited by Marjorie Chibnall (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), 208.

<sup>94</sup> Engel, *Worcester Cathedral*, 161.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 208.

<sup>96</sup> R. Allen Brown, H.M. Colvin, and A.J. Taylor, *The History of the King's Works, Volume I: The Middle Ages* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963), 478.

<sup>97</sup> Engel, *Worcester Cathedral*, 162.



when no else would,<sup>98</sup> the truth was that Queen Isabella and Roger Mortimer had deliberately chosen the site and paid for its transport.<sup>99</sup> However, Westminster Abbey had deployed two monks to claim the body. One of these monks knew anatomy, anticipating that they would transport the corpse back to London for a funeral.<sup>100</sup>

As such, it was evident from the very start that possession of Edward II's body would be contested by Westminster Abbey. Westminster Abbey believed it had a superior claim on the king's corpse compared to the church that presently possessed the body. With royal bodies came royal patronage; Gloucester was keen to preserve this privilege, even though movement of the body seemed unlikely during the regency of Isabella and Mortimer. An additional incentive to keep the body came even as the regime faltered. Edward of Caernarfon became the focus of a cult, replete with pilgrims.<sup>101</sup> Edward's rumoured murder paired with the unpopularity of the regime that replaced him profited the church that held his body. The construction of a splendid tomb would serve Gloucester well, whether Edward was to be ultimately remembered as a king by the elites or as a saint by the people.

Much like the tomb of King John at Worcester, there are no records to suggest the Crown funded the tomb that stands in Gloucester. It is worthwhile to mention here that prior to the *gisant* and tomb seen today, Edward II's remains were placed under a slab of Purbeck marble,<sup>102</sup> not unlike Edward I, John prior to 1232, or the aforementioned post-Conquest Norman kings buried in England. Edward III, early in his reign, may have preferred to leave the tomb as it was, due to the depleted royal coffers.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> *Historia et cartularium monasterii sancti Petri Gloucestræ*, i, edited by W.H. Hart. Rolls Series, 33 (London, 1863) 44-45.

<sup>99</sup> TNA E 368/100, m. 8; TNA E 101/383/1. See also Phillips, *Edward II*, 551-554 for details of the treatment of the body and its burial at Gloucester.

<sup>100</sup> WAM 20344.

<sup>101</sup> *Historia et cartularium*, i, 46.

<sup>102</sup> *The Brut or The Chronicles of England*, ii, edited by Friedrich W. D. Brie. Early English Text Society, 136 (London: 1908), 394.

<sup>103</sup> W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 110-111; 113-114. See also Caroline Shenton, "Edward III and the Coup of 1330," in *The Age of Edward III*, edited by James Bothwell (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2001), 14, n. 5.

Both W.M. Ormrod and Seymour Phillips argue, however, that there must have been some connection between the Crown and the Gloucester tomb. Based upon the work of art historians, they have suggested that the *gisant* and tomb of Edward II bear a remarkable resemblance to the *gisant* and tomb of his younger son, John of Eltham, at Westminster Abbey. Both were the work of a master, and the resemblances both in the physical image of the two men and the style of tombs must be accounted for.<sup>104</sup> Ormrod suggests in an earlier work that even though Thomas of Canterbury, the royal architect, was likely on the job, it did not necessarily mean that Edward III paid for or commissioned it.<sup>105</sup> Later, Ormrod states it was a direct commission from Edward III,<sup>106</sup> but this cannot be confirmed.

Even without royal patronage, John's tomb topper was of rich quality. Philip Lindley has pointed out that while the *gisant* resembles the tombs at Fontevraud in form, the details are decisively different. At Fontevraud, the figures have their eyes closed and are dressed as if recumbent; the carved fabric seems to be draped over the dead. In contrast, John's *gisant* has its eyes open, and the clothing falls as if he were standing upright.<sup>107</sup> These details were fashionable for English episcopal elite during the thirteenth century, furthering the idea that Worcester Priory fully funded John's 1232 tomb, using their own contacts.

Concerning the tomb of Edward II, then, taking into account the money that his cult was already generating by 1330, it would not have been impossible for Gloucester to at least begin the tomb project, with the hopes that Edward III would take interest and continue to fund improvements at Gloucester. The money was an advantage that Worcester did not have for John, yet their bid to keep John was successful, even with an oddly-styled *gisant*; if the tomb had been unsuitable or displeasing, Henry III could have elected to remove his father.

---

<sup>104</sup> Ormrod, *Edward III*, 121-122; Phillips, *Edward II*, 557. See also Philip Lindley, *Gothic to Renaissance: Essays on Sculpture in England* (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995), 110; Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 121.

<sup>105</sup> W.M. Ormrod, "The Personal Religion of Edward III," *Speculum*, 64, no. 4 (October 1989), 870-871, n. 123.

<sup>106</sup> Ormrod, *Edward III*, 123.

<sup>107</sup> Lindley, *Gothic to Renaissance*, 99.

Edward III visited Gloucester 23-26 June 1330, after an extended stay at Woodstock as he awaited the birth of his son.<sup>108</sup> Other than giving notice to his justices that the abbot was sick, Edward III was silent regarding the abbey itself in his letters close.<sup>109</sup> The lack of gifts to the church that held his father's body may have prompted Gloucester's actions, interpreting Edward III's detachment as disapproval or contemplation of removing his father's body to Westminster.

Thus, Gloucester began on its venture to gain the favour of Edward III through the tomb of Edward II. Alabaster was a new material to work with in sculpture and building during the first half of the fourteenth century, and the material itself was local to Gloucester.<sup>110</sup> Christopher Wilson describes alabaster as "the far less expensive and prestigious material" in the context of Henry IV's tomb and comparing it to Purbeck marble, which had to be brought up from Corfe.<sup>111</sup> Arthur Gardner notes that several of the masons working for the king during this period came from Gloucester and probably cut their teeth on this material prior to coming to London.<sup>112</sup> Edward II's tomb was the first in all of England to have an alabaster *gisant*. Edward II's tomb chest is made of Purbeck marble, the more expensive material, with limestone. If it was a royal commission, why the *gisant* was not crafted in Purbeck marble or cast in metal from the start should raise questions.

If Edward III did commission the tomb, it would have been felicitous to select alabaster, a material completely unproven in royal tombs at that point, and then select a well-trained Gloucester-raised mason to create the image seen today. Purbeck marble would have been the far safer bet for London masons. Purbeck marble and gilt tombs were tried and true commemorative elements in England – there was no good reason for Edward III to risk an

---

<sup>108</sup> Ormrod, *Edward III*, 613.

<sup>109</sup> *CCR, 1330-1333*, 43.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid*, 45.

<sup>111</sup> Christopher Wilson, "The Medieval Monuments," in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, edited by Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, and Margaret Sparks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 500.

<sup>112</sup> Arthur Gardner, *Alabaster Tombs of the Pre-Reformation Period in England* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 45-46.

unsuitable, unstable, or unsightly monument for his father, whose reputation was teetering between that of a saint and that of *regem inutilis*. The fact that alabaster was native to Gloucester and that county happened to be where Edward II had met his end all seems too neat.

Instead, we may consider that the commissioning of the tomb began with someone familiar with Gloucester, the masons that resided there, and the stone locally available that would be aesthetically pleasing. The local masons would know how to handle this stone to the best of its potential. Importing Purbeck marble from Corfe and expending the money to do so may have been too risky for a bid for patronage. Alabaster with local talent would have been much cheaper and quieter to execute.

John Wygmore, abbot of Gloucester, started his building programme by 1335,<sup>113</sup> but there is evidence to suggest that construction in the abbey started as early as 1331.<sup>114</sup> However, Edward III only began to generously endow Gloucester in 1337.<sup>115</sup> Two years was a respectable amount of time for a fine *gisant* to be carved. The success of the *gisant* in alabaster may have provided Edward III with enough impetus to help Gloucester finish the job. We can speculate that the tomb box and the rest of the tomb decoration were funded by Edward's gifts; the reason for his generous grants is never overtly stated. It can also be suggested that this was the moment that Thomas of Canterbury, the royal architect, became involved. As evidenced by the indentures and bills for the construction of the tombs of Richard II<sup>116</sup> and Philippa of Hainault,<sup>117</sup> one needed an expert coppersmith or sculptor for the *gisant*, not an architect. The structural elements of the tomb box and the free-standing canopy, however, were certainly more geared toward the skills of the royal architect.

---

<sup>113</sup> *Historia et Cartularium*, i, 47-48.

<sup>114</sup> *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200-1400*, edited by Jonathan Alexander and Paul Binski (London: Royal Academy of Arts 1987), no. 497.

<sup>115</sup> *CCR, 1337-1339*, 8-9.

<sup>116</sup> TNA E 101/473/7 f. 1.

<sup>117</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 189.

These skills were also on display in the form of John of Eltham's tomb prior to the eighteenth century. The second son of Edward II and Isabella of France, John died in 1336 and was moved several times within Westminster Abbey before settling in the Chapel of Sts. Edmund and Thomas, probably c. 1340.<sup>118</sup> His permanent tomb, therefore, easily fits into the timeline if we believe that the carver of Edward II's *gisant* was the same person who carved John of Eltham's. Likewise, the architect who took care of the structural matters of the two tombs was likely the same person. John of Eltham's limestone canopy survived until it was toppled by the crush of people during the Duchess of Suffolk's funeral in 1776,<sup>119</sup> but an engraving of it survives in Dart's *Westmonasterium*.<sup>120</sup> Although on a much smaller scale, it bears a strong resemblance to that of Edward II.

Given the new use of alabaster and the distant relationship between Edward III and Gloucester until 1337, it is plausible that the tomb of Edward II was started by Gloucester Abbey alone, but completed through the patronage of Edward III. No money was ever sent for the expressed purpose of construction on Edward II's tomb, but that does not mean Edward III did not have an off-the-record conversation with the abbot as to how his gifts were to be used.

Edward II's royal tomb set a trend. Alabaster became the main material for *gisants* for tombs commissions by the royal family until the 1370s. This includes the *gisants* of Isabella of France at Greyfriars London,<sup>121</sup> Philippa of Hainault at Westminster Abbey,<sup>122</sup> William of Hatfield at York Minster,<sup>123</sup> and Blanche of the Tower and William of Windsor (in a joint

---

<sup>118</sup> See Chapter V, 176-177, n. 37.

<sup>119</sup> Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, England, *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in London, Volume I: Westminster Abbey* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1924), 48.

<sup>120</sup> John Dart, *Westmonasterium* (London: 1742), plate 132.

<sup>121</sup> BL Cotton MS Vitellius F XII, f. 275v.

<sup>122</sup> Ormrod, "Queenship, Death, and Agency," 96. Westminster Abbey and Philip Lindley refer to Philippa's *gisant* as alabaster as well; Lindley, *Gothic to Renaissance*, 109. Mark Duffy believes the *gisant* was constructed of white marble, *Royal Tombs*, 137.

<sup>123</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs of Medieval England*, 128.

tomb) at Westminster Abbey.<sup>124</sup> Dying in 1399, John of Gaunt was buried at St. Paul's Cathedral beside his first wife, Blanche, in a shared tomb with two alabaster *gisants*; Gaunt had built this tomb between 1374 and 1380, when alabaster was still the material of choice.<sup>125</sup> The *gisants* after 1377 ordered by Richard II reverted to the gilt style akin to that of William Torel, who cast the *gisants* of Henry III and Eleanor of Castile in the 1290s. These included Edward III, the Black Prince, Anne of Bohemia, and Richard II himself.<sup>126</sup>

The tombs of John and Edward II are unique, as their agency belongs to the churches in which they are housed, at least in part. In contrast, all other royal tombs came either at the behest of the deceased prior to his death or at the desire of his successor and family. In the first group, Richard II, Henry V, Edward IV, and Henry VII recorded their desires as they pertained to their tombs. Richard II built and finished his own tomb prior to his death, so the agency is not disputed.<sup>127</sup>

Henry V's tomb was promptly started upon news of his death and was under construction by the time he was buried 7 November 1422.<sup>128</sup> The instructions left in Henry V's will of 1415 were followed closely, right down to the unique construction of a chantry chapel over the tomb.<sup>129</sup> The tomb was completed by 1431, and despite the challenges of building such a chapel, Cardinal Henry Beaufort was able to comply with his half-nephew's will, beginning construction on the chantry chapel in 1438.<sup>130</sup> No specific demands were made for

---

<sup>124</sup> Ibid, 131. The two tombs of Lionel of Antwerp, one in Italy and one in England, are both lost and the material never specified.

<sup>125</sup> Oliver D. Harris, "“Une tresriche sepulture”": the tomb and chantry of John of Gaunt and Blanche of Lancaster in Old St Paul's Cathedral, London," *Church Monuments*, 25 (2010), 7-35.

<sup>126</sup> Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, 195-197; Phillip Lindley, "Absolutism and Regal Image in Ricardian Sculpture," in *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*, edited by Dillian Gordon, Lisa Monnas, and Caroline Elan (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997) 62, 64-65, 68-69.

<sup>127</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, 270; this was payment for the copper gilt images of Richard and Anne, dated April 1399, in fulfilment of the indenture of 1395; for the indenture, see *Foedera* (The Hague), iii, pt. 4, 106.

<sup>128</sup> Christopher Allmand, *Henry V* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 180.

<sup>129</sup> *Foedera* (The Hague), iv, pt. 2, 138-139. The chapel is also referenced in Henry's deathbed will and codicils of 1422; see Patrick Strong and Felicity Strong, "The Last Will and Codicils of Henry V," 89-90. Allmand provides an excellent summary of both the 1415 and 1421 wills in *Henry V*, 179-182.

<sup>130</sup> Allmand, *Henry V*, 180-81.

the tomb's appearance; the will was more concerned with the surrounding structure and access to the chantry chapel, which was described thoroughly.

Henry V's tomb fits the traditional tomb box and *gisant* pattern of Westminster Abbey, but his original *gisant* was uniquely crafted with a wooden core, covered over with silver gilt plating, and held silver accoutrements.<sup>131</sup> No documentary evidence exists for the tomb as to the identity of the workmen or the amounts paid for the work,<sup>132</sup> with the exception of 10s paid as a reward to Robert Cowper, the head carpenter, by Westminster Abbey.<sup>133</sup> The original materials of Henry V's *gisant* are unique to tombs, but it is unknown whether he expressed a desire for such a construction.

Architect and art historian W.H. St. John Hope theorizes that the tomb box of Purbeck marble may have been planned or even constructed prior to Henry V's own death.<sup>134</sup> Stephen Lote, who had worked with the Henry Yevele in the construction of the Purbeck marble tomb boxes of Edward III and Richard II and Anne of Bohemia, survived until 1417. This was well into Henry V's reign and after his first will of 1415, which detailed the chantry chapel and general appearance of the area surrounding the tomb. All three tomb boxes are similar to each other, enough to suggest the same designer. Henry V or one of his representatives may have consulted with Lote and had the tomb box constructed to his design. As such, there is a distinct possibility that Henry V did have a hand in the appearance of his tomb box; whether it was constructed before or after Henry V's death is uncertain.

Edward IV started his tomb prior to his death. Henry VII likewise began his tomb prior to his death, but it was not completed by his own death in 1509. However, the finished

---

<sup>131</sup> W.H. St. John Hope, "The Funeral, Monument, and Chantry Chapel of King Henry the Fifth," *Archaeologia*, 65 (1915), 150.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid*, 152.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid*, 148.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid*, 152.

tombs of both men varied significantly from the original requests made by the deceased.

Despite the highly detailed plans in their wills, the executors elected not to abide by them.

Edward IV's will called for a chantry chapel atop his vault, and within the chapel would be his tomb monument. The description in the will can be interpreted a request for a *transi tomb*. Edward was to be buried in a vault, with the covering stone having an image of Death upon it. Atop this was to be a monument with a silver or copper gilt *gisant*.<sup>135</sup> Edward IV's tomb was ultimately topped with touchstone,<sup>136</sup> but there was no *gisant* and no "image of Deth." The request for a *transi tomb* was not fulfilled, although the requests concerning the chantry chapel were fulfilled. Paul Binski believes that "the *transi tomb*'s unmasking of decay threatened the ideological integrity of the body politic better exemplified by the tough, ineluctable gilt bronze or marble effigy of the monarch as office holder."<sup>137</sup> In short, the *transi tomb* emphasized too much the death of the man and failed to promote the survival of the office.

However, the financial information relating to Edward IV's tomb ends in 1483, not long after his death. Either the executors of the will or Edward IV's successor, Richard III, found the *transi tomb* to be an inappropriate monument, or one or both of those parties felt that further expenditure on the tomb would be imprudent. In 1476-1477, the second full year of construction, £1408 16s 9 ¼d were paid out for the tomb; the first year of receipts are lost, and further payments for stone and labour had been made over successive years.<sup>138</sup> By 1483, the tomb had to have been a very expensive venture for king whose funeral had been difficult to

---

<sup>135</sup> *Excerpta Historica, or Illustrations of English History*, edited by S. Bentley (London: Samuel Bentley, 1831), 366-367.

<sup>136</sup> W.H. St. John Hope, *Windsor Castle: An Architectural History, Collected and Written by Command of Their Majesties Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V*, ii (London: Country Life, 1913), 382.

<sup>137</sup> Paul Binski, *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), 151.

<sup>138</sup> Hope, *Windsor Castle*, ii, 377-378.



pay for and whose kingdom was in tumult; construction may have reached a logical stop-point and ceased due to financial considerations.<sup>139</sup>

Henry VII's tomb went through several stages of planning before what was recorded in his will of 31 March 1509. His executors, especially his son Henry VIII, elected to modify the tomb, resulting in what stands in Henry VII's Lady Chapel at Westminster Abbey. As discussed in Chapter V, Henry VII planned to be buried at Windsor until it was determined that Henry VI would be translated to Westminster Abbey.<sup>140</sup> The plans at Windsor were abandoned, with nothing built and very few specifics laid out for the appearance of the tomb itself.

The first Westminster Abbey tomb plan appears to have been drawn up in the intervening years between Queen Elizabeth's death in 1503 and the start of construction of Henry VII's tomb in 1512. Mark Duffy believes that the initial tomb design was produced before Henry VII's death around 1507.<sup>141</sup> Barbara Hochstetler Meyer, in examination of BL Harley MS 297, notes that this particular design was placed after a copy of Henry VII's will, with the notation that Henry VIII did not like the design and thus changed it. She also observes that the original estimate, found in the State Papers, was endorsed by Henry VIII.<sup>142</sup> Given that Henry VII's will was written only a month before his death, it is likely that the chronological order of tomb designs proceeded as such: Henry VII's preliminary preparations for a Windsor tomb pre-1498, the design laid out in Henry VII's 1509 will, the design recorded in SP 1/1/44 and 45 c. 1509-1510 and later in BL Harley MS 297 to be executed by

---

<sup>139</sup> *Registrum Thome Bourghier, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi AD 1454-1486*, edited by F.R.H. Du Boulay. Canterbury and York Society, 54 (Oxford: 1957), 52 and 54; see also Chapter I, 10. Rosemary Horrox has also indicated that due to military activity in Scotland and dealings in France, Edward IV had left limited cash funds to his successor; see Rosemary Horrox, "Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V, Longleat Miscellaneous Manuscript Book II," in *Camden Miscellany*, 29 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1987), 209-210.

<sup>140</sup> See Chapter V, 180-182.

<sup>141</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 281.

<sup>142</sup> BL Harley MS 297, f. 28r; Barbara Hochstetler Meyer, "The First Tomb of Henry VII," *The Art Bulletin*, 58, no. 3 (September 1976), 360, n. 9.

Guido Mazzoni, and lastly the design seen today, arranged by 1512, executed by Pietro Torrigiano.

Henry VII's agency in his tomb is therefore limited to what was written in his will; anything else was at the behest of his executors. Henry VII requested that his shared tomb with his predeceased wife Elizabeth of York be placed in the middle of the Lady Chapel, in front of the high altar. Atop the touchstone tomb box was to be copper gilt images of the king and queen. On the edges of the stone were to be inscribed with the relevant dates of life, reign, and death. Lastly, there were to be tabernacles or small shrines on all four sides of the tomb, filled with images of Henry's favourite saints, and a grate to enclose it all from the main body of the chapel.<sup>143</sup>

The plan that Henry VIII ultimately discarded was quite different from Henry VII's vision in his will. First, the tomb was to be dual layered, with *gisants* of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York on the lower level and a kneeling figure of Henry VII, a *priant*, alone atop the second layer.<sup>144</sup> It was also to be done rather quickly, within eighteen months of the indenture. The images of four kneeling lords were also to feature on the tomb, probably on the upper level with Henry VII's second image.<sup>145</sup> The tomb box was to be of black touchstone for the legs and base and white marble for the sides and end, and painters were to colour the clothes of the images.<sup>146</sup> Duffy suggests that this was to appear similar to Mazzoni's work on the tomb of Charles VIII and reflect the fashion in France at the time for dual layer tombs.<sup>147</sup>

What is presently seen in the Lady Chapel of Westminster Abbey bears little resemblance to the interim plans of 1509-10. The dual-layer is gone, as are the *priants*. The basic instructions in Henry VII's will are followed: the king and queen lie atop the tomb in

---

<sup>143</sup> *The Will of Henry VII*, edited by Thomas Astle (London: B. Whit and T. Payne, 1775), 4-5; see also Margaret Condon, "The Last Will of Henry VII," *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 113.

<sup>144</sup> TNA SP 1/1/44; BL Harley MS 297, f. 28r.

<sup>145</sup> TNA SP 1/1/44; BL Harley MS 297, f. 29r.

<sup>146</sup> TNA SP 1/1/44; BL Harley MS 297, ff. 29r-v

<sup>147</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 282 and 284.

copper gilt, with the images of saints around the sides of the tomb box. That said, these saints are not in the niches requested by Henry, but rather part of emblematic decoration.

Surrounding the tomb is a tall grate. What was not followed was the placement of the tomb itself; rather than being in front of the high altar, the Torrigiano tomb is placed where the shrine to Henry VI should have been, behind the high altar.<sup>148</sup> Shrines to saints are normally placed in the eastern-most area of the church, as seen with the Confessor's Chapel in the main body of Westminster Abbey. As such, one can assume that Henry VIII had no interest in moving Henry VI from Windsor post-1512.

The other details of the tomb take some pieces from the 1509-1510 plan, while others are new. Black touchstone and white marble are the principal materials of the structure of the tomb. *Putti*, or cherubs, hold up heraldic and royal symbols, an innovative feature for English monuments and keeping up with French fashion at the time.<sup>149</sup> The decorations of the tomb are three-dimensional, larger-than-life, and certainly more than what Henry VII originally requested; this is reflective of Henry VIII's agency.

The remaining kings during the 1216-1509 period left the disposition of their tombs to their successors and executors, whether by direct statement in their wills or by their unexpected deaths. Edward I erected the tombs of his father, Henry III, and his wife, Eleanor of Castile. The agency of Eleanor of Castile's tomb belongs to Edward I. Her tomb at Westminster Abbey was made to pair well with her father-in-law's tomb. Both tombs have Purbeck marble tomb boxes and gilt effigies. Although Edward was responsible for the construction of Henry III's tomb, there are signs that Henry III had left orders pertaining to his temporary resting place, his tomb, and the Confessor's Chapel.

---

<sup>148</sup> Margaret Condon, "God Save the King! Piety, Propaganda and the Perpetual Memorial," in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 60.

<sup>149</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 288.

Beginning In 1240, Henry III had undertaken major works in Westminster Abbey and the Confessor's Chapel.<sup>150</sup> In 1269, the relics of Edward the Confessor were moved to the shrine seen today, leaving behind the old stone coffin and the vault it was housed in.<sup>151</sup> This was used as a temporary resting place for Henry III between 1272 and 1290, when he was moved to the tomb seen today;<sup>152</sup> his gilt *gisant* was placed around the same time as Eleanor of Castile', by 1293.<sup>153</sup> The use of *gisants* was wholly Edward I's choice, in line with elite and episcopal fashion in both England and France.<sup>154</sup>

Eleanor of Castile was placed in the Confessor's old tomb from the time of her funeral in December 1290 until the completion of her own tomb in 1293. The Cosmati pavement ends neatly at the tombs of Eleanor and Henry III, indicating both tomb chests were in place by the time the floor was laid out.<sup>155</sup> Eleanor's tomb chest does not match the Cosmati work; it bears the coats of arms of Edward and both her parents. Henry III's tomb chest, while made of Purbeck marble, was decorated in the same Cosmati pavement as on the floor of the Confessor's Shrine. This would indicate that Henry made a request for his tomb to match the pavement and shrine of the Confessor. At some point after the entombment of Eleanor, the Cosmati pavement was finished. Tombs placed after this point either required the removal of the pavement or show obvious signs of the tomb overlapping the pavement.<sup>156</sup> By finishing the Cosmati pavement floor without laying out his tomb, Edward was either unconcerned with his burial being within the Confessor's Chapel, or he intended to be interred elsewhere.<sup>157</sup> Edward I's tomb and its agency has already been discussed.

<sup>150</sup> Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Historiarum*, ii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 95 (London: 1890), 248.

<sup>151</sup> *The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds, 1212-1301*, edited by Antonia Gransden (London: Nelson, 1964) 45.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid*, 95.

<sup>153</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 75-76.

<sup>154</sup> Binski, *Westminster Abbey*, 112.

<sup>155</sup> Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Historiarum*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 95 (London: 1890), 71; Sally Badham, "Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Westminster Abbey: The Origins of the Royal Mausoleum and its Cosmatesque Pavement," *The Antiquaries Journal*, 87 (September 2007), 209.

<sup>156</sup> Badham, "Edward the Confessor's Chapel," 212.

<sup>157</sup> To this point, English kings had no pattern of burial: Henry III at Westminster, John at Worcester, Richard I and Henry II at Fontevraud, Stephen at Faversham, Henry I at Reading, William II at Winchester, and William I

Under Edward I's supervision, the Confessor's Chapel and the immediate surrounding area were populated by Purbeck marble tomb boxes and metal *gisants*. However, from the construction of Edward II's tomb in the 1330s at Gloucester Abbey, there were no gilt *gisants* commissioned by the royal family. Alabaster was preferred. The reversion to Purbeck marble and gilt came at the indirect agency of Edward, the Black Prince.

The Black Prince died in 1376. In a will dictated shortly before his death, he requested a metal *gisant* in full armour and a heraldic tomb chest.<sup>158</sup> The Black Prince separated himself from his family's recent custom of alabaster *gisants* by choosing a different material, and he chose to represent himself in full armour rather than robes of state. However, while a *gisant* in full armour was popular among the nobility, the gilt metal was a feature that distinctly separated him from the elite, revealing his elevated position. The tombs of Sir Richard Pembridge at Hereford Cathedral<sup>159</sup> and Sir John de Sutton at St. James Church at Sutton-on-Hull<sup>160</sup> depict the deceased in knight's armour, but they are made of alabaster. The Black Prince was aware of his status among the elite and within the royal family: while above all noblemen, he would not die as king, thus shunning the robes of estate for the garb he wore on campaign.

The Black Prince's tomb was the likely model for his father's tomb; the former was complete by 1380, while the latter was still under construction in 1386 but certainly completed by 1395, when Richard II modelled his own tomb box after his grandfather's.<sup>161</sup> The Black Prince's *gisant* and Edward III's *gisant*, like the others at Westminster Abbey, showed no signs of any final, wasting illness. While alabaster allowed for more careful, truer-to-life detail, the casting process produced idealized images; Eleanor of Castile was 48 when she died, yet her *gisant* is as youthful as that of Anne of Bohemia, who died at 28. As such, Edward III's *gisant*

---

at Caen. However, given how many people Edward I had buried in Westminster Abbey, Edward II would have been hard-pressed to think of another location.

<sup>158</sup> *A Collection of Wills*, 67.

<sup>159</sup> Gardner, *Alabaster Tombs*, 92.

<sup>160</sup> "Photos: a portrait in stone," *St. James' Church at Sutton on Hull*, website, last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://suttonstjames.org/onewebmedia/rh-sutton-tomb.jpg>.

<sup>161</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 141; 148.

served as the visual prompt for how the king was to be remembered, not as he actually was in his last days. This was likely the agenda of Richard II, establishing continuity between his father at Canterbury and his grandfather at Westminster.<sup>162</sup> Later, he would join this tradition with his own gilt *gisant* and Purbeck marble tomb box, shared by his queen.<sup>163</sup>

Although the Black Prince's tomb was completed first and served as a visual guide, the inspiration for its design may have come from Edward III. As pointed out previously in this chapter, private conversations and verbal requests were expressions of agency that left little to no evidence. It is likely that throughout the last ten years of his reign, Edward III had conversations with his children as to what he desired in a tomb. The Black Prince may have taken some ideas from his father and incorporated them into his will. The Black Prince, though ailing for years, simply had the misfortune of dying first; had Edward III succumbed sooner, we may be discussing the influence of Edward III on the Black Prince's tomb rather than vice versa. As such, delineating the agencies of Edward III, the Black Prince, and Richard II in the construction of the tombs at Canterbury and Westminster Abbey is difficult.

Joan of Navarre is often recognized as the patron of her Canterbury Cathedral tomb *gisant* and that of her husband, Henry IV, both made of alabaster.<sup>164</sup> As pointed out by Ormrod, queens were limited in their agency by the fact that their money came from the king. He would have to approve any tomb design, any great foundation, and any funeral preparations that the queen wanted.<sup>165</sup> This was the case for Isabella of France, Edward III's mother, and Philippa of Hainault, Edward III's wife. Henry V likely approved of the tomb design at some point, but no financial evidence exists for his support. Joan had been dowered 10,000 marks per year by Henry IV. Despite difficulties in gaining control of all the lands, she still managed

---

<sup>162</sup> Ormrod, *Edward III*, 582-583; Lindley, "Absolutism and Regal Image in Ricardian Sculpture," 65.

<sup>163</sup> Lindley, "Absolutism and Regal Image in Ricardian Sculpture," 65, 68-69.

<sup>164</sup> Christopher Wilson, "The Medieval Monuments," in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, edited by Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, and Margaret Sparks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 500.

<sup>165</sup> Ormrod, "Queenship, Death, and Agency," 94.

to maintain a high level of conspicuous consumption until her last years, wherein she lived on 500 marks per year.<sup>166</sup> Even with the challenges after Henry IV's death, Joan was still likely capable of erecting the joint tomb in Canterbury Cathedral.

There are indications that Stephen Lote, one of the masons that worked on Richard II's tomb and possibly Henry V's, also had a hand in the tomb box prior to his death in 1417.<sup>167</sup> One or both of the *gisants* may not have been added until later, closer to the death of Joan in 1437. Henry V had died in 1422, and he consistently favoured gilt *gisants* over alabaster. Henry V had installed a gilt *gisant* over his mother Mary's tomb at St. Mary's Leicester, and his tomb would later be decorated with one at Westminster Abbey.<sup>168</sup> The abovementioned gilt *gisant* of the Black Prince at Canterbury Cathedral would have been an additional influence, if the royal house were dictating the appearance of the tomb. The presence of alabaster instead of gilt furthers the argument for Joan. Whether alabaster chosen for thrift<sup>169</sup> or for personal reasons<sup>170</sup> is uncertain, but there are no financial records from the reign of Henry V or Henry VI to indicate any financial contribution to the shared tomb of Henry IV and Joan of Navarre. Joan herself remains the likely supervisor of this project.

Two alabaster tombs, the material chosen for thrift, have been debated as to their existences and appearances: Henry VI and Richard III. Mark Duffy suspects that an illustration in BL Additional MS 6298 depicts Henry VII's plans for Henry VI's new tomb at Westminster, drawn from now-lost plans in 1563, but this is a troublesome interpretation.<sup>171</sup> By 1563, Elizabeth I's "middle path" had taken hold in England, and the cause to move Holy King

<sup>166</sup> Michael Jones, "Joan (1368–1437)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/14824.

<sup>167</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 204.

<sup>168</sup> Wilson, "The Medieval Monuments," 500; *Issues of the Exchequer*, 321.

<sup>169</sup> This may have reflected Joan's reduced financial estates in later years.

<sup>170</sup> Joan's first husband John IV duke of Brittany also had an alabaster tomb erected for him by Joan in 1409; Michael Jones, "Montfort, John de, duke of Brittany and earl of Richmond (d. 1399)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/53088. Henry IV's parents also had alabaster *gisants*; see above, 237, n. 125.

<sup>171</sup> Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 245.

Henry had died out, though his cult continued to flourish.<sup>172</sup> Rather, as indicated by C.R. Beard<sup>173</sup> and Philip Lindley,<sup>174</sup> this was likely a rendering of the tomb that actually stood in Windsor, as erected by Richard III.<sup>175</sup> The tomb stood *in situ* until the end of the reign of Elizabeth; based upon documentation of various tourists that went to Windsor during this period, it was disassembled sometime after 1598 but before 1611. BL Additional MS 6298, f. 148, depicts a tomb box with a *gisant*, all made of alabaster. The king is bearded and surrounded by various symbols of monarchy, such as his various coats of arms, lions at his feet, angels about his head, and a crown on his head. Henry VI's tomb was extensively decorated with achievements, despite Henry VI not being a military leader. As indicated in Chapter IV, this was recognition of Henry's station in life, rather than his function.<sup>176</sup> By representing Henry VI as a king of England, the Yorkist king Richard III had attempted to reconcile with remaining Lancastrian partisans, as well as to draw attention away from the spectre of Holy King Henry; it was better to have Henry as a dead political rival than as a martyr at the hands of Edward IV.

More elusive is the original alabaster tomb of Richard III. Henry VII elected to pay James Keyley £10 1s for a "tombe" for Richard c. 1497.<sup>177</sup> However, another earlier account from 1495 indicates that Henry had paid £50 toward Richard's tomb; what Henry ultimately meant to build for Richard is unknown.<sup>178</sup> Possibly, it was originally meant to be a larger monument that never came to fruition and instead was a low-cost marker. John Ashdown-Hill

---

<sup>172</sup> For the survival of the cult of Henry VI, see Brian Spencer, "King Henry of Windsor and the London Pilgrim," in *Collectanea Londiniensia: Studies presented to Ralph Merrifield*, edited by Joanna Bird, Hugh Chapman, and John Clark (London: London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, 1978), 235-264.

<sup>173</sup> C.R. Beard, "The Tomb and Achievements of King Henry VI at Windsor," in *Fragmenta Armamentaria, Volume II, Part I*, edited by Francis Henry Cripps Day (Frome: Butler and Tanner, 1936), 17.

<sup>174</sup> Phillip Lindley, "The singular mediacions and praiers of the holie companie of Heven': Sculptural Functions and Forms in Henry VII's Chapel," in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown, and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 266.

<sup>175</sup> For a discussion of this, see Chapter VII, 277-279.

<sup>176</sup> See Chapter IV, 155.

<sup>177</sup> BL Additional MS 7099, f. 30r and f. 129r, dated to c. 1495-1497.

<sup>178</sup> David Baldwin, "King Richard's Grave in Leicester," *Transactions of the Leicester Archaeological and History Society*, 60 (1986), 21-22. Baldwin refers to TNA C 1/206/69, dated eighteen months prior.



has pointed out that Cecily Neville utilized Sir Thomas Lovell and Sir Richard Bray, the recipients of the £50, to construct her own tomb at Fotheringhay.<sup>179</sup> She ultimately spent 100 marks, or about £66, on her tomb with an alabaster effigy. If both sums in Henry VII's account books were for the same tomb, this would suggest that Richard did not receive a simple slab tomb, which would have cost far less, but rather, a tomb that, like his mother's, indicated his status.<sup>180</sup> However, what Richard wore or appeared as on this tomb is completely unknown, as well as whether this tomb was ever constructed.

Agency could not be exerted from beyond the grave. After death, the king was at the mercy of those who came after him, particularly in the case of this tomb. However, rather than strictly assigning the physical commemoration to one person or set of persons, it must be considered that all tombs were a collaborative effort of three parties: the deceased, the living family, and the caretakers of the church in which the body was interred. By beginning construction the tomb prior to death, the deceased ensured at least part of his requests would be fulfilled. Some of the deceased's requests were passed on to the living, but it is difficult to delineate agency. Most responsibility for tombs constructed after a king's death fell to the successor king, but in the case of Henry IV, the well-heeled surviving widow was able to exert full power. In the cases of John and Edward II, no one from the family immediately appeared to erect a monument, the delay being so long that the churches took the duty upon themselves. Though this was likely for institutional gain, the action underlined the expectation of physical commemoration of some sort, regardless of the reputation of the deceased.

---

<sup>179</sup> John Ashdown-Hill, *The Last Days of Richard III and the Fate of His DNA* (Stroud: The History Press, 2013), 98-99.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.

### *Conclusions*

Although there were no prescribed rules for the commemoration of kings, there were certainly external expectations. Caring for the living, having concern for one's soul, and erecting a tomb were all expected behaviours for men and women of status in medieval society, but the level at which these actions were performed stressed the differences between the merely noble and the royal. Commemorative activity must be placed on a spectrum rather than as right or wrong. The tomb of Edward I was no less appropriate than the tomb of Henry VII, nor the tomb of Henry III more than that of Richard III – whatever it was. The prayers for Edward II were considered no less effective than those said for Henry V. The care for the living provided by one king compared to another can be considered more or less generous, but it was still done in some form.

What was exceptional for high-status people was the money spent on such activity; indeed, as noted at the end of Chapter III, the secular activities at the funeral and burial of a king contravened no rules, but simply went to extremes through expenditure in order to express the station of the deceased. The king, being at the top of the social hierarchy, needed to outshine all others, resulting in increasing expenditure over the centuries. The same principle applies to commemorative activity, with even fewer constraints due to no prescriptive texts. What was performed was dictated by personal taste, contemporary fashion, and pressure from below on the social ladder.

The agency of commemorative activity can be difficult to determine. A combination of influences, rather than any single entity, was typically responsible for what ultimately materialized in commemorative activity. There have been debates concerning the agency of various tombs within the royal family, a prominent example being the tomb of Henry IV. However, as seen in the cases of John and Edward II, the power wielded by the burial church has been underestimated. Worcester and probably Gloucester took full charge of creating

monuments for the kings laid to rest within their walls. No penalty was ever assessed for the ecclesiastics overstepping their bounds or violating royal privilege concerning the care of royal corpses, because they had not committed any transgressions. This suggests that the ecclesiastical hierarchy at the burial church had significant control over what transpired within the building's walls, even when dealing with the funeral, burial, and commemoration of royalty. Indeed, at the end of the funeral ceremony, the living abandoned the dead to the care of the celebrating bishop.<sup>181</sup> While this surrender was mostly symbolic, as living kings still took care of their dead forebears and their affairs, it does suggest a transfer of power and oversight that has not been previously assessed.

The authority that dictated commemorative activity was broader than that of the funeral and burial. The funerary and burial activities were dictated by the prescriptive texts (which include the personal will of the king) and the Crown's interpretations thereof. These events were tempered by external factors, such as medical science and church procedure. Commemorative activity had no written authority, but there was a division of power. Its initiation could be triggered by the royal family, the deceased prior to his own death (again, through the royal will), and the church in which the body was buried; possession of the corpse or body part granted power. Thereafter, the carrying out of commemorative activity fell to the living, be it prayers or distribution of alms or the maintenance of a tomb. The funeral and burial were singular events, occurring only once. Commemoration's purpose was to continue to remember the deceased long after his death. The authority for the ceremonies was fixed, reserved to written word and the Crown. The authority for commemoration had to transfer repeatedly in order for the acts to be carried out over the centuries, as the preserved prescriptive words always outlived the mortals who celebrated mass. Because commemorative acts were controlled by humans, misinterpretations could occur; what was originally Eleanor of

---

<sup>181</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114; *A Collection of Ordinances*, 131.

Castile's anniversary eventually was understood by posterity as the anniversary of Edward I, used by Edward III to solicit divine help in military pursuits.

Still, even when performed erroneously, commemorative acts were seen as positive events that rendered little harm; the deceased were not present to complain about the error. The exception to this was the care for the living, such as monks who had not received their alms in exchange for prayers said for the souls of the dead. The living would vocally object to not receiving their payments, but it would hardly cause a crisis or nearly as much embarrassment as a disruption at the one, only funeral. Lapses in such payments frequently occurred, as recorded in the Exchequer records, and they were rectified easily. In contrast, errors in the funeral and burial ceremonies were remarked upon and recorded by posterity.

There were three kings whose initial exequies were deemed inadequate. The first two, Richard II and Henry VI, were reinterred within fifteen years of their deaths and granted new anniversaries. The third, Richard III, was the subject of a modern reburial after his bones were rediscovered in the paved over ruins of Greyfriars Leicester. These reburials were dramatic reassessments of prior regimes. The reburials of Richard II and Henry VI were done within the same general context of the age they died in; their contemporaries were dissatisfied. In contrast, Richard III's ceremonies were complicated by the passage of five centuries, the construction of a complicated public image for the deceased, and changes to the religious landscape of England. In the next chapter, these reburials will be assessed in comparison and in opposition to each other.

## Chapter VII: Reburial<sup>1</sup> and Translation

Reburial has been mentioned in the context of deviated ceremony, individualized commemoration, and the initial location of a king's burial site. As remarked in Chapter V, reburial was not a strictly monarchical phenomenon. Non-ruling family members, friends, enemies, and courtiers were also reburied.<sup>2</sup>

Inadequacies at an initial burial were key elements in triggering a reburial. The flaws of the funerary and burial ceremonies became part of commemoration, as opinions circulated via word of mouth, with some of these editorial comments reaching the chronicles of the period. The high-profile reburials of Richard II, Henry VI, and Richard III resulted from this process.

However, it would be shallow scholarship not to consider the less elaborate movements of bodies throughout the period 1216-1509. "Reburial" is simply the act of burying again. It has no qualifying details as to the initial ceremonies, nor to the events surrounding the reinterment. The term "reburial," in isolation, does not imply a full-scale anniversary event or a second funeral occurred. Reburying is an action done to a body that was previously buried and disinterred, with no suggestion of any special religious or political activities. By defining reburial as an act rather than a blanket term for the ceremonies surrounding the act, this creates a category of disinterment and reinterment that is strictly functional.

Two types of reburial appeared in the English royal house during the period 1216-1509. The first type of reburial manifested as a high-profile, elaborate public event with financial investment; the three abovementioned examples fall into this category, as would the reburial of Richard, duke of York, in 1476.<sup>3</sup> When the movement of a corpse was marked with ceremonies, the event demanded notice and intended to convey meaning. The second

---

<sup>1</sup> The author is aware of some debate as to the use of the term "reburial," particularly as it pertains to the ceremonies for Richard III in March 2015. Reburial and reinterment will be used interchangeably throughout this chapter. How the ceremonies affected Richard is debatable between Catholics and Protestants; this will be discussed on 282-285 of this chapter. Both sides concur that Richard III did not receive a second funeral.

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter V, 196-202.

<sup>3</sup> A full study of this event is Anne F. Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs with P.W. Hammond, *The Reburial of Richard Duke, of York, 21-30 July 1476* (London: Richard III Society, 1996).

type tended to be low-profile, private occasions that were done more for practicality than for publicity and ceremony. The deceased monarch was moved from one site to another within the same church. Throughout the history of Westminster Abbey, several non-regnant tombs have been moved in and out of the Confessor's Chapel with no public fanfare;<sup>4</sup> this second type of reinterment occurred more often than the first. Tomb openings by antiquarians also did not entail ceremonies; the body was dug up, examined, and then replaced, with perhaps a private blessing by the ecclesiastics in attendance.

A better term for the higher-profile reinterments of kings would be "translation." Translation is a term traditionally used to describe the removal of saintly relics from one site to another. While technically a reburial, a translation has greater ceremonial trappings. A formal translation is composed of processions, vigils, and masses to honour the saint and celebrate the privilege of receiving his relics. Similar ceremonies were enacted in the reception of a king's body after his death, or when he was moved from one burial site to another; the reburials of Richard II, Henry VI, and Richard III all share these elements.

Strong parallels have also been drawn between the translations of saints and the heart burial processions of French kings, but Murielle Gaude-Ferragu makes the point that unlike saints, French kings' power ceased at the interment. Any movement thereafter of a king's parts was subject to less pomp and ceremony, the celebrations decreasing each time. Meanwhile, a translation of a saint's parts demanded ostentation each time.<sup>5</sup> In the case of English monarchs, the translations were the opposite; while the first burial was not as grand, the second was meant to readjust the deceased's status to an appropriate level.

---

<sup>4</sup> Sally Badham, "Whose Body? Monuments Displaced from St. Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Westminster Abbey," *Journal of the British Archaeology Association*, 160 (2007), 135-152, principally covers movements prior to the deposition of Richard II.

<sup>5</sup> Murielle Gaude-Ferragu, "Le Coeur 'Couronné': Tombeaux et Funérailles de Coeur en France à la Fin du Moyen Age," *Micrologus: Natura, Scienze e Società Medievali*, 11 (2003), 264.

This chapter aims to examine the reburials and translations of kings during the period 1216-1509. First, the known low-profile reburials will be placed into the context of their location, the reasons why the bodies had to be moved, and the evidence for ceremonies that may have occurred at this second interment. This will segue into the second section, which discusses the Beauchamp burial *ordo* in BL Harley MS 6466, recently discovered by Alexandra Buckle, and its significance to the present study and to elite reburial broadly. The Beauchamp *ordo* is the order of ceremonies for the reburial of Richard Beauchamp, thirteenth earl of Warwick, c. 1475. Beauchamp had died in 1439, and in his will, he had ordered the creation of a chapel at St. Mary's Warwick. This was not completed for over three decades, but ultimately, Warwick was interred at St. Mary's and now rests beneath a bronze *gisant* atop a stone tomb box.

Having discussed reburial in general, there will be a section dedicated to each individual king that experienced a particularly elaborate translation and reburial: Richard II, Henry VI, and Richard III. The translation of the three kings were effectively an editing device for the history of the monarchy, restoring the relationship between the sitting king and his predecessor's partisans. The living king and the dead one were bound together thereafter. However, the exact reasons for each man's reburial and how it was done (both religious and secular mechanics) were markedly different and deliberately conveyed nuanced messages regarding the deceased. Each translation also had a different outcome.

### ***The Necessity of Reburial***

As mentioned in Chapter I,<sup>6</sup> John was reburied 21 October 1232, sixteen years almost to the day after his death.<sup>7</sup> He was initially interred near St. Wulfstan in the Lady Chapel of Worcester Priory (now Cathedral), but in 1218, St. Wulfstan's relics were removed to a new

---

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter I, 33-34.

<sup>7</sup> "Annales Theokesberia," *Annales Monastici*, i, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1865), 84.

reliquary by the high altar.<sup>8</sup> This may explain Henry's willingness to move his father to the chancel with a more ornate tomb; the Lady Chapel's status in the church had decreased without St. Wulfstan, while the high altar's had increased.

R.C. Finucane coins the term "holy radioactivity" when describing the power of saints' relics; close proximity to them meant that the body (and soul) of the person was better protected from the elements, grave robbers and evil.<sup>9</sup> Much like actual radioactivity, closeness to the holy items transferred some residual holiness to them. As such, there was competition for people to be buried near to saints' relics, the tabernacle, the high altar, and other foci of holiness in a church.<sup>10</sup> John had made the choice to be buried close to the saint at his death in 1216; by moving him in 1232, Henry III remained obedient and observant of his father's wishes.

Little wonder, then, that Henry III was more than satisfied to have his body wait in the former coffin of Edward the Confessor until his own tomb was completed. In 1269, Edward the Confessor had been translated from his 1163 tomb to the current shrine in the Confessor's Chapel. At his death in 1272, Henry's body was initially interred in the now-empty saint's coffin. In 1290, he was moved into his own tomb. According to the chronicler at Bury St. Edmunds, this was performed on 11 May 1290 at night, suddenly and hastily, on the order of his son Edward I.<sup>11</sup> The Annals of London state that Henry was seen intact, with a long beard.<sup>12</sup>

No great ceremony was recorded for this event in 1290, nor for the movement of John in 1232. In fact, they are barely mentioned at all in contemporary chronicles. This implies a personal motivation for these events; if the reigning king was to gain any political mileage from

---

<sup>8</sup> *The Historical Collections of Walter of Coventry*, i, edited by William Stubbs. RS, 58 (London: 1871), 240.

<sup>9</sup> This is the concept of *ad sanctos*, addressed by Philippe Ariès in *The Hour of Our Death*, translated by Helen Weaver (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 33.

<sup>10</sup> R.C. Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1977), 26.

<sup>11</sup> *The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301*, edited by Antonia Gransden (London: Nelson, 1964), 94.

<sup>12</sup> "Annales Londomiensis," *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, i, edited by William Stubbs. RS, 76 (London: 1882), 98.



events, they would have to have had adequate attendance and publicity. As hypothesized above, Henry III may have moved his father to maintain the protection of St. Wulfstan; he is known to have placed the heart of his murdered nephew Henry of Almain, as well as the remains of his beloved daughter Katherine, at the Confessor's Shrine.<sup>13</sup>

Edward I's movement of Henry III is more ambiguous. Several historians have postulated that this act was Edward giving up on forming a saintly cult around Henry III, much like that which was quickly manifesting around the figure and remaining body parts of Louis IX (d. 1270).<sup>14</sup> The abovementioned reference to Henry's beard being intact may have been a small push for Henry's sanctity; saintly corpses did not rot.<sup>15</sup> D.A. Carpenter has pointed out that until 1287, a number of bishops had offered indulgences to anyone who came to Westminster Abbey to pray at the Confessor's Shrine, in the presence of any of its other relics (including the Virgin's Girdle), or at the tomb of Henry III.<sup>16</sup> Carpenter has also suggested that Edward I personally hoped to have his father canonized.

However, according to William Rishanger and later Thomas Walsingham, in 1281, a man met with Eleanor of Provence and claimed that his vision had been restored at Henry III's tomb in Westminster. Edward I responded to that fraudulent claim by having the man's eyes put out.<sup>17</sup> The eye story may have been created by chroniclers at St. Albans as an allegory for Edward I's own scepticism and reluctance to use his father's piety and devotion as a political tool. If Edward himself did not buy the story of his father's saintliness, he was not going to try to sell it, be it to the English people or to the pope in Rome. When Henry III's tomb was

---

<sup>13</sup> See Chapter V, 172.

<sup>14</sup> D.A. Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 423-424; D.M. Palliser, "Royal Mausolea in the Long Fourteenth Century (1272-1422)," in *Fourteenth Century England III*, edited by W.M. Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 6.

<sup>15</sup> See Chapter III, 73.

<sup>16</sup> Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III*, 424.

<sup>17</sup> William Rishanger, "Chronica et Annales," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ii, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1865), 98; Thomas Walsingham, "Historia Anglicana, pt. 1," *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, i, edited by H.T. Riley. RS, 28 (London: 1863), 21.

finally complete in 1290, it was simply time to put him in it. So it was done, with no public celebrations.

Two English queens are known to have also rested outside of their permanent tombs, albeit for far shorter durations than John or Henry III. Not long after Henry III was removed from the Confessor's tomb, the corpse of his daughter-in-law Eleanor of Castile was placed there temporarily.<sup>18</sup> Her death on 28 November 1290 seems to have been due to long term illness, but for her to die in Lincoln was unexpected.<sup>19</sup> It does not appear that Eleanor had made any plans regarding her final resting place. Her tomb was complete by spring 1293, with her body being moved at some point thereafter.<sup>20</sup> The near contemporaneous chronicles report that she was initially buried in the Confessor's tomb, while those writing later say she was laid at the feet of her father-in-law King Henry. Neither description is inaccurate, but the former is more specific to the years 1290-1293, while the latter better describes the present position of her William Torel tomb.<sup>21</sup>

When Henry VII wrote his will on 31 March 1509, mere weeks before his death, his predeceased consort Elizabeth of York (d. 1503) was not yet in their tomb vault.<sup>22</sup> Elizabeth had died due to complications of childbirth,<sup>23</sup> and again, it does not appear she had had any forethought to her own death. As discussed in Chapter VI, the Torrigiano tomb was not constructed until several years after Henry VII's death, but the bodies of Henry VII and

---

<sup>18</sup> Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Historiarum*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 95 (London: 1890), 71, specifically the section from Chetham MS 6712; "Annales Dunstaplia," *Annales Monastici*, iii, edited by H.R. Luard. RS, 36 (London: 1866), 362-363. The sections in these chronicles referring to Eleanor's interment are thought to have been written contemporaneously.

<sup>19</sup> John Carmi Parsons, "Eleanor (1241-1290)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/8619.

<sup>20</sup> Sally F. Badham, "Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Westminster Abbey: The Origins of the Royal Mausoleum and its Cosmatesque Pavement," *The Antiquaries Journal*, 87 (2007), 209-212.

<sup>21</sup> See n. 18 above for the contemporary works; later chronicles include the later copies of *Flores Historiarum* (MS Lambeth 1106); "Annales Londonienses," 99; and Robert Fabyan, *The New Chronicles of England and France*, edited by Henry Ellis (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1811), 393.

<sup>22</sup> *The Will of King Henry VII*, edited by Thomas Astle (London: T. Payne and B. Whit, 1775), 4.

<sup>23</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London*, edited by A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley (London: George W. Jones at the Sign of the Dolphin, 1938), 321; Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 688.

Elizabeth of York were not in the tomb box itself but rather in a vault underneath it.<sup>24</sup> If that vault had not been constructed within the last two weeks of Henry VII's death, it is possible that Henry VII was also reburied; the heralds distinctly state that he was laid to rest next to his wife, Elizabeth of York,<sup>25</sup> but it is not known whether the translation of her body to their permanent sepulchre had already occurred. Regardless of her husband, Elizabeth was certainly moved sometime after 31 March 1509 from wherever she was in Westminster Abbey.<sup>26</sup>

The chronicle and documentary sources clearly report the initial burial locations of Eleanor and Elizabeth. By the fact that they now lie elsewhere, reburials must have occurred. However, there are no references to their disinterments and reinterments, unlike John and Henry III. Eleanor and Elizabeth were not regnant queens, so it may be that post-funerary movements of their bodies were not as important to chroniclers; Eleanor of Castile's viscera and heart burials are well-documented, but the arrangements were made by the time her body's funeral took place.<sup>27</sup>

Because queenly reburial was not documented, the accompanying ceremonies also were not, a striking contrast to our kings, John and Henry III. For John, it was overtly stated that he received some sort of ceremony with high-ranking prelates and two of his children in attendance, not least of all King Henry. It can be inferred from two reports of Henry's movement that this reburial, while carried out at night, was not secret. As seen in Chapter IV, if there had been anything amiss with the ceremonies surrounding the reburials, it would have been reported;<sup>28</sup> while the timing may not have been optimal, there is no direct statement that Henry was put back in the ground with no words. Instead of signalling disapproval, the Bury

---

<sup>24</sup> See Chapter VI, 241-243. The front panel illustration of Arthur P. Stanley's *The Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, Third Edition (London: John Murray, 1869) depicts the vault's entrance beneath the tomb.

<sup>25</sup> Margaret Condon, "The Last Will of Henry VII: Document and Text," in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003) 114.

<sup>26</sup> Unlike the Confessor's old tomb, there was no known temporary holding place for a body in the Abbey in 1503, so it was likely that a place had to be made for her while the Lady Chapel itself was under construction.

<sup>27</sup> See Chapter V, 174, n. 27.

<sup>28</sup> See Chapter IV, 136-142.

St. Edmunds chronicler praised Edward I for moving his father to a higher position in the Confessor's Chapel.<sup>29</sup> These reburials were important on a personal level and not intended to be remarked upon at a public level. As such, the details of these special events were recorded limitedly.

These lesser reinterments – lesser in the sense of both publicity and political impact – were founded in necessity. The dangers of keeping a body outside of the grave have been discussed; if a tomb was years away from being completed, then alternative arrangements had to be made for the body. A funeral still had to be celebrated, regardless of the state of the grave. As such, when the body was moved to its “proper” resting place, mass was celebrated in memory of the person's soul at such occasions. The Roman, Westminster, Sarum, Dominican, and Benedictine Uses all have variations on the Requiem Mass for anniversaries, for bodies in the church graveyard, and other specialized circumstances.<sup>30</sup> It would be unlikely that the movement of a Christian body of high status did not have words said by the religious, nor that the religious could not find an appropriate mass or office to fit the situation. Recently, an *ordo* for an extensive reburial ceremony has surfaced, dating to the reburial of Richard Beauchamp in c. 1475.<sup>31</sup>

***BL Harley MS 6466, ff. 33r-34v***

BL Harley MS 6466 contains a seventeenth-century copy of a small, fifteenth-century manuscript for an order of ceremonies for a reburial. This includes the Office of the Dead

<sup>29</sup> *The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds*, 94.

<sup>30</sup> *Missale Romanum, Mediolani 1474*, i edited by Robert Lippe. Henry Bradshaw Society, 17 (London: 1899), 483-491; *Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, ii, edited by John Wickham Legg. Henry Bradshaw Society, 5 (Bury St. Edmunds: Boydell Press 1999), 1167-1175; *The Sarum Missal, edited from Three Early Manuscripts*, edited by John Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916), 431-446; *Missale Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Venice: Nicholai de Frankfordia, 1484), unpaginated 595-601; *The Bec Missal*, edited by Dom Anselm Hughes. Henry Bradshaw Society, 94 (Leighton Buzzard: 1963), 269-277.

<sup>31</sup> Alexandra Buckle, “‘Entumbid Right Princely’: the Re-Interment of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick and a Lost Rite,” in *The Yorkist Age: Proceedings of the 2011 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Hannes Kleineke and Christian Steer (London: Donnington, 2013), 402-403.

and the masses to be offered for the deceased, but most significantly, it contains special prayers for the reburial of a corpse. While the heading on the manuscript indicates that it was used for Beauchamp's reinterment, the *ordo* itself uses "N" to stand for the name of the deceased; this was not a specially created order of services for one man, but rather, it was meant to be used for anyone being reburied in the parish. In this case, it was St. Mary's, Warwick. In her discussion of the events described in BL Harley MS 6466,<sup>32</sup> Alexandra Buckle asks why a bishop would have to be involved with a reburial, the regular domain of a parish priest.<sup>33</sup> One theory would be that, much like escalating a customer service complaint, someone of high authority had to "redo" the previously unacceptable work. The alternative interpretation of this author is that because reburials were almost exclusively for those of station (due to costs), a bishop was required due to social expectations.

Even with the bishop's presence suggesting an elite service, how useful BL Harley MS 6466 is to the current study is debatable. The unique prayers justifying the body's disinterment and reinterment are undoubtedly significant for historians of religion and churches.<sup>34</sup> However, these prayers were performed after the end of Requiem Mass. In the royal prescriptive texts, the most, if not all, guests had left by this point, abandoning the body to the care of the bishop.<sup>35</sup> Even in the special case of a reburial, it is uncertain whether the guests would stay, as the remains were re-entrusted to the bishop at the end of the Requiem Mass. The graveside prayers at the initial funeral were said and heard by the bishops and priests, not by secular elite. It would logically follow that the same procedure would apply at the reburial: the secular elite

---

<sup>32</sup> Buckle, "Entumbid Right Princely," 409-413; the timeline offered in Table 2, 412-413, is the far more likely one, given the events of an initial funeral for a person of high estate; see Chapter III, 70-117.

<sup>33</sup> Buckle, "Entumbid Right Princely," 408.

<sup>34</sup> BL Harley MS 6466, ff. 33r-34r. These prayers invoke two stories from the Old Testament. The first, Ezekiel 37:1-14, describes a dream of the prophet Ezekiel, wherein he was ordered to preach to a valley of dry bones. Upon hearing God's word from him, the bones grew flesh and were reanimated as the lost people of Israel. The second prayer refers to the translation of Joseph. When Moses led the Hebrews out of Egypt, he took the bones of Joseph, son of Jacob, with him (Exodus 13:19), as Joseph had made his descendants swear to return his remains to the Promised Land (Genesis 50:25). The bones were ultimately buried by Joshua at Shechem (Joshua 24:32).

<sup>35</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 131; *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114.

would depart, leaving the remains in the care of the religious elite. As such, the most special elements of the Beauchamp *ordo* may have been irrelevant and unknown to the laity.

On the other hand, upon reading the narratives of the funeral of Edward IV, Elizabeth of York, and Henry VII, there is some evidence to suggest that not all of the secular lords left. In the French narrative, Edward IV's household officers cast their staves into the tomb vault once Edward IV's coffin was placed in there.<sup>36</sup> For Elizabeth of York, the ladies, including the chief mourner left, at the end of the Requiem Mass, leaving the men to perform the stave ritual.<sup>37</sup> Henry VII's funeral also had the stave ritual at the graveside.<sup>38</sup> All three narratives state that people did accompany body to the site of burial in the church. However, none of the narratives state that they stayed until the very end or heard the specialized prayers; Edward IV's narrative does inform the reader that the Our Father and Hail Mary were said for the deceased, but nothing further. As such, it is uncertain whether those involved in breaking staves stayed for the prayers or if they left after the secular ritual.

While Buckle theorizes there must have been other reburial rites such as the one in BL Harley MS 6466,<sup>39</sup> there is more evidence to suggest that the Beauchamp reburial *ordo* is a unique piece. Its liturgical contents do not stray far from the Office of the Dead and masses performed for the deceased on the day of the burial. All of the options for its psalms, collects, and other elements are present in contemporary breviaries, except for the burial prayers, as noted by Buckle herself;<sup>40</sup> what BL Harley MS 6466 represents is the documentation of a geographic area's particular liturgical choices when performing reburials. Derived from the Sarum missal, this service is specifically that of St. Mary's, Warwick. Although its formula was

---

<sup>36</sup> Anne F. Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs with R.A. Griffiths, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York at Windsor* (London: Richard III Society, 2005), 45.

<sup>37</sup> *Antiquarian Repertory*, iv, edited by Francis Grose and Thomas Astle (London: Edward Jeffrey, 1809), 662-663.

<sup>38</sup> BL Harley MS 3504, ff. 259v-260r (old ff. 271v-272r); John Leland, *Johannis Lelandi, Antiquarii, De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, iv, edited by Thomas Hearne (London: Benjamin White, 1774), 309.

<sup>39</sup> Buckle, "Entumbid Right Princely," 414.

<sup>40</sup> Buckle, "Entumbid Right Princely," 408.

meant to be universal (referring to the movement of both single and multiple persons),<sup>41</sup> the reburial procedure was recorded in connection to a particularly notable, elite reburial. Though it takes on a prescriptive guise, much like the variations of *De Exequiis Regalibus* written for the funeral of Edward IV,<sup>42</sup> one must allow for some narrative elements in BL Harley MS 6466 text to inform the reader particularly about Beauchamp's reburial and the choices made for it.

The existence of other reburial *ordines* may be considered doubtful. Reburial services would normally derive from other set services for the dead that happened far more often, such as the standard Office of the Dead, the funerary masses, and their variations for anniversaries. The exact readings, psalms, and collects were chosen by the bishop from the options presented in the Sarum breviary, possibly with consultation from the family. The *ordo* in BL Harley MS 6466 was uniquely recorded due to its use in the Beauchamp reburial.

What, then, happened at a royal reburial? Because the reburial event and its specialized prayers were isolated to after the Requiem mass, it may be assumed that the preceding events followed the pattern of an anniversary, which itself mimicked the events of the funeral. The body was brought in procession to the burial church, stopping along the way as needed. The day before, Vespers, Matins, and Lauds would operate using the variations permitted by the Office of the Dead. It is highly likely that the votive Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Holy Trinity were performed on the day of reinterment; the Requiem Mass was required. It is worthwhile to mention that several breviaries have anniversary variations for the body being present and not present.<sup>43</sup> This likely refers to whether or not the church celebrating the anniversary was the burial church, but it would not be a far stretch of the imagination to consider that these services could have been adapted.

---

<sup>41</sup> BL Harley MS 6466, f. 33r.

<sup>42</sup> See Chapter III, 80-82.

<sup>43</sup> See above, 260, n. 30.

The known liturgical activity of royal translations coordinates with breviary *ordines* for the initial funeral as well as for the yearly anniversaries. BL Harley MS 6466, save for its specialized prayers noted above, was adapted from the Sarum rite. The key difference at a reburial was the message conveyed at the burial itself: rather than the soul's journey, the focus was the journey of the bones and the justification for their removal from holy ground. It is uncertain as to whether anyone heard this message other than the ecclesiastics managing the reburial, as elite secular guests may well have departed before the body was completely replaced in holy ground. No extant medieval reburial narrative has conveyed this change in tone. What was more important to the lay audience, including the king sponsoring the reburial, appeared to be the continuing prayers for the soul of the deceased and the more fitting tomb site.

This brings us to the known elements of the translated kings Richard II, Henry VI, and Richard III. Although better documented than the low-profile reburials of the aforementioned kings and queens, there is surprisingly little narrative data for Richard II and Henry VI. Much of Richard II's reburial must be reconstructed from entries in the issue rolls of the Exchequer; it is here we learn of the moneys spent and the various accoutrements brought in for the occasion, but even with the help of chronicles, the exact date remains uncertain.

### ***The Case of Richard II***

The chronicles tend to list Richard II's reburial as one of Henry V's numerous acts of goodness. Walsingham put words into Henry V's mouth to the effect that he should "show as much veneration for Richard as he would to his very own father."<sup>44</sup> This was true as far as time, if not money. Time is actually the great unknown in Richard II's reburial; no precise date is offered by the chroniclers, contemporary or otherwise.

---

<sup>44</sup> Thomas Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica majora of Thomas Walsingham*, ii, edited and translated by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011), 635-637.



Universally, the chronicles state that the reburial of Richard II took place in the first year of Henry V's reign. Robert Fabyan offers the broadest date, stating that it was done after Easter, which was 23 April that year.<sup>45</sup> Entries in the issue roll of Henry V's first year reveal that Henry V co-opted the banners and other accoutrements of Henry IV's Trinity Sunday service to be reused at Richard II's reburial.<sup>46</sup> This places Richard II's reburial after 18 June 1413.

*A Chronicle of London, 1066-1483* states that Richard was reinterred after 20 November (St. Edmund's Day), on which day a convocation on heresy began. This ended on 4 December.<sup>47</sup> The convocation circulated the official account of the trial and sentencing of Lollard John Oldcastle and appears to have sought a strategy as to how to deal with heretics.<sup>48</sup> After this, Henry V was asked by the people to fetch the remains of Richard II to Westminster Abbey and celebrate his reburial.<sup>49</sup> Given the Exchequer records,<sup>50</sup> it is certain that this part was for show, as the wheels had been turning for the reburial since the prior month.

*A Chronicle of London, 1066-1483* gives the most specific time of year for the reburial. The chronicle was compiled in the fifteenth century, and the published version utilizes two manuscripts: the earlier BL Harley MS 565 and the later BL Cotton MS Julius B I. The chronology of events is based on the regnal year, rather than the Exchequer year. In the notes, the editor states that in the BL Cotton MS Julius B I version, Richard II's reburial is the only event of 1 Henry V.<sup>51</sup> Everything touching the Oldcastle revolt is in 2 Henry V. BL Harley MS 565's text is suggested to be closer to the version published, wherein the events of Richard II's

---

<sup>45</sup> Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 577.

<sup>46</sup> TNA E 403/614, m. 5, dated 8 November. A similar request appears on m. 7, dated 1 December, published in *Issues of the Exchequer*, 327.

<sup>47</sup> *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483; Written in the Fifteenth Century and for the first time printed from MSS in the British Museum to which are added Numerous Contemporary Illustrations*, edited by Nicholas Harris (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1827), 96.

<sup>48</sup> Ian Forrest, *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 86.

<sup>49</sup> *A Chronicle of London*, 96.

<sup>50</sup> See above, n. 46.

<sup>51</sup> *A Chronicle of London*, 157, note DD.

reburial are intermixed with the adventures of Oldcastle. This makes for some abrupt reading, as the reburial seems out of place and almost shoe-horned into the chronicle text.

Having an ecclesiastical convocation around the time of Richard II's reburial was highly convenient; the *Liber Regie Capelle* states that multiple bishops were expected to attend royal exequies.<sup>52</sup> Additionally, in December, Henry V hosted a French embassy at Westminster. *A Chronicle of London* places the official arrival of the French ambassadors in London on 19 December,<sup>53</sup> but the ambassadors had arrived in England by 6 December.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, these were funeral guests fit for a king.<sup>55</sup>

Henry V ordered the friars of King's Langley to disinter Richard II and have him brought to Westminster Abbey.<sup>56</sup> Henry V paid the expenses of several lords and officers for traveling to King's Langley and back to Westminster over the course of four days in December for the movement of the corpse of Richard II.<sup>57</sup> If the call for reburial had been heeded on 4 December and Henry set his plans in motion that day, then Richard would have been reinterred no sooner than 8 December 1413. Before the lords could return from King's Langley, the obvious thing that had to happen was Richard II's disinterment. King's Langley lies about thirty miles outside of London. The ride to Langley would have taken the better part

---

<sup>52</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 113.

<sup>53</sup> *A Chronicle of London*, 97.

<sup>54</sup> J.H. Wylie, *The Reign of Henry V*, i (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 155-156. Wylie dates their arrival based on an entry in *Foedera* (the Hague), iv, pt. 2, 99, which states that £1634 11d were paid for the expenses of the Archbishop of Bourges (Boisratier), the Duke of Brittany and others, from 6 December until 13 February. The Duke was negotiating in his own right, but the expenses of the Armagnac embassy and the Brittany embassy were lumped together due to their close dates of arrival.

<sup>55</sup> Jonathan Sumption, *Cursed Kings: The Hundred Years War IV* (London: Faber and Faber, 2015), 373-374, offers some biographical detail on the key participants. Sumption does not mention Richard II's reburial in this context, but he does emphasize the potential impact that the Oldcastle situation had on French perceptions of Henry V. The assassination attempt at Eltham on Twelfth Night and the Oldcastle Revolt on 9-10 January did not instill confidence.

<sup>56</sup> *The Brut or The Chronicles of England*, ii, edited by Friedrich W. D. Brie. Early English Text Society, 136 (London: 1908), 373; Ralph Higden, *Polychronicon*, viii, edited by J.R. Lumby. RS, 41 (London: 1882), 548. The latter parts of these chronicles were likely compiled by the same person, possibly Caxton, though not written by him. They seem to draw on the same original source, though *Brut* has more detail. For a discussion of this, see Lister M. Matheson, "Printer and Scribe: Caxton, the Polychronicon, and the Brut," *Speculum*, 60, no. 3 (July 1985), 593-614.

<sup>57</sup> *Foedera* (The Hague), iv, pt. 2, 99. This entry is in 1414, but the other entries surrounding it refer to the expenses of the previous year as well.

of an entire day; indeed, after Richard II's initial exequies had been celebrated in London in 1400, the cortege did not arrive in Langley until "the dead of night" the same day.<sup>58</sup> This resulted in the disgruntled Walsingham reporting that at the last, minute, Henry IV sent for the abbot of St. Albans to assist with the funeral at King's Langley the morning after.

It is questionable whether the lords could have ridden out to King's Langley, given the monks Henry's orders to disinter Richard, prepare the body for the ride back, and then arrive back in London within four days. Additional torches were sent to St. Albans as part of the procession; the time to detour to St. Albans really would have made the four days tight on time.<sup>59</sup> All of the decorations from Henry IV's ceremonies were sent only to Westminster to decorate Richard II's herse; since no other hurses were made, Richard II's body did not stop anywhere on the route from King's Langley, through St. Albans, and to Westminster.<sup>60</sup> In order for this all to happen within four days, the body had to have been already prepared. It would have laid in state at King's Langley, and merely had to be retrieved.

The preparation for the corpse's transportation made it entirely possible for the French embassy to attend, even if they had not yet appeared in their official capacity. The sequence of events conveyed in *A Chronicle of London* suggest that Richard was reinterred before their official arrival at court. It can cautiously be concluded, assuming the timing in each source is accurate, that Richard was placed in his tomb at Westminster Abbey sometime between 8 December and 19 December.

The appearance of the reburial was praise-worthy. The remains were transported in a funeral chare covered in black velvet and drawn by horses in black trappings. The chare was surrounded by banners and arms in procession.<sup>61</sup> Henry V also ordered that torches burn

---

<sup>58</sup> Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle*, ii, 299.

<sup>59</sup> TNA E 403/614, m. 7. Also in *Issues of the Exchequer*, 327.

<sup>60</sup> TNA E 403/614, m. 7. Also in *Issues of the Exchequer*, 328.

<sup>61</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 373.

between Langley and Westminster.<sup>62</sup> Upon his arrival in London, Richard had an Office of the Dead, followed by a Mass of Requiem the day of his reinterment.<sup>63</sup> No contemporary complaints regarding this reburial have survived. Visually, it fit the dignity of a king, thanks in part to Henry IV's own ceremonies earlier that year. Ecclesiastically, there were more than sufficient bishops to conduct masses as directed in *Liber Regie Capelle*. Although this is not overtly stated in the records, it is also plausible that votive were celebrated, as they traditionally were at a royal funeral.

Additional votive activity was set up for Richard II on this occasion. Later variations of the *Brut* (BL Additional MS 10099) and *Polychronion* (BL Harley MS 2261) note that Henry installed a new anniversary for Richard at Westminster at the encouragement of Pope Gregory XII.<sup>64</sup> Four tapers were to burn perpetually around Richard's body, and there was to be a weekly obit for Richard, containing the Office of the Dead (which included nine-lesson Matins), a mass of Requiem, and 11s 8d to be distributed to the poor. At the one-year mark, the anniversary was to be held with full honours, and £20 were to be distributed to poor people. Each monk was to have 20s.<sup>65</sup> The *Brut* passage states that Henry IV contracted leprosy due, in part, to not celebrating Richard's anniversary adequately.<sup>66</sup>

Given the arrangement of secular and ecclesiastical elites, Henry V must be accorded some measure of political acumen and good planning. His reburial of Richard II effectively garnered good favour across the social and political spectrum, and on national and international fronts.<sup>67</sup> This was a bloodless coup for his public image. Tudor writer Edward Hall went as far to give Henry V credit for erecting Richard II and Anne a new tomb, which is

---

<sup>62</sup> This is supported by an order for 120 torches to burn around Richard en route from Langley to Westminster. TNA E 403/614, m. 7; *Issues of the Exchequer*, 327.

<sup>63</sup> *A Chronicle of London*, 96.

<sup>64</sup> *The Brut*, Part ii, 494, taken from BL Additional MS 10099, f. 180.

<sup>65</sup> Fabyan, *The New Chronicles*, 577, also reports this, but given the late date of his work, he likely derived this either from the *Brut* or *Polychronicon*.

<sup>66</sup> *The Brut*, ii, 495.

<sup>67</sup> However, this may have been complicated by the concurrent troubles with John Oldcastle; see above 266, n. 55.

patently false.<sup>68</sup> Paul Strohm states that Henry V had not only succeeded in elevating Richard's status and displaying his own piety, but he had also created continuity between Richard II and the Lancastrians.<sup>69</sup> Joel Burden does not go this far; rather, on a purely practical level, Henry was steadying a shaky political situation by putting Richard II in the tomb he had intended to be in from the start. The utilization of recycled decorations and a standing order for any leftover wax to be retrieved for Henry V's own use suggest that the ceremony was not as expensive and ostentatious as commentary would suggest.<sup>70</sup> Sumption states that Henry V's actions may have been prompted by personal good memories of Richard as well as an attempt at political reconciliation.<sup>71</sup> That all said, the critical component of positive public opinion came to Henry V, regardless of money spent or the message intended to be relayed.

Richard II's reburial was very successful, and Henry V's reputation profited, not least of all his piety. But, as pointed out by Strohm, this was not completely about Henry V's virtue.<sup>72</sup> It was about politics too, given the presence of powerful religious prelates and French ambassadors. There was also the persistent rumour that Richard II had survived and was living in exile in Scotland.<sup>73</sup> As long as the possibility survived, the Lancastrian grasp on the throne was troubled.

The reburial did not solve this problem, even if it did elevate Henry V's status. Rather than the personal rivalry between Richard II and his usurper Henry IV, this was a dynastic problem. The Southampton plot of 1415 involved either the installation of Edward, earl of

---

<sup>68</sup> Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle, containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods* (London: Printed for J. Johnson; et. al, 1809), 47.

<sup>69</sup> Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399-1422* (London: Yale University Press, 1998), 117.

<sup>70</sup> Joel Burden, "Rituals of Royalty: Prescription, Politics, and Practice in English Coronation and Royal Funeral Rituals c. 1327 to c. 1485" (doctoral thesis, University of York 1999), 159-162.

<sup>71</sup> Sumption, *Cursed Kings*, 368.

<sup>72</sup> Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 116; 119-121.

<sup>73</sup> For a full discussion of the rumour and its survival, see Peter McNiven, "Rebellion, Sediton, and the Legend of Richard II's Survival in the Reigns of Henry IV and Henry V," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 76 (1994), 93-117.

March on the throne or the restoration of Richard II, if he still lived.<sup>74</sup> Even Oldcastle the Lollard heretic invoked Richard II's survival to defend his actions against the Crown in 1417.<sup>75</sup> These items were not personal vendettas against Henry of Monmouth the person, but rather the Lancastrian line itself. This rumour would not run its course until the early 1420s, once Henry V had married and had prospects of fathering a legitimate heir.

Putting another monarch to rest was not a new manoeuvre in the political game. Edward I did it twice in the thirteenth century. In 1278, Edward and Eleanor of Castile had viewed the disinterment and reinterment of bones believed to be those of Arthur and Guinevere.<sup>76</sup> In 1283, it was claimed that the modifications made to Caernarfon Castle in Wales had disturbed the "body of a great prince, father of the noble emperor Constantine."<sup>77</sup> Both these figures had significant mythological connections to Welsh independence in the great Roman imperium.<sup>78</sup> It was hardly a coincidence that Edward happened to find these independent Welsh leaders and put them squarely under his heel, in earth, at Glastonbury and Caernarfon.<sup>79</sup> They were not going to return to preserve Wales; Edward I of England had buried them. Likewise, Henry V reburied Richard II, so that he would not return from a supposed sojourn in Scotland. Perhaps the difference was that, at the time of the reburials, Edward I had at least one son and multiple daughters; the line was secure. These kings sought

---

<sup>74</sup> T.B. Pugh, "The Southampton Plot of 1415," in *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages: A Tribute to Charles Ross*, edited by Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherborne (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1986), 65.

<sup>75</sup> Walsingham, *The St. Albans Chronicle*, ii, 729; Sumption, *Cursed Kings*, 463-464.

<sup>76</sup> Adam of Domesday, *Historia de rebus gestis Glastoniensibus*, ii, edited by Thomas Hearne (Oxford: Sheldon Theatre, 1727), 588-589.

<sup>77</sup> Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Historiarum*, iii, 59.

<sup>78</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth attempted to genetically connect these two figures. Early Welsh folklore (and Matthew Paris) conflated Constantius, father of Constantine the Great, with Magnus Maximus, the great prince found at Caernarfon, who was the father of another emperor Constantine; see John J. Parry, "Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Paternity of Arthur," *Speculum*, 13, no. 3 (July 1938), 271-277.

<sup>79</sup> For a similar interpretation, see Maurice Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward, Volume II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947), 724. For an alternative reading, see Roger Sherman Loomis, "Edward I, Arthurian Enthusiast," *Speculum*, 28, no. 1 (January 1953), 114-127; Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 120.

connections with their predecessors, whether to show their respect or to prove that the icon of the opposition was a corpse.<sup>80</sup>

Of course, some types of corpses are more dangerous than others. This is the lesson seen in Richard III's reburial of Henry VI. Richard II was dangerous because he was still alive. Henry VI was dangerous precisely because he was dead. Henry VI (and the rest of the Lancastrian line) had been described as a "king by fact, not by law" by Richard III's brother, Edward IV.<sup>81</sup> However, after Henry VI's death in the Tower of London in 1471, a saint's cult bloomed. Richard III was faced with either accepting Henry as a dead, legitimate king of England, or a martyr killed at the hands of his brother.

### *The Case of Henry VI*

The cult of Henry VI prior to his reburial must be considered independently of Henry VII's efforts at canonization after 1485. Previous scholarship has treated Richard III's reburial of Henry VI as a means of stamping out the cult. Outside the study of *miracula* and religious history, scholars tend to fixate on the two miracles cures of the King's Evil (scrofula) by invocation of Holy King Henry instead of taking the suffering child to King Richard, a challenge to the sitting monarch's legitimacy.<sup>82</sup> Pro-Ricardian historians have stated that Richard III had moved Henry VI "so that the lucrative cult of the dead king might bring its profits to the mausoleum of his 'conqueror,' Edward IV, and be thereby quietly 'domesticated' and controlled."<sup>83</sup>

This section argues that rather than destroying the cult and actively creating new enemies, Richard III reburied Henry VI in an attempt to redirect attention toward King Henry

---

<sup>80</sup> McNiven, "Rebellion, Sedition, and the Legend," 111, finds this viewpoint cynical, but this author finds it completely pragmatic.

<sup>81</sup> This is seen in *CChR, 1427-1516*, 139-167, the earliest charters in the reign of Edward IV.

<sup>82</sup> John McKenna "Piety and Propaganda: the Cult of King Henry VI" in *Chaucer and Middle English Studies, in Honour of Rossell Hope Robbins*, edited by Beryl Rowland (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974), 75.

<sup>83</sup> Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 4.

VI of England instead of Holy King Henry, martyr. A dead king was less dangerous than a saint. That said, it was also safer for Richard to not actively oppose the cult. Henry VI's initial burial, as discussed in Chapter IV, was conducted on the assertion he was never a legitimate king of England.<sup>84</sup> Edward IV had intended to prove Henry of Windsor was dead and shuffle him off to Chertsey to be forgotten. This backfired in spectacular fashion: Henry's badly embalmed body triggered either pity or devotion in those who witnessed the funeral. Rather than continue down the same path, which clearly was not working, Richard III took a different tact; whether it would have worked long-term is impossible to gauge.

Within a year of Henry VI's death, shrines popped up in honour of Holy King Henry at Ripon, Durham, and York.<sup>85</sup> The rood screen of York Minster generated some controversy, though the exact events pertaining to its creation are unsure. John McKenna suggests that Richard Andrew, the dean of York Minister (in office 1452-1477), had been Henry VI's secretary at one point and still held particularly strong Lancastrian loyalties. The Great Screen, erected by Andrew in the mid-1470s, begins with the Conqueror and ends with Henry VI, leaving no room for Edward IV or any of his Yorkist successors.<sup>86</sup> However, John H. Harvey has argued that the screen was original planned to have only fourteen kings, with Henry VI hastily tacked on due to his father's early death. As such, this would place the planning and initial construction of the screen well before the second reign of Edward IV beginning in 1471.<sup>87</sup> Either way, in 1479, Archbishop Lawrence Booth of York had to issue a scolding letter to those visiting the Minster, stating that offerings were not to be left at the Great Screen in front of the Henry VI statue, as this was an insult to King Edward.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> See Chapter IV, 145-146.

<sup>85</sup> McKenna, "Piety and Propaganda: The Cult of King Henry VI," 74.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> John H. Harvey, "Architectural History from 1291 to 1558," in *A History of York Minster*, edited by G.E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 182 with illustration on 187.

<sup>88</sup> *The Miracles of King Henry VI: Being an Account and Translation of 23 Miracles Taken From the Manuscript in the British Museum (Royal MS 13c. viii)*, edited by Ronald Knox and Shane Leslie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), 3.



On 12 July 1473, Edward IV issued a proclamation, stating that anyone going on pilgrimage needed to have letters of permission with an itinerary sealed with the great seal.<sup>89</sup> The letter was also directed at vagrants, wandering students, and slothful peons, but Brian Spencer believes the main cause for the letter may have been the Henry VI cult's meteoric rise and the flow of pilgrims to quaint Chertsey.<sup>90</sup> Antagonism was not limited to one geographic area near Chertsey, but rather across the kingdom as people made their way to the abbey.

John Blacman, Henry's sometime confessor, completed his hagiographic *Henry the Sixth* prior to the Battle of Bosworth, and probably before the translation to Windsor; how much circulation it had prior to Henry VII's canonization campaign is uncertain.<sup>91</sup> The most effective fuel for any saint's cult is miracles. BL Royal MS 13 C VIII contains a collection of miracles of Henry VI. There were four books in total in this Latin compilation. The first book does contain several miracles pre-dating the 1484 translation, but it is in the second book pilgrims show up *en masse* at Henry VI's new tomb at Windsor in order to give thanks for the miracles he had wrought, mostly during the prior two years.<sup>92</sup> These earliest miracles represent items potentially in oral circulation during the late reign of Edward IV and the reign of Richard III. Not every person who claimed a miracle from Henry VI was able to make the pilgrimage and report an act of intercession; these written examples are perhaps a small fraction of the stories being told about Holy King Henry.

The general format of the miracles proceeded as follows. The receiver detailed the burden they had been saddled with and the precise moment they called out for Henry's help. The ailment or problem was resolved shortly thereafter. Often, the date of onset and the date

---

<sup>89</sup> CCR, 1468-1476, 299.

<sup>90</sup> Brian Spencer, "King Henry of Windsor and the London Pilgrim," in *Collectanea Londiniensia: Studies presented to Ralph Merrifield*, edited by Joanna Bird, Hugh Chapman, and John Clark (London: London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, 1978), 240.

<sup>91</sup> John Blacman, *Henry the Sixth: a Reprint of John Blacman's Memoir with Translation and Notes*, edited by M.R. James (Cambridge: University Press, 1919).

<sup>92</sup> *Henrici VI Angliae Regis Miracula Postuma: Ex Codice Musei Britannici Regio 13 C VIII*, edited by Paul Grosjean (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1935), 39, 45.

of cure or relief was included in the description. The date of visitation to the tomb of Henry, be it at Chertsey or Windsor, was also included, and occasionally, the pilgrim offered an excuse as to why the visit to Henry's tomb was delayed.

The table in Appendix Ten is a condensation of Paul Grosjean's introduction to the *miracula* and the text of the miracles themselves.<sup>93</sup> This has been created in order to illustrate the strength and nature of the cult at the time of Richard III's movement of Henry VI to Chertsey. The table only refers to miracles that were reported at the tomb of Henry VI prior to the Battle of Bosworth. It is notable that only two miracles, those of Agnes Freeman and Margaret Tryll, deal with the King's Evil. Only Agnes' miracle directly states a preference for Henry over Richard for healing purposes, as Richard III was not a true king.<sup>94</sup> In Margaret's miracle story, no reference is made at all to Richard.<sup>95</sup> Thus, out of the twenty-four miracles reported at the tomb of Henry VI that were known to have been in circulation prior to Richard III's death at Bosworth in August 1485, only one contained a political challenge to Richard III. The cult was not volatile or critical of Richard III on the whole.

However, Edward IV's efforts at exterminating the cult were unsuccessful, and, if anything, had been counterproductive in reconciling with Lancastrian partisans. Despite Edward IV's use of the popular saint Archbishop Scrope in support of Yorkist claims to the throne,<sup>96</sup> he had not learned from Henry IV's mistakes concerning the Archbishop. Henry IV had received criticism for the Archbishop's hasty trial and death and for barring pilgrims from the tomb. Henry IV also attempted to stop veneration of Scrope at York Minster, to the point

---

<sup>93</sup> See Appendix Ten, 325.

<sup>94</sup> *Henrici VI Angliae Regis*, 122-123.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid*, 73.

<sup>96</sup> Peter McNiven, "Scrope, Richard (c.1350-1405)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/24964; J. McKenna, "Popular Canonization as Political Propaganda: The Cult of Archbishop Scrope," *Speculum*, 45, no. 4 (October 1970), 620-622.

of threatening pilgrims with death. He effectively created new enemies even among those that had not been enamoured with Richard II.<sup>97</sup>

The parallels between Henry IV and Edward IV in coping with opposing cults are obvious. Richard III could be cast into the role of Henry V, but this is not an easy fit. Henry V dealt with the respective partisans of secular King Richard the legitimate king and ecclesiastical St. Richard Scrope separately. Richard III had to deal with Holy King Henry; Richard II was never a saint, and Scrope was never a king, but Henry was considered to have been both.

The records of the translation of Henry VI from Chertsey to Windsor are minimal. W.H. St. John Hope found a single entry in the treasurer's account book for 1483-1484, stating that £5 10s 2d was paid on 12 August for the expenses of the translation.<sup>98</sup> What could this have bought Henry? The expenses for Richard II's chare and items needed to carry the coffin were a total of £4 in 1413.<sup>99</sup> Richard III as King or as a private person may have paid the majority of expenses for the translation and any accompanying ceremonies. Through the antiquarian opening of Henry VI's tomb in 1910, it is known that the bones were placed in a special lead coffin after they were already disarticulated.<sup>100</sup> This was an expense for which no documentation exists. Financial records, in this case, are inadequate for determining what transpired in the process of translating Henry VI from Chertsey to Windsor in 1484. The narratives must be relied upon.

The earliest response to the translation of Henry VI from Chertsey to Windsor was overwhelmingly enthusiastic. John Rous, though hypercritical of Richard III in the rest of his *Historia Regum Angliae*, was positively thrilled with the translation of Holy King Henry to

---

<sup>97</sup> McKenna, "Popular Canonization as Political Propaganda: The Cult of Archbishop Scrope," 611-612, 614. See also Christopher Norton, "Richard Scrope and York Minster," in *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr*, edited by P.J.P. Goldberg (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2007), 138-213, for the cult and its context in York Minster

<sup>98</sup> W.H. St. John Hope, *Windsor Castle: An Architectural History, Collected and Written by Command of Their Majesties Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V*, i (London: Country Life, 1913), 241.

<sup>99</sup> TNA E 403/614 m. 6; *Issues of the Exchequer*, 326.

<sup>100</sup> W.H. St. John Hope, "The Discovery of the Remains of King Henry VI in St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle," *Archaeologia*, 62, no. 2 (1911), 536.

Windsor. Henry VI had been conveyed to St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and honourably received. With greatest solemnity, he was reinterred to the south of the high altar. Rous also reported the odour of sanctity and that Henry, minus being thinner than Rous remembered, was incorrupt, with his hair and beard intact.<sup>101</sup> At face value, this was clearly a bid for favour with Henry VII, the sitting monarch, when *Historia Regum Anglie* was completed in 1486.<sup>102</sup> However, Rous did not take the opportunity to skewer Richard III, who would later be cast into the role of Henry VI's murderer. Given the decayed state of the bones in 1910, Rous's account is fictional, but his choice to be positive despite Richard's involvement suggests sincere satisfaction with the ceremonies that took place; the care with which the remains were handled suggest an honourable reburial.<sup>103</sup>

The Tudor chroniclers were neutral about the translation of Henry VI. Polydore Vergil remarked upon the distance of Chertsey from London. Then, Henry was translated to St. George's Chapel, "his chapel," and laid in a new tomb.<sup>104</sup> Edward Hall simply stated that soon after his initial interment, Henry VI was moved to a new vault at Windsor.<sup>105</sup> There is no mention of Henry's sainthood or Richard's involvement. This would be expected of Hall; he wrote after the Reformation during the reign of Henry VIII. Meanwhile, Vergil wrote during the reign of Henry VII and prior to the Reformation under Henry VIII. The failure to make mention of Holy King Henry and Henry VII's goals of canonizing him seems odd.

There are no accounts that lauded Richard III for his piety, in contrast to nearly every account of Henry V's reburial of Richard II. This can be attributed to a short reign and a hostile successor; had Richard III reigned longer, stories similar to those of Henry V may have

---

<sup>101</sup> John Rous, *Johannes Rossi, Antiquarii Warwicensis, Historia regum Angliae E. codice MS in Bibliotheca Bodlejana descripsit, notisque & indice*, edited by Thomas Hearne (Oxford: 1745), 217.

<sup>102</sup> Nicholas Orme, "Rous, John (c. 1420–1492)," *ODNB*, last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/24173.

<sup>103</sup> Bertram Wolffe, *Henry VI* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1981), 352.

<sup>104</sup> Polydore Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III*, edited by Sir Henry Ellis. Camden Society, Old Series, 24 (London: 1844), 156.

<sup>105</sup> *Hall's Chronicle*, 303.

been crafted instead. The lukewarm reception of the translation, save for Rous, and the loss of Henry VI's tomb in the early seventeenth century<sup>106</sup> may have led later scholars to suppose that Richard III had deliberately done a bad job, attempting to hide Henry VI.

Early twentieth-century proponents of Henry's canonization in the Catholic Church called Henry's burial site in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, "obscurer" than his resting place at Chertsey.<sup>107</sup> This was rebuked by C.R. Beard, whose response is worthy of a quote: "One might with as much reason speak of an obscure burial before the high altar of Westminster Abbey!"<sup>108</sup> The south side of the high altar was a distinguished place for a king. Edward IV was buried on the north side of the high altar, an equally prestigious spot. Henry VI, like Edward IV, had been king. If Richard III had wanted to encourage the cult, he would have buried Henry VI further east, just as the relics of Thomas Becket at Canterbury and Edward the Confessor at Westminster Abbey lay eastward of the high altar.

Unlike Worcester for King John or Gloucester for Edward II, St. George's could not have built a saint's shrine or a tomb for Henry VI, even if its dean and canons desired this. St. George's Chapel was (and is) a royal peculiar, governed by the monarch. Richard III was purposefully promoting Henry as a king, not as a saint. The tomb Richard erected at Windsor for Henry VI depicted him as a king, with full military achievements hoisted above his sepulchre.<sup>109</sup> To refute the suggestion that Henry VI's cult was excessively profitable, there are no signs of significant income or expenditure at St. George's after the construction of Edward IV's tomb until Henry VII took interest in the chapel in the mid-1490s.<sup>110</sup> As such, it is highly

---

<sup>106</sup> See Chapter VI, 247-248.

<sup>107</sup> *The Miracles of King Henry VI*, 2.

<sup>108</sup> C.R. Beard, "The Tomb and Achievements of King Henry VI at Windsor," in *Fragmenta Armamentaria, Volume II, Part I*, edited by Francis Henry Cripps Day (Frome: Butler and Tanner, 1936), 20.

<sup>109</sup> BL Additional MS 6298, f. 148.

<sup>110</sup> W.H. St. John Hope, *Windsor Castle: An Architectural History, Collected and Written by Command of Their Majesties Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V*, ii (London: Country Life 1913), 383-385; Tim Tatton-Brown, "The Constructional Sequence and Topography of the Chapel and College Buildings at St. George's," in *St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages*, edited by Colin Richmond and Eileen Scarff (Leeds: Maney Publishing 2001), 15-16.

likely that Richard III paid for the white alabaster tomb box and *gisant* personally. Pilgrims did make offerings, but evidence for how much has not survived.

The traditionally accepted date of Henry VI's translation as 12 August 1484 is solely based on the sum cited by Hope pertaining to Henry's translation. Looking at Richard III's itinerary during August, the king was in Westminster for the first eighteen days of the month before moving to Windsor on 19 August.<sup>111</sup> Thereafter, by 26 August, Richard III had gone to Nottingham. If one believes that Richard III was involved with the disinterment at Chertsey or the transport to Windsor, then Windsor may have paid in advance of receiving the body, sometime between 19 August and 25 August. As seen in the case of Richard II, paying ahead was not unheard of, particularly if there was extensive choreography to play out. The 12 August date remains possible, however, if the stoppage and influx of pilgrims are considered.

There is a two-and-a-half week gap between the accepted translation date of 12 August 1484 and the first *miracula* reported at St. George's Chapel; it is worthwhile to speculate that pilgrims were only given access once Richard III's visual statement was completely constructed. Something was clearly there for the pilgrims to venerate. Perhaps Richard III hoped its appearance, over time, would have the desired effect of perpetuating the memory of King Henry rather than Holy Henry. There are no financial records extant to indicate that Henry VII erected the tomb.<sup>112</sup> Based upon the rate of miracles reported at Windsor in BL Royal MS 13 C VIII and the resulting constant presence of pilgrims, one is hard-pressed to find another time when a monument would have been erected prior to 1500, by which time Henry VII had already decided to go to Westminster Abbey and take Henry VI with him. As such, Henry VI

---

<sup>111</sup> Rhoda Edwards, *The Itinerary of King Richard III, 1483-1485* (London: Alan Sutton for the Richard III Society, 1983), 23.

<sup>112</sup> BL Additional MS 7099, a manuscript of extracts of the Privy Purse from 1491-1505, shows regular payments sent to Windsor for the upkeep of Henry VI's anniversary and obits, but not for his tomb. Considering one entry mentions Richard III's tomb and at least three address Henry VII's own tomb at Westminster, if Henry VII had built a tomb for Henry VI, some mention of its construction ]would be expected to be here. BL Additional MS 7099 is partially transcribed in *Exerpta Historica, or Illustrations of English History*, edited by S. Bentley (London: Samuel Bentley, 1831), 85-133.

may have been moved on 12 August, and Richard III came to Windsor sometime during 19-25 August to check on the status and appearance of the monument erected and possibly pay his respects to his predecessor.

Richard III did not legislate anything regarding the pilgrims, but he did not repeal his brother's 1473 restrictions on them. Neither did Henry VII, for in 1500 or 1501, Thomas Clerk of Nottingham was arrested on suspicion of being a vagrant in New Windsor. He claimed that he was a pilgrim to the tomb of Henry VI, albeit without the proper paperwork. His case was forwarded to the King's Bench for review.<sup>113</sup>

The types of stories that ultimately circulated around Good King Henry V and the reburial of Richard II took some years to mature, which was aided by the succession and nominally long reign of his son. Richard III lacked these components, and Henry VII's efforts at removing Henry VI to Westminster soon overshadowed whatever had transpired in 1484. The difficulty in assessing Henry VI's reburial lies in the short duration of Richard III's reign and the destruction of records pertaining to his reign. Based upon the evidence above, Richard III was not vehemently opposed to the Holy King Henry cult. Rather, he actively promoted the restoration of Henry VI's identity as King of England so that it might negate the idea of Henry as a saint. Both actions intended to smooth the ruffled feathers of politically-minded partisans and faithful religious adherents. Edward IV, by his treatment of Lancastrians and later Henry VI's pilgrims, had created more enemies. The potential success or failure of Richard III's more reserved strategy will never be known.

Both Richard III and Henry V deliberately engaged in stagecraft in order to produce a reburial ceremony that would be politically beneficial, visually remarkable, and spiritually satisfying for the deceased as well as those that took part in the votive activity. For Richard III, the most obvious evidence of this was his choice in the appearance of Henry VI's tomb. The

---

<sup>113</sup> TNA C 1/238/36.

tomb depicted Henry VI as a legitimate king of England and stood in an esteemed location within St. George's Chapel near to Edward IV, Richard III's predecessor. Minimal anti-Ricardian or anti-Yorkist propaganda came out of the cult at Windsor prior to Richard's own death. The description supplied in Rous' *Historia Regum Angliae* suggests that the translation itself was well-done. The lack of complaints in Tudor sources support this, given the venom reserved for Richard in most other scenarios, including Henry VI's death.

While the long-term benefits of Richard III's 1484 efforts never came to fruition, Henry V's stage-acting and direction of the events in 1413 aided in creating the legendary image he now sports. The reburial was timed to include prestigious guests, all while anticipating the time needed to move the corpse in procession. The Office of the Dead and masses were celebrated, along with the installation of a new anniversary. The stage had been set at least a month in advance, and yet it all looked like a spontaneous gesture of good will and piety.

The reburial of Richard III in the twenty-first century may then be seen as a more honest procedure than its medieval counterparts. The politics were obvious and openly discussed throughout the proceedings. There was no suspension of disbelief required. The secular elements were adapted, as were the religious elements, due to the passage of 530 years. However, there seems to have been a gap in understanding the nature of the medieval royal funeral. In the frank discussion of politics and beliefs regarding Richard III, as well as a result of the changed religious landscape, the original goals of a medieval reburial may have become irrelevant.

### *The Case of Richard III*

The rediscovery and study of Richard III's bones belong to a different discussion. As to the "proper" location,<sup>114</sup> those nearest to Richard in life were scattered in death. Richard,

---

<sup>114</sup> This was the cause of a legal battle between the University of Leicester and the Plantagenet Alliance, an organization of Yorkist descendants, composed primarily of Richard III's sixteenth- and seventeenth-generation



duke of York, Richard III's father, was interred at the collegiate foundation at Fotheringhay,<sup>115</sup> where his widow Cecily would join him in 1495. Edward IV was buried at Windsor, per his will, in 1483.<sup>116</sup> In 1484, Richard III moved Henry VI from Chertsey to Windsor in a new lead coffin, reburying him in a prestigious location within the chapel, replete with an alabaster tomb. In 1485, Anne Neville, Richard III's wife, was buried south of the high altar at Westminster Abbey.<sup>117</sup> Because of Richard's early death, we have an incomplete picture of his burial agenda. Any plans were either undocumented or lost.

The limited involvement of the present royal family was a critical difference between this reburial and those of Richard II and Henry VI. The earlier reburials had been performed within living memory of the original funeral and burial, fifteen years or less, by a successor who sought an association with the deceased, whether through forming a positive relationship or proving the troublesome king was a corpse. In contrast, Queen Elizabeth II did not intervene once Richard III's identity had been confirmed. Channel 4 commentator Robert Hardman stated that Richard III was of limited concern to the royal family; he had been long dead and by blood there is little relation. However, Elizabeth II and other relatives engaged "on a pitch that they [thought was] appropriate."<sup>118</sup> Richard, duke of Gloucester, the patron of the Richard III Society, was an active participant in proceedings, accompanied by his wife. The Queen contributed an open letter in the reburial service programme and sent, as her representative, Sophie, countess of Wessex.

---

grand-nieces and grand-nephews. The former had chosen Leicester Cathedral, and the latter argued that they, as Richard's closest relatives, were not consulted and should have been. The Alliance argued for reinterment at York Minster. The case was found to be with merit 13 August 2013, CO Reference CO/5313/2013, <https://www.judiciary.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/JCO/Documents/Judgments/king-richard-iii-permission-judgment.pdf>. The Queen's Bench ultimately found in favour of the University of Leicester and its arrangements; Queen (Plantagenet Alliance) v. Secretary of State for Justice, University of Leicester, et. al. (2013), QB, Neutral Citation Number: [2014] EWHC 1662, <https://www.judiciary.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/richard-3rd-judgment-.pdf>.

<sup>115</sup> BL Additional MS 45131, ff. 23v-24r.

<sup>116</sup> For Edward IV's will, see *Exerpta Historica*, 366-367. For his funeral, see Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, *The Royal Funerals of the House of York*, 33-45.

<sup>117</sup> BL MS Harley 541, f. 217; Anne's location in Westminster Abbey is now marked by a plaque.

<sup>118</sup> *The Return of the King*, live television broadcast. Leicester, UK. Channel 4, 22 March 2015.

In place of the medieval royal house, the parties engaged with Richard III's reburial were those who had procured his discovery: the Richard III Society and the University of Leicester, in conjunction with Leicester Cathedral. The University of Leicester was the keeper of Richard's remains, as it had been the entity to apply for the exhumation license.<sup>119</sup> Although the Richard III Society had invested money and effort, their legal stance was non-existent in the official paperwork, resulting in tensions among the coordinating groups.<sup>120</sup> Such drama was played out in the public eye, but royal funerals in the past were not exempt from this. Over the intervening years, arguments or disagreements over exequies were likely allowed to fall to the wayside for the sake of presenting a normative, uneventful funeral. As such, what has survived to the present day is a glossed over, refined version of medieval events, save for when the unpredictable or uncontrollable occurred.<sup>121</sup>

Channel 4 had purchased the exclusive rights to broadcast the funeral during a two-day campaign, with a week's lead up of relevant programmes. This was a far faster way of transmitting accounts of the funeral to the general public than chronicles or even gossip circulating through the country. Through social media, forums, websites, blogs, and vlogs, everyone was able to form their opinion of how everything went. As such, attempting to assess the public opinion, particularly less than ten years after a given event, would be an overly laborious task. Unlike the reburials of Richard II and Henry VI, scholars have access to the recordings of the procession, Compline, and the reburial service. Rather than rely on opinion as to how well it went, adherence to the prescriptive texts can be used here. This is a more

---

<sup>119</sup> "Reinterment of King Richard III - Statement from the University of Leicester." *University of Leicester Press Office*, last accessed 6 May 2016, <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/press/for-journalists/richard-iii/statements/reinterment-of-king-richard-iii-statement-from-the-university-of-leicester>.

<sup>120</sup> This is seen throughout the broadcasts of 22 and 26 March. An example that encapsulated the problem was the debate as to where Richard III's remains should lie prior to interment. Peter Warzynski, "Richard III: New Row Over Interim Resting Place for King Found Under Leicester Car Park," *Leicester Mercury*, 21 January 2014, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/New-row-interim-resting-place-king/story-20471638-detail/story.html>.

<sup>121</sup> See Chapter IV, 118-167.

objective tact, but as shown in Chapter III and IV, the texts were deliberately elastic; the final assessment cannot be merciless.

The reburial events began with a procession from the University of Leicester to Bosworth Field to Leicester Cathedral. The nature of transport changed multiple times throughout, including the caisson being drawn by army cadets and driven in a modern funeral hearse automobile. However, once it entered the city of Leicester, the procession attempted to take on a medieval guise. Two horses with riders in modern official dress led two riders in full armour. The bier itself was a gun carriage drawn by four horses. The bier was then followed by another two horses, riders in modern dress, for a total of ten horses. Based upon *Liber Regie Capelle*, Richard had more than sufficient horses.<sup>122</sup> The great crowds, which surprised some of the commentators, would have been expected at a medieval gathering, particularly since there was money and food to be received thereafter. This tradition was not repeated in Leicester in 2015.

Considering that the Cathedral, the Richard III Society, and the general public had raised the money for the reinterment and the tomb, it is questionable why two knights in armour were included. Neither wore Richard's livery, but they were fully armed, as were the horses. As such, they were dressed as the payment riders, which were superfluous in this situation.<sup>123</sup> This would suggest a gap in understanding in the function of these riders. Alternatively, they were simply used to give medieval flavour to what otherwise would have been a modern funeral procession.

Attendance at Richard III's funeral was limited by the size of Leicester Cathedral, whose maximum capacity is about 300-400 people normally but expanded to 500 for Richard III's reinterment; Westminster Abbey, in contrast, has a capacity of 2,000 normally, but

---

<sup>122</sup> *Liber Regie Capelle*, 114. Six or seven was the suggested minimum.

<sup>123</sup> See Chapter IV, 150-151 for a description and explanation of these riders.

expanded to a capacity of 8,200 for the present queen's coronation in 1953.<sup>124</sup> The royal representative was Richard, duke of Gloucester, and peers descended from the Yorkist and Lancastrian lines were also in attendance, something that would have been expected at a medieval funeral. Attendance of the monarch was not a requirement; the wording in the Household Articles indicates that certain elements were to be employed only if the king was attendance.<sup>125</sup> As such, the Queen's absence from Leicester in 2015 would not have been considered an insult.

The draping of a pall at Richard III's Compline service was drawn straight from a royal funeral in Renaissance France. Four peers of the realm covered Richard III's coffin with a pall, decorated not with religious or royal symbols, but rather illustrative of the story of the finding of the bones and their journey thitherto. At the French royal funeral, this pall would have been borne by four presidents of the Parlement in the procession<sup>126</sup> and likely offered at the subsequent masses or draped over the coffin itself.

Richard III's reburial 530 years after his death was complicated by the English Reformation, the extinction of "Romish" Purgatory among Protestants, and the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century; Richard III's brand of English Catholicism is extinct.<sup>127</sup> In lieu of an Office of the Dead in a Use, Anglican Compline was said for Richard. Compline is the final liturgical hour of the day, as opposed to Vespers, which takes place at sundown. The choice of this was to cater to the shared identity of Anglicanism and Catholicism; Compline is

---

<sup>124</sup> Victoria Ward and Andrew Hugh, "Westminster Abbey: A Royal Wedding Venue Steeped in History," *The Telegraph*, 23 November 2010, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/royal-wedding/8154425/Westminster-Abbey-a-royal-wedding-venue-steeped-in-history.html>. This is a modern consideration for fire safety standards. It is highly likely that more were crammed in during medieval and early modern funerals. A crush of people damaged John of Eltham's tomb at the Duchess of Suffolk's funeral; see Chapter VI, 237, for reference to this event.

<sup>125</sup> *A Collection of Ordinances*, 136.

<sup>126</sup> Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Gènève: Libraire E. Droz, 1960), 13, 55.

<sup>127</sup> The most conservative Catholic groups today prefer Tridentine Mass over the Mass of Paul VI, created in the vernacular during Vatican II. No group presently advocates for a reversion to pre-Tridentine Uses such as Sarum. The Book of Common Prayer was originally drawn from the Sarum Rite, but with the religious reforms enforced by Edward VI as Supreme Head and reinstated by Elizabeth I in 1559 after the reign of Mary I, the modern incarnation bears little to no resemblance to the pre-Tridentine ceremonies.

still celebrated in both denominations. Christine Reese, member of the General Synod and commentator during the Channel 4 broadcast, stated that Richard would have recognized such a service, even with the modernizations.<sup>128</sup>

However, the converse message was relayed at the reburial services on Thursday 26 March. Gordon Campbell, who eulogized Richard III at the beginning of the service, stated that the liturgical rites had been rendered as “something modern people would understand.” The prayers at the graveside were done in the presence of the guests, a measure not necessarily performed in a medieval funeral.<sup>129</sup> The influences of BL Harley MS 6466 were clearly seen in the selection of psalms and antiphons,<sup>130</sup> but other elements were geared for a modern audience. For example, popular actor Benedict Cumberbatch read a poem by the poet laureate Carol Ann Duffy. This and the inclusion of three soils from three locations in Richard’s life,<sup>131</sup> while invoking sentimentality suitable for a modern audience, probably would have confused medieval participants; what did this have to do with the deceased’s soul?

In Richard’s own time, the reburial would have been occasioned by Offices of the Dead and votive Masses of the Trinity, the Blessed Virgin, and Requiem. These were all designed to aid the passage of a soul out of Purgatory and into Heaven. The medieval Church and the modern Roman Catholic Church maintains that Purgatory is a place of suffering and repentance; people actively prepared in life to curtail their time in Purgatory, and others aided them in this effort. After their purification, they entered Heaven immediately.<sup>132</sup>

In the Church of England’s Thirty-Nine Articles, first approved in 1562 and later re-ratified and confirmed by Charles II in 1662, Article XXII stated that the Church of England did not believe in the “Romish Doctrine” of Purgatory. This included the use of “pardons,

---

<sup>128</sup> *The Return of the King*, live television broadcast. Leicester, UK. Channel 4, 22 March 2015.

<sup>129</sup> See above, 261-262.

<sup>130</sup> BL Harley MS 6466, ff. 33r-34v.

<sup>131</sup> *The Burial of the King*, live television broadcast. Leicester, UK. Channel 4, 26 March 2015.

<sup>132</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church With Modifications from the Editio Typica* (New York: Image for Doubleday, 1995), articles 1030-1032.

worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints” to accelerate one’s time in Purgatory.<sup>133</sup> In the twentieth century, this had been interpreted to indicate that while there was an intermediary state of purgation, it did not coincide with the Catholic imagining of it, nor could it be alleviated by the abovementioned activities. The dead still could and should be prayed for, though not in a votive capacity.<sup>134</sup>

Though the dead are prayed for in both denominations, only the Catholic formation of Purgatory provides direct benefit for the dead, and indeed, these benefits were sought by Richard III and other kings of England in life, as evidenced by the efforts remarked upon in the first half of Chapter VI.<sup>135</sup> The differing messages of the sermon by the Archbishop of Westminster, Vincent Nichols, on Sunday (“Our prayers for his eternal rest are not impeded or made invalid by the passing of these years. We pray for him today just as those who prayed for him at the time of his death in 1485”)<sup>136</sup> and the sermon by the Bishop of Leicester, Tim Stevens, on Thursday (which focused on what these activities meant to the living faithful rather than Richard)<sup>137</sup> reveal this persistent division.

This was a week of mourning for a far distant time period and the potential of a continued Yorkist dynasty rather than just one man who died. These services were for the suffering or contemplative living, as all funerary services are in the Protestant faith. In the medieval faith that Richard knew, the Office of the Dead and the votive masses were for the dead, speeding up the trials that prepared the soul for Heaven. This led to Catholics

---

<sup>133</sup> “Articles of Religion,” *The Book of Common Prayer*, Church of England website, last accessed 12 May 2016, <https://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/book-of-common-prayer/articles-of-religion.aspx#XXII>.

<sup>134</sup> Kevin Smyth, “The Anglican Conference at Lambeth, 1958,” *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 47, no. 188 (Winter 1958), 375.

<sup>135</sup> See Chapter VI, 226-230.

<sup>136</sup> *The Return of the King*, live television broadcast. Leicester, UK. Channel 4, 22 March 2015.

<sup>137</sup> *The Burial of the King*, live television broadcast. Leicester, UK. Channel 4, 26 March 2015.

organizing Masses of Requiem in Leicester,<sup>138</sup> York,<sup>139</sup> and Leyland<sup>140</sup> for Richard III; these masses were not officially affiliated with the events aired on television.

The Anglican services of Compline and Reburial in March 2015 for Richard III were not inappropriate; times had changed theologically in England. Yet, there is something unsettling in a person who was an active Catholic in life not receiving official votive activity; even Mary I was buried as a Catholic by her Protestant sister Elizabeth. The secular elements of Mary's funeral were completely appropriate for a reigning monarch, as would be expected, but Mary also had Catholic Offices of the Dead, a High Mass of Requiem, and a dispersion of alms.<sup>141</sup> These religious elements innately contained votive characteristics directly connected to the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, not the Protestant doctrines of soul sleep, painless reflection, or immediate judgment that Elizabeth herself may have possessed.

The secular elements of Richard III's funeral, including the procession, pall, the presentation of soils, and the poetry reading, were not wholly inappropriate. However, they do illustrate the very gap in academic understanding this work attempts to remedy. Fully-armoured knights served a function in the medieval royal funeral; here, they were window-dressing. The pall came from the French royal funeral ceremony, the continuing influence of Kantorowicz and Giesey; achievements, which comment on the social status of the deceased rather than their legitimacy, would have been more fitting and natively English.<sup>142</sup> The

---

<sup>138</sup> Tim Healey, "Hundreds of Worshippers Pray for the Soul of King Richard III at Holy Cross Priory," *The Leicester Mercury*, 23 March 2015, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/Hundreds-worshippers-pray-soul-King-Richard-III/story-26218485-detail/story.html>.

<sup>139</sup> "Requiem Mass for King Richard III," *St. Wilfrid's Catholic Church in York* news archive, 4 March 2015, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.stwilfridsyork.org.uk/blog/post/845-requiem-mass-for-king-richard-iii-2/>.

<sup>140</sup> "Latin Mass to Be Offered to Mark Reinterment of Richard III," *The Catholic Herald*, 4 March 2015, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2015/03/04/latin-mass-to-be-offered-to-mark-reinterment-of-richard-iii/>.

<sup>141</sup> Henry Machyn, *The Diary of Henry Machyn Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London (1550-1563)*, edited by J.G. Nichols. Camden Society, Old Series, 42 (London: 1848), 182-184; John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I, Volume I: 1533-1571*, edited by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clark, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer, et al. (Oxford: University Press, 2014), 103-104. John Edwards in his Yale English Monarch Series biography offers a detailed description of Mary's exequies, but the section is disappointingly without citation. *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (London: Yale University Press, 2011), 333.

<sup>142</sup> See Chapter IV, 151-155.

presentation of soils and the reading of a poem belong to modern tokenism, not medieval devotion and concern for the souls of the dead. The visual effects were pleasing, but their execution illustrated a certain level of unknowing ignorance.

### *Conclusions*

A reburial was a transformative tool to adjust history to suit the needs of the living. In the cases of kings John and Henry III and queens Eleanor of Castile and Elizabeth of York, these reburials were practical necessities done at the convenience or will of the sitting monarch; John did not request that his body be always kept near the relics of St. Wulfstan, nor would Henry III have minded if he had lain the tomb of the Confessor forever. These movements were done since reigning king had decided to move them to what he deemed a more appropriate or convenient place.

When it came to reburials on a grander scale - translations - there was profit to be made, and not necessarily monetarily. Henry V banked on Richard II's translation, carefully staging it to give his public persona a boost both domestically and internationally. Richard III sought to curb any deleterious capacity that the cult of Henry VI might have had against the Yorkist line of kings. The University of Leicester as well as the Richard III Society benefited from the high-profile publicity generated by the discovery and reburial of the remains. In the specific case of Richard III, there was measurable financial benefit as well; Leicester City Council stated in May 2015 that between Richard III's discovery in September 2012 and the week preceding reinterment, the city had profited more than £59 million.<sup>143</sup> The profits thereafter, particularly during the intense week of the reburial, have not yet been assessed. One

---

<sup>143</sup> "Richard III Effect brings almost £60 million to city" *University of Leicester* press release, 19 May 2015, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/press/press-releases/2015/may/richard-iii-effect-brings-almost-ps60-million-to-city>. A more skeptical look at this figure can be found in P.J. White, "Richard III economic impact," *Leicester Finance*, 7 July 2015, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.leicesterfinance.co.uk/richard-iii-impact/>.



may conclude that having the king's body *in situ* at the Cathedral and further exhibits added to the King Richard III Visitor Centre could only generate even greater profits; in July 2015, it was reported that the Centre had welcomed 81,627 people since its opening in July 2014.<sup>144</sup>

As remarked at the end of the section on Henry VI,<sup>145</sup> Richard III's reburial ceremonies bring into focus what medieval chroniclers may have attempted to gloss over or avoid discussing. Politics and less-than-sterling opinions of the dead surfaced. Not only were the dead critiqued, the living who put on the show likely received some grief as well. What survived in the long term for both Henry V and Richard III was overall approval; the short reign of Henry V was lionized, while the very short reign of Richard III avoided another black mark on its reputation.

Perhaps the key to understanding how the reburial of Richard III relates to the reburials of Richard II and Henry VI rests in the original mission statement of the Looking for Richard project. This was reiterated by Tim Stevens in his funerary sermon: Search, Find, Honour. These were the action words of the living, not the wishes of the dead. They, using their modern research strategies and tactics, narrowed the field and located the corpse. For the Richard III Society, the University of Leicester, and Leicester Cathedral, their modern ideas of honour and honouring someone were different to what a medieval king and his kin felt to be honourable. To recall the text of *De Exequiis Regalibus* and *Liber Regie Capelle*, the king was to be interred honourably and fittingly to his station. However, the still-living ultimately determined what, in their view, was honourable and fitting for a given king; the dead had no power over their exequies. Richard II and Henry VI had the good fortune to be reburied within living memory and within the same religious, political, social, and environmental context as their funerals. Richard III was reburied in Protestant England under a constitutional

---

<sup>144</sup> Alan Thompson, "King Richard III Visitor Centre Celebrates After Attracting 80,000 Visitors in First Year," *Leicester Mercury*, 24 July 2015, last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/King-Richard-III-Visitor-Centre-celebrates/story-27471967-detail/story.html>.

<sup>145</sup> See above, 280.

monarchy with a parliamentary system, in urban Leicester, after being found under a paved carpark. Five-hundred thirty years made quite a difference, because the living function differently compared those who lived in the fifteenth century.

That said, the reburial of Richard III has highlighted the need for a study such as this. The problems and issues raised by various members of the public, as well as dissent within the ranks of the organizers, could have easily been resolved if more information about the medieval English royal funeral was readily available. The problematic riders could have simply been draped in Richard III's livery, making it a heraldic offering or an achievement that could have been hoisted and permanently displayed in the Cathedral. The pall could have been replaced by the offering of arms, which was not a rite reserved solely for an English king; it was for any man with a military past, later becoming a simple mark of status. The showrunners should not be completely faulted; when there was no book or study to refer to, how were they to know?

This thesis has attempted to fill in the blanks, technically and narratively, in the development of the English royal funeral during the period of 1216-1509. The corpse's importance has hopefully been restored. However, even with the amount of research invested in this project, there is still much to do. There are also gaps that may never be resolved, cases that simply do not fit any paradigm presented here. This brings us to the final chapter, and the final king for whom there are no easy answers: the young Edward V.

## Chapter VIII: The Last Things

### *The Case of Edward V*

The final chapter in a book about a person usually addresses their death, burial, and afterlife. This presents a challenge to this thesis, as the last things have been the focus throughout. To begin the end, we first must look to the final, undiscussed king from the 1216-1509 era. Edward V presents as the ultimate outlier in all things related to the royal funeral, except for the consequence of his status.

The usurpation and de-legitimization of Edward V began with the onset of factional infighting immediately after his father's demise. In Chapter II, the deathbed speeches of Edward IV were discussed. At each version's core was Edward IV's desire that his wife's family and his chamberlain, William Hastings, put aside their disagreements to support Edward V in his reign.<sup>1</sup> This clearly did not happen. The factions were binary, with no middle ground and, at that time, few magnates that were fully of age.<sup>2</sup>

Michael Hicks couches the events in the framework that Richard, duke of Gloucester executed two coups d'état against those factions unwilling to unite. First, Richard gained physical custody of the young Edward V and arrested the boy's uncle Anthony Rivers and half-brother Richard Grey. In response to this, Elizabeth Woodville, the queen mother and the rest of her children went into sanctuary; the Woodvilles were temporarily scattered and neutralized.<sup>3</sup> Second, he eliminated Hastings, effectively blunting the other major faction in London at the time.<sup>4</sup>

After Edward V's coronation was delayed twice, a sermon was given in London by Ralph Shaa, stating that a long-hidden truth had been revealed. The marriage between

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter II, 59-61.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Ross, *Richard III* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1981), 41.

<sup>3</sup> Michael Hicks, "A Story of Failure: The Minority of Edward V," in *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England*, edited by Charles Beem (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 201.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, 205.

Elizabeth Woodville and King Edward IV was not valid, and the resulting children were not legitimate.<sup>5</sup> Allegations of illegitimacy on both sides had littered the Wars of the Roses, but these were built on the supposition that the named father was not the biological father. While insulting, the only person who could deem a child illegitimate was the named father; rumours may have abounded, but it was the man's choice as to whether he accepted the child as his own. *Titulus Regius* made reference to the rumour that Edward IV was not son of Richard, duke of York by explicitly identifying Richard as the "the undoubted son and heir."<sup>6</sup>

However, the crux of the sermon and pro-Ricardian argument was that while the wedding had taken place and Edward IV was indeed the father of Elizabeth Woodville's children from 1464 onward, Edward had married by proxy a princess or had pre-contracted with another English woman, rendering any arrangement with Woodville invalid.<sup>7</sup> In *Titulus Regius*, additionally, it was claimed that the wedding ceremony had been secretive, performed without consultation of the lords, and engineered by magic by Jacquetta, Elizabeth's mother.<sup>8</sup>

The different approach to legitimacy worked in the short term, despite the outlandish witchcraft charge. There had been domestic and international upset when Edward revealed this marriage in the midst of negotiations with foreign princesses.<sup>9</sup> J.L. Laynesmith notes that Elizabeth and Edward's wedding had a very small number of witnesses but did have a priest, so while not clandestine, it was certainly more secretive than was acceptable. Unlike the wedding of the Black Prince and Joan of Kent, there was no later public ceremony to assert its validity.

---

<sup>5</sup> At what point Richard chose to take the crown for himself and whether his argument is valid matters less than how it was employed and the *de facto* results; see Chapter V, 188, n. 92, for contenders in this debate.

<sup>6</sup> *PROME*, Parliament of January 1484, item 5, *Titulus Regius* or *The Royal Title*.

<sup>7</sup> The assertion of a marriage by proxy was the original story in the Shaa sermon, but by the Parliament of 1484, the difficulty was a pre-contract. Charles T. Wood, "The Deposition of Edward V," *Traditio*, 31 (1975), 276.

<sup>8</sup> *PROME*, Parliament of January 1484, item 5.

<sup>9</sup> It also severed diplomatic relationships with these princesses. In August 1483, Isabella of Castile wrote to Richard III to offer her assistance against the king of France, stating that Edward's deception of her and Warwick, the negotiator, in 1464 had driven her into alliance with France. Now that Edward was dead, she was eager to be friends with England again. *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII*, i, edited by James Gairdner. RS, 24 (London: 1861), 32.

Elizabeth was crowned and her identity as Edward IV's queen was "proved," but not her identity as Edward IV's wife.<sup>10</sup>

The accusation gained enough traction to be effective. In the words of Michael Hicks, Richard, "like the speaker of the Commons and all popes, formally protested his incapacity but allowed himself to be persuaded,"<sup>11</sup> and he took the throne as Richard III, deposing Edward V. Oaths that had been taken in allegiance to Edward V were discounted, saying that they had been made when it was thought that Edward V was the true king of England.<sup>12</sup> The argument laid out in *Titulus Regius* did not retain its strength in the long term; Richard III's short reign was punctuated by rebellions, culminating in the invasion of Henry Tudor and the Battle of Bosworth in 1485.

Though Edward V had been proclaimed king, he had not been crowned, and, by Richard's machinations, never would be. He disappeared while in the custody of his uncle and never reappeared. Much like Henry VI and later Richard III himself, Edward V was considered never rightly king of England. He was not re-legitimated until the reign of Henry VII.<sup>13</sup>

Although there are many speculative accounts about the deaths of Edward V and his younger brother Richard of Shrewsbury,<sup>14</sup> there are only two which suggest any sort of funeral for them. The first, Thomas More's "A History of King Richard III," was used as a source by the second, *Hall's Chronicle*. More states that after the boys had been murdered and buried under a staircase at the Tower of London, Richard III was struck by a sudden case of piety.<sup>15</sup> A priest of Robert Brackenbury, keeper of the Tower, had the boys moved and reburied

---

<sup>10</sup> J.L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 78-79.

<sup>11</sup> Michael Hicks, *The Wars of the Roses* (London: Yale University Press, 2010), 222.

<sup>12</sup> BL Harley MS 433, f. 238.

<sup>13</sup> *PROME*, Parliament of 7 November 1485, item 23.

<sup>14</sup> See Chapter II, 61-63.

<sup>15</sup> Thomas More, "A History of Richard III," in *Richard III: The Great Debate*, edited by Paul Kendall (Chatham: The Folio Society Limited, 1965), 106.

appropriately in a secret place. Hall expands upon this narrative, suggesting that after the funeral rite, Richard went as far to have the bodies plumed and sunk to the bottom of the Thames.<sup>16</sup> The priest involved, according to Hall, died soon thereafter, so no one could ever find the bodies of the boys again.

Richard III's change of heart regarding the burial site of the murdered boys was used as a device to display his hypocrisy by More and Hall. However, his supposed regret over his political expediency would have been similar to that of Henry IV.<sup>17</sup> Richard III would have broken tradition, as previous kings buried their usurped predecessors in at least holy ground. Richard III was a pious person, based on what is known of his religious pursuits.<sup>18</sup> The fact that Richard III was fairly quick in reburial of Henry VI at Windsor with greater honours makes the completely hidden, unholy burial of the two boys incongruent.<sup>19</sup>

As a result of Richard's short reign, his ultimate intentions regarding Henry VI's tomb at Windsor, Anne Neville's unmarked tomb at Westminster Abbey, his own choice of interment site, and even what explanation he would have given for Edward V's disappearance remain unknown. If he had lived, it is likely that the official line would have further developed. By dying at Bosworth, Richard III's burial agenda was left in a nascent form, incomplete and unable to be assessed. The death of one king permanently obscured the fate of another.

The situation amplified when Edward V was reinstated, but he could not be found in any manner, dead or alive. His posthumous recognition as the rightful king – reinforced by the later choice of Edward VI to reign as the sixth, not the fifth, king by that name – brought and still brings criticism to bear on Richard III for his legal and physical disposal of the princes.

---

<sup>16</sup> Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle, containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, et. al., 1809), 378.

<sup>17</sup> See Chapter II, 54-56; Chapter IV, 134-136.

<sup>18</sup> Anne Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs, *The Hours of Richard III* (Gloucester: Sutton, 2000). This is the publication of Lambeth MS 474, thought to be Richard III's personal book of hours, with extensive commentary. The manuscript was utilised at Richard III's reburial in 2015. For further considerations, see also Nigel Saul, *The Three Richards* (London: Hambledon, 2005), 193-197.

<sup>19</sup> See Chapter VII, 275-277.

Given Richard's previous actions regarding Henry VI, it is a reasonable possibility that Edward V and his brother Richard were laid to rest in holy ground, rather than the hasty and irreverent burials posed by More and Hall. The location is problematic, as they may have long returned to earth if they were only placed in wood coffins.<sup>20</sup> In the excavation of St. Peter ad Vincula in the Tower of London in 1877, there were no male adolescent or child remains found.<sup>21</sup>

There was no official end to Edward V. He just disappeared without a dead body, without a funeral, and without a burial, save for the allegations created by More and Hall. How could a royal prescriptive text be applied to such a king? I have argued that the texts were not applicable to him at the accepted time of his death, in the same way they were not applicable for Henry VI and Richard III; they were not considered legitimate kings of England at the time of their demise. The disposal of these bodies were not held to the same standards as normative monarchs.

However, for Henry and Richard, there ultimately was the option of using the editorial device of a reburial: there was a body. This is impossible for Edward V, as there are no remains. Even a piece of him would be suitable; Louis XVII, the boy king who died in the throes of the French Revolution, received a funeral for his heart.<sup>22</sup> Louis' heart, like the remains of Richard III, had been identified through mitochondrial DNA.<sup>23</sup> No piece of Edward V has been confirmed to survive in such a scientifically satisfactory way.

Despite no evidence that could withstand a modern legal challenge, remains have been designated as those of Edward V and Richard of Shrewsbury. P.W. Hammond and W.J.

---

<sup>20</sup> P.W. Hammond and W.J. White, "The Sons of Edward IV: A Re-Examination of the Evidence on their Deaths and on the Bones in Westminster Abbey," in *Richard III: Loyalty Lordship and Law*, edited by P.W. Hammond (London: Richard III and Yorkist History Trust, 1986), 115, address the difficulties of actually smuggling two corpses out of the Tower complex as it was in 1485. They also discuss of the vast numbers of "princes' bones" discovered at the Tower prior to the ones officially recognized as such in 1674.

<sup>21</sup> Doyne C. Bell, *Notices of the Historic Persons Buried in the Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula in the Tower of London* (London: John Murray, 1877).

<sup>22</sup> Philip Delves Broughton, "Tragic French boy king's heart finds a final resting place after 209 years," *The Telegraph*, 8 June 2004, last accessed 9 May 2016, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1463951/Tragic-French-boy-kings-heart-finds-a-final-resting-place-after-209-years.html>.

<sup>23</sup> Philippe Delorme, *Louis XVII, la verite: Sa mort au Temple confirmee par la science* (Paris: Pygmalion, 2000).

White, in their essay on the disappearance of Edward IV's sons, identify and discuss at least four other supposed princely skeletons that have been found at the Tower of London since 1485.<sup>24</sup> The bones that Charles II accepted as those of Edward V and Richard of Shrewsbury in 1674 and later reburied at Westminster Abbey in 1678 are, at best, only representative of finally laying the boys to rest.

Charles II's sincerity in his belief can be put into question. The warrant for the tomb was issued by Charles II to Christopher Wren on 18 February 1675.<sup>25</sup> This was to be done "as the Dean of Westminster shall appoint." Charles II selected white marble, a low-budget material, and ultimately left the details of the tomb and reinterment to the Dean, then John Dolben (later the Archbishop of York).<sup>26</sup> There are no records pertaining to any ceremonial expenses at Westminster Abbey<sup>27</sup> or with the College of Arms<sup>28</sup> for the period 1 February 1678 to 31 January 1679, per the date on the finished urn.<sup>29</sup> These entities would have been involved for any event at the Abbey relating to the interment of royal personages.

If Charles II sincerely believed that these bones were of the unfortunate king and his brother, one would expect some record of at least a modest ceremony to survive with or without his attendance. Rather than capitalizing on this supposed reburial, the urn simply came to be in the Henry VII Lady Chapel, a silent marker for the missing king and his brother; in the intervening years between finding the bones, accepting their identification as the Princes in the Tower, and having them interred at Westminster, Charles II seemingly lost interest and the bones were placed into their new resting place with no grand reception, perhaps only a blessing

---

<sup>24</sup> Hammond and White, "The Sons of Edward IV," 112-114.

<sup>25</sup> TNA LC 5/141, f. 131.

<sup>26</sup> My thanks to Gary Brannan for checking to see if any of Dolben's papers from Westminster Abbey had ended up in the Borthwick Institute for Archives, University of York.

<sup>27</sup> Email conversation between author and Christine Reynolds, assistant keeper of Muniments, Westminster Abbey, 24 September 2015.

<sup>28</sup> Email conversation between author and Lynsey Darby, archivist at the College of Arms, 30 September 2015.

<sup>29</sup> Charles II counted his regnant years from the date of his father's death, despite England becoming a republic. As such, his personal accounting of his reign differs from historians, who do not count the Interregnum as part of Charles II's reign. The urn's inscription includes reference to the thirtieth year of Charles II's reign, which would be the dates abovementioned, by his reckoning.



by the Dean (hence the charge laid out in the warrant); the blessing was also performed at the closing up of the urn in 1933.<sup>30</sup>

Since 1933, there has been reluctance to open tombs by the two latest British monarchs, George VI and Elizabeth II. Prior to this, a regular pattern of exhumation existed. George III's reign (and the regency of the Prince of Wales, later George IV) saw the examination of the bodies of Edward I, Edward IV, and John. William IV allowed the confirmation of the body of Henry IV at Canterbury. Victoria had allowed access to Richard II and Anne of Bohemia, but blocked the opening of Henry III's tomb. Edward VII permitted the investigation of Henry VI's tomb at Windsor in 1910. The 1933 investigation of the Princes' urn at Westminster had been under the auspices of George V. Since the last opening, forensic science has grown considerably, and any future examination would garner better results than the one performed in 1933. Answers may yet be had within the next fifty years, given the science as well as the increasingly popular push for identifying human remains.

The question of whether the remains in Westminster Abbey are those of the boys is perhaps irrelevant; are they not remembered and commemorated? Does it matter whose bones they are? With the centennial of the First World War, there has been public pressure to identify unknowns from both World Wars. If there are surviving family members, then the possibility of a DNA confirmation match still exists. Considering the interest Richard III's rediscovery generated and the enthusiasm expressed thus far for finding Harold Godwinson, there is popular interest for such efforts at identification. The bones in the urn have already become a topic of discussion in the media because of Richard III's genome being mapped. It is plausible that someone bearing the mitochondrial DNA of Elizabeth Woodville will come forward, but it will ultimately be a question of access to the remains.

---

<sup>30</sup> Lawrence Tanner and William Wright, "Recent Investigations Regarding the Fate of the Princes in the Tower," *Archaeologia*, 84 (1935), 15.

*Outbound: Beyond the Thesis*

The worthwhileness of pursuing future research in the field of elite death and burial becomes more evident when a royal funeral is viewed beyond the immediate, high profile events. The cooperative effort among living entities to stage the production provides insight into the secular elite's relationship with the Church and its elite members. When considering the secular elements that conveyed status, one must recall the aspirational work of nobles to imitate the royal house. Each social stratum imitated the one above it; knowing royal activity in certain arenas reveals what was the ultimate goal for a given set of social climbers. The royal house was the most public and visible example of a society's tastes and desires, because it had the money and influence to fulfil every wish or hope a person could have. Additionally, people lower in society, both lay and religious, played important roles in the exequies beyond the immediate bidding of their superiors. For example, the preservation of a body stirs questions as to the identity of the person who had the skills to aid the royal house and how they were employed.

The constancy of the Church in even royal matters was remarkable. All of the elements that identified the king as a king were kept in the secular realm; offerings, processions, and other elements, while occurring during the course of the funerary mass, did not invoke special words or religious ceremonies. Furthermore, as shown in Chapter VI in particular, the burial church retained significant control over the corpse once it was handed over to its care. The nature of the monument erected as well as the commemoration that took place at the site seems to have been closely regulated by the church. The role of churches pertaining to the royal and non-royal funeral is not yet fully developed, but initially, it appears that the transfer of custody at the funeral was more than just for show. How far this guardianship went is yet to be determined.

The religious services at the royal funeral could have been performed for anyone. In fact, they were; there is no specially labelled mass or office for a king, though there are a few prayers specifically for the souls of kings or queens, living or dead. All the accoutrements of station ultimately had no bearing upon the religious content of the funeral masses and the Offices of the Dead. The prayers that were said for a pauper were also said for a king. The number of prayers for a king were greater, but the poor man had still been saved from Hell if he was in Purgatory. The unique liturgical structures of Uses remind the scholar of the diversity in acceptable religious practice prior to the Reformation, as well as the varying soundscape any given location would have had. Meanwhile, determining what contemporaries understood of a king – or any person – in Purgatory is another area to be investigated.

Less dramatic – and more practical, as this thesis is wont to emphasize – would be the improved understanding of the stage and soundtrack of the royal funeral. In 2003, Julian Litten coordinated a re-enactment of Arthur Tudor’s funeral based upon the extant manuscript texts.<sup>31</sup> Although he managed to produce a fair facsimile for £200,000, Litten estimates that a true-to-life production would have cost closer to £2 million. However, even with Litten’s fastidious research, there are still items that resist confirmation. The experience of a funeral was multisensory: smell of incense, the sound of weeping backed by the song of monks in plainsong and later polyphony, the bland unleavened dryness of the Eucharist and the sickly sweet tang of wine for the most elite, the sight of a grand herse reaching toward the ceiling of the choir, the sensation of heat emanating not only from that herse and its candles, but also from the bodies of hundreds, even thousands of mourners all around. Each experience may well be retrieved or reconstructed by specialists in the given fields with enough research.

---

<sup>31</sup> Julian Litten, “The Reenactment of the Funeral of Prince Arthur,” in *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death, and Commemoration*, edited by Steven Gunn and Linda Monckton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 167.

The royal funeral, stripped of its secular accoutrements, was the same as a commoner's medieval funeral. The royal funeral was a prominent and rare event that was recorded by those who saw even the smallest piece of it; hundreds of funerals occurred daily in medieval England with little to nothing said about them. What contemporaries understood and accepted about these final things is vital to gaining insight to a lost world. The topics addressed in this section are but a few reasonable extensions of this work into the unknown.

When examining the exequies of Henry IV,<sup>32</sup> a gap in historiography opened pertaining to the small interregna that England and other kingdoms experienced. The spaces between funeral and coronation deserve attention, given the efforts of Henry V to preserve that ceremonial order. If there was a consistence sequence of ceremonies, one must enquire as to the justification of this order; these queries inform the scholar as to the varying importance of ceremonial integrity. England was hidebound in the sequence, while other kingdoms were not - why? That is not a question to be answered here, but it must be answered somewhere. This thesis' afterlife can extend into multiple fields

### *The Conclusion*

The focus of the medieval royal funeral in England was the body of a deceased monarch. This fact has been the premise of this thesis, as the physicality of a royal funeral has been forgotten in favour of objects around the corpse or the cultural commentary generated by a corpse. The return to the actual body in this study has produced four major themes.

First, when arranging a royal funeral, the first concern of the organizers was the reality of a decaying corpse in their midst. Consideration for the body affected every aspect of a royal funeral. In Chapter III, the royal prescriptive texts were shown to be practical at their roots; there was a reason for each item. The first prescriptive text, *De Exequiis Regalibus*, set out the

---

<sup>32</sup> See Chapter IV, 135.

final appearance of the dead king, indicating that he needed to be eviscerated, embalmed, and dressed appropriately for his station. In the *Liber Regie Capelle*, the anticipated liturgical activity for a king or queen was set out, with no specific commitment to any given Use. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, behavioural expectations were codified in the Household Articles of Henry VII and the work of Margaret Beaufort.

The royal funeral was not organized based upon these prescriptive texts alone, nor can it be discussed solely through these items. By attempting to get down to the raw mechanics of this final medieval pageant, it has been necessary to pursue interdisciplinary lines of research. From breviaries to medical manuals to the extant chronicle texts and beyond, there has been an effort to reconstruct the entire experience of a medieval king's death in England. It is impossible to view any type of source in strict isolation, as this skews the event's presentation and perception by later audiences. The funerals of Edward III and Henry V may have been the narrative basis for the prescriptive texts, but features of the exequies were likely enacted long before they were formally recorded. Additionally, the images presented are incomplete, remarking upon the need for looking beyond traditional sources to fill in the gaps.

The prescriptive texts were vital for the stability of the event, but also for the living to accommodate the specific status and circumstance of the dead king. In Chapter II, the deaths of kings were presented in order to grant context to the ceremonies that followed. The reputation of the king mattered more to chroniclers than the specific facts. However, regardless of their opinions, English kings universally went to Heaven, whether by their personal virtues, their valorous concern for their kingdom and dynasty, or their pitiable sudden deaths. This was one unifying element, but everything else clashed. Some died young, some died old; some were deposed but kept their nobility, while others were reduced to nothing.

The second theme of the prescriptive texts' flexibility cannot be understated here. These elastic texts enabled each individual king to be buried in consideration of his status and

the context in which he died. The basic purpose of prescriptive texts was to assist in the management of the royal exequies, not to overburden the executors. *De Exequiis Regalibus* made no mention of contemporary fashion, nor did it clarify the exact method of embalming; it left this to the discretion of those performing such duties. The *Liber Regie Capelle* likewise did not commit itself to a specific geographic location or time of year for the funeral of the king. The texts pertaining to court protocol expected good behaviour from guests, but certain items were clarified in order to assist guests in this aim. Certain secular elements of a given funeral were customized to suit the king's status at the time of death. In Chapter III, it was shown that nothing the royal house performed at a funeral tested the tolerance of the Church or the natural limits of the body; the differences between anyone's funeral and a royal funeral lay in the expenditure.

Chapter IV discussed the moments of deviation, which stretched the texts' meanings and, at the same time, revealed their tensile strength. They did not break when the slightest mishap happened or when minor changes occurred; Henry IV's funeral had several irregular features, but it was only in retrospect and through a tomb opening that any deviation came to light. However, the collective importance of the prescriptive texts, Church influence, and embalming technique was revealed when the funeral had to stop (or should have been stopped) in order to rectify a problem, such as Richard II's fight at his wife's funeral, the leaking coffin of Henry VI, and the scuffle at Edward IV's funeral over precedence.

No prescriptive texts exist for commemoration. Just as the living defined what was fitting and suitable for a given king at his exequies, so they determined what was expected, appropriate commemoration. Again, much like the secular accoutrements of the royal funeral, the only limit was money. However, the pressures for certain activities were present, especially in consideration of the royal house's place at the top of the social and political hierarchy. In special cases, these pressures added up to the need to rebury a king. This was not done for the

sake of the dead but for the comfort of the living. In some cases, it was a private, practical operation in order to put someone in the proper place. Alternatively, when done publicly, the living benefitted by affiliating themselves with the deceased in a high-profile act. The royal house did not exist in a vacuum; external pressures from below affected the level of conspicuous consumption at the royal exequies.

At the end of his discussion of the royal funeral in *The King's Two Bodies*,<sup>33</sup> Ernst Kantorowicz did not investigate the post-mortem legacy of a mortal king any further. He judged it politically null and less significant than the immortal aspects of the office of King and the Dignity thereof. For Kantorowicz, the division between the mortal king and the immortal office of King was clean.

The third theme of this thesis is the opposite conclusion: the division between the king and the King was never so neat. Parts of the theory retain traction, as seen in the existence of the royal prescriptive texts and the separate creation of a personal will by each king. When it came down to the actual execution, the line between king and King quickly became blurred. The royal prescriptive texts often bowed in the face of the mortal individual and external circumstances, offering just enough structure to be unified with other monarchs' burials but retaining individual aspects of the person; this is what they were built to do. The effigy for Edward II was an indubitable innovation. It is less clear whether this was done solely to befit the office of King by concealing a decaying corpse months after its death, or if it was done for Edward II personally to stress his important, but reduced, status as father of the current king. Alternatively, it could have been done to address both problems of the king and the King, illustrating the difficulty in separating the two sides of Kantorowicz's argument.

Given the extensive commemorative acts that were performed for the royal corpse and the concern expressed over its resting place, the mortal king was not politically dead even after

---

<sup>33</sup> Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 419.

he had expired. The living still constantly encountered him through the written chronicles, as see in Chapter II, and through the king's commemoration. The living managed the king's memory. Once dead, the king had no power to enact his will, but his inability to act did not render him inert or something easily ignored.

At the end of the introduction, a widely accepted fact was stated: John, dying in 1216, was the first English king buried in England since Stephen in 1154, and he was the first Angevin to be buried away from Fontevraud. What does this matter to this thesis?

The fourth and final theme is that of a developing consciousness as to what was an English, royal funeral and burial. John, for all his failings, may be credited for establishing an identity as King of England. Prior to John, significant elements of Franco-Norman identity were present in the reigns of Henry II and Richard I, as well as the long-lived influence of Eleanor of Aquitaine. Before the First Barons' War, the principal conflicts fought in the Angevin Empire were not for England, but rather for continental holdings in Normandy, Aquitaine, and Anjou, among others. England was placid in comparison. Additionally, even before he had lost these continental lands, save Gascony, John spent a higher proportion of his time in England than had his brother Richard or his father Henry. By the increasing attention of the king, his court, and his administration, England was becoming more and more of a kingdom in its own right rather than a far-flung piggy bank for military expeditions.

This is supported by the nature of the claimants for John's body. Casting aside the anachronistic possibility of Westminster Abbey, Worcester, the site chosen in his will, and Beaulieu, his great foundation, were both in England. There seems to have been no interest on John's part to be buried in the continental holdings, should they be retrieved. Fontevraud



made no request of him, and contrary to secondary literature,<sup>34</sup> John's heart lies at Croxton;<sup>35</sup> a small item such as a heart could have been easily sent to Fontevraud if desired, as evidenced by Henry III's own action on this matter. All of John is in England. The burial place of England was a conscious choice on John's part.

From Edward III onward, statements were made by kings that suggested a formed idea of what a funeral and burial should be for a king in England. Edward III was able to refer to the Confessor's Chapel as the resting place of English kings. Richard II explained a "royal way" of the funeral in his will of 1399. By the time of Henry V's funeral in 1422, Thomas Walsingham was able to describe the function of payment riders as a traditional element of the English royal funeral. In consideration of Henry V's long journey back to England, one must consider that the English way of death, which included burial in England, was a conscious and deliberate feature in the royal house's agenda. By their repatriations of family members, Edward I, Edward III, and Richard II also indicated that those of royal blood or close kinship belonged to England and deserved English exequies. Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales, could have easily been buried at his place of death, Ludlow (then in Wales), but Henry VII made the choice to bring him over the border to Worcester, where he lies not far from John himself. Indeed, it has been suggested that the very presence of John and his status as King made Worcester a far more desirable resting place compared to a church in the Welsh marches.<sup>36</sup>

But perhaps it is not just John, but John in England that is most important to this thesis. Despite later re-conquests of some of these overseas territories, no medieval king ever chose anywhere but England to be buried. Henry V died in what was to be his inheritance, the

---

<sup>34</sup> Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power, 1200-1400* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), 92; Aidan Dodson, *The Royal Tombs of Great Britain: An Illustrated History* (London: Duckworth & Co., 2004), 60; D.M. Palliser, "Royal Mausolea in the Long Fourteenth Century (1272-1422)," in *Fourteenth Century England III*, edited by W.M. Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 2.

<sup>35</sup> See Chapter IV, 160, n. 211, for items related to John's heart at Croxton.

<sup>36</sup> Ralph Houlbrook, "Prince Arthur's Funeral," in *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death, and Commemoration*, edited by Steven Gunn and Linda Monckton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 67.

kingdom of France, and he could have been interred with pomp and dignity at Saint-Denis with his peers, the kings of France. At that very moment, the English and French royal ceremonies could have merged entirely, and Kantorowicz's arguments in *The Kings' Two Bodies* would not have had to seek foreign support, for it would have become all the same. Instead, the long dolorous procession brought Henry V home to Westminster Abbey, to England.

By re-examining the exequies of English kings through these four themes, a series of tiny revolutions has occurred. Previously accepted historical facts have been dashed away, replaced by a clearer narrative that fits into the known framework. These tiny revolutions have not changed the key elements of when a king died and who was his successor, but they have changed the previously held dynamics between the living and the dead. The development of John and his choices throughout this thesis has been a clear example of this, but other kings, sources, and events have experienced a shift.

When looking at the entirety of this thesis, the significance of Richard II comes to light. In his will of 1399, Richard II explicitly stated the expectations for his funeral, setting them in a historical context of being *more regio*. In prior historiography, this may have been used to prove that Richard II was high-strung, a tyrant, or overly obsessed with his end. However, by placing Richard II and his will in the context of the period 1216-1509, he was the person who overtly stated what had transpired before and indicated that he expected to be treated the same way. Beyond a high budget, Richard did not demand anything innovative in his proposed exequies. Everything he discussed made up the traditional events of the royal funeral. Richard II was the King, but he was still Richard, the person, so he clarified some of the visual elements to his own preference.

The kings that followed him seem to have adapted this perspective, though they focused on their tombs and commemoration rather than the appearance of their funerals. This may suggest, as indicated in the fourth theme, other kings were aware of the content of Richard

II's will, which came in between the prescriptive texts *De Exequiis Regalibus* and the funerary section in the *Liber Regie Capelle*. For the funeral, kings trusted in their executors and had to allow a certain level of flexibility to cope with unexpected events, but we many consider that they knew that the proper appearance of exequies in ideal circumstances had already been addressed in extant texts. There was no need to repeat this. However, they expressed their personal wishes regarding their tombs; there was no prescriptive text as to a monument's appearance.

Both in how he handled preparations for his death and how he dealt with the deaths of others, Richard II had precedents to refer to; he was not as extreme or creepy as Thomas Walsingham's chronicles would have posterity believe. Richard did arrange for the movement of bodies within England and the repatriation of others. Edward I exhibited similar behaviour in repatriating the remains of family members, though he was more narrowly interested in blood relatives and Westminster Abbey. In expounding on how inappropriate it was for Richard II to look upon the dead Robert de Vere, Walsingham had forgotten that the practical measure of confirming the earl's identity was required, and that Henry V had handled the dead body of his friend Bishop Richard Courtenay at Harfleur.<sup>37</sup> The fact that Henry IV disinterred Henry Percy, displayed him to prove his death,<sup>38</sup> and then quartered him for further display across the kingdom<sup>39</sup> was put aside as well. Richard II functioned within the normative continuity of kings and how they handled the last things, both for themselves and others, but he was certainly innovative how he used the royal will to express his personal wishes; the problem rests in how posterity has read these events through the writing of Lancastrian partisans, such as Walsingham.

---

<sup>37</sup> *Gesta Henrici Quinti: Deeds of Henry V*, edited by John Taylor and F. Roskell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 45.

<sup>38</sup> Simon Walker, "Percy, Sir Henry (1364-1403)," *ODNB*, last accessed 9 May 2016, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/21931.

<sup>39</sup> *CCR, 1402-1405*, 203, for the return of the quarters and his head to his wife.

Throughout this thesis, when comparing the chronicle narratives to the documentation, the chronicles of St. Albans tend to be slightly out of step. While the St. Albans chronicles remain important sources for the medieval period, they are typically the sole source of bizarre stories. Edward I's demand that his bones be carried into battle, the theft of Edward III's rings on his deathbed, the disruption of Anne of Bohemia's funeral, and a variety of other stories are not consistent with any other contemporary narrative. Certain details suggest that these authors did have connections to the inner royal circles. Walsingham, in the employ of Henry IV and later Henry V, was certainly writing to purpose, as evidenced by his changing narratives. The variant stories illustrate the greater issues of the kingdom, but the specific events reported do not tally with other accounts. This work raises the possibility that the St. Albans chroniclers were more inclined to produce allegorical fiction to depict, in their view, the true characters of the participants and the political climate rather than a factually accurate historical record. The St. Albans chronicles are "correct" in many ways, though perhaps not in the way they have been traditionally interpreted.

The complexity of the royal exequies required a certain level of deception and the stagecraft to produce the desired visuals. Such activity was specifically discussed in Chapter VII in relation to Henry V's well-choreographed reburial of Richard II, but other parts of royal funeral required similar staging, including the procession. The BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII variation of Margaret Beaufort's texts seems to endorse deception over a disruptive correction. The offering of arms required similar tactics. The unravelling of the concurrent two or three events within that ceremony in Chapter IV was necessary in order to clearly delineate which elements were pragmatic, which elements were symbolic, and which elements were a clever distraction. The prescriptive texts only state that cloths of gold and banners were be offered at the high altar; this was not enough to pay for the services rendered. In the *Liber Regie Capelle*, the shield raising was symbolic, but the item was not necessarily offered to the church. As

such, the entirely secular presentation of arms and achievements was free to evolve unchecked. The arrival of a mounted knight in the king's livery was a practical solution, the handsome things he carried being left out to be offered. But these items were more for decoration than battle, and their corresponding values were slight compared to battle-ready armour and horse. The audience's focus remained on these useless imitations, while the monks smuggled the armour and the horse to the Abbey's stables for later resale.

The medieval royal funeral required a certain amount of deception in retrospect as well, if it was considered to have been successful or at least uneventful. Unlike the offering of arms, this type of "deception" was not active. Rather, it was the passive acceptance of missteps; not everything would go to plan, and not everyone would be happy with the exequies. These events and opinions have not always survived to the modern day. No glaring errors were reported for the funeral of Henry III, despite fifty-six years having passed since the interment of John. Edward III's funeral came fifty years after that of his father in Gloucester, while seventy years had passed since Edward I's burial in the Confessor's Chapel in Westminster Abbey. If one went by the lack of complaints and commentary, one could assume Edward III's funeral was perfect. The long gap between the funeral of Henry V and that of Edward IV - sixty-one years - should have produced more than one obvious mistake, which was related to a new order of precedence rather than the prescriptive texts.

However, the innate flexibility of the royal prescriptive texts coped with variations, save for ones that should have stopped the ceremonies. Minor mistakes may have been noticed at the time, but were forgotten, any disagreements of the living forgiven. The "truth" of a royal funeral was allowed to fade over time. Posterity's view of the reburial of Richard III will be interesting to examine in a few decades; each moment, from his remains' discovery to reinterment, can be replayed on video and digital media. Richard III's reburial, its narrative, and the storyline of the living will not deteriorate or soften over time.

Though some of the source material has been lost, both the living and the dead involved in the English medieval royal funeral are now subject to reinterpretation and reconsideration. This is no longer an object-centred antiquarian cabinet of curiosities, nor is it a hands-off interpretation of arts and literature. Considering the body as the centre of the royal funeral necessitated the use of flexible prescriptive texts in order to cope with the intertwined entities of the man and the office. In this way, the living could manage a funeral and burial and perform commemorative acts suiting both a monarch of England and a private man. Further investigations of royal deaths and their exequies may reveal more “tiny revolutions” in historical thought pertaining to the physical and spiritual lives of some of the most powerful men and women in medieval Europe. The relationship and interplay between the living and the dead did not cease at the funeral, but continued from generation to generation. Even for the mortal king, death was not the end.

### Appendix One: Liturgical Source Information

Medieval churches were either secular or monastic. Secular clergy lived in and served the world typically in parish churches or collegiate foundations. Monastic clergy withdrew from the world, and their services were usually intended only for members of their community.

Secular and monastic churches followed slightly different arrangements of the liturgy.

However, at exequies, both types of churches followed the secular structure of a given region due to the presence of a body.<sup>1</sup> This change of structure did not affect the individual contents of a given Use; if there were different antiphons, psalms, or verses, they were retained.

In 1215, the Fourth Lateran Council issued two canons that regulated the order of St. Benedict. The Benedictines, having been in England centuries before the Conquest, were now held to a more unified office and mass structure, to be shared with their kin in and out of England.<sup>2</sup> However, unlike many other orders, the Benedictines did not (and do not) have a chapter general or a single, international governing body. Rather, the religious houses remained individual parts of a larger whole. As a result, each individual community may have had different arrangements for certain sections of a mass or liturgical hour.

Appendices Two through Seven are compiled orders of a given mass or liturgical hour. This is to illustrate the differences and similarities among Uses employed in medieval England, particularly as they touch funerary ceremonies. Some Uses have additional psalms or verses at certain points in the liturgy; white space will mark places that lack parallel data for a Use. The sources selected for this purpose aim to predate the English Reformation for obvious reasons. John Wickham Legg's edition of the *Missale ad Usam Ecclesie Wesmonasteriensis* was collated from several medieval texts. Westminster Abbey MS 37 *Lytlington Missal* (also referred to as the *Westminster Missal* in some texts) was compiled sometime between 1362

---

<sup>1</sup> John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: a Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 86, 97, 105.

<sup>2</sup> Richard Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 157.

and 1386, the beginning and end of Nicholas Lytlington's tenure as Abbot of Westminster.<sup>3</sup> Bodleian MS Rawlinson 425 C<sup>1</sup> and a psalter now identified as BL Royal MS 2 A XXII were also used by Legg to collate the *Missale*. They were identified as being part of the Abbey's library in the inventory of 1540.<sup>5</sup> However, they were extant during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Legg's edition of *The Sarum Missal* was based on the earliest known copies of the 1220s second recension of the rite. His original aim was to create a Sarum missal that reflected its contents prior to the printing press.<sup>6</sup> Among these were the Crawford Missal, which dates to the mid-thirteenth century and is the earliest known copy of Sarum text.<sup>7</sup> Two other manuscripts - Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal MS 135, and Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria MS 2565 - date from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and were collated with the Crawford Missal. *Breviarium ad Usum Insignis Ecclesiae Sarum*, edited by Francis Proctor and Christopher Wordsworth, was an effort to recreate the Great Breviary of 1531, published originally by Chevallon and Regnault, Paris.<sup>8</sup> Although this is later than most of the other sources included here, it was created before the English Reformation and supplies many of the variations for the Sarum entries in Appendices Two through Seven. The early dates of the three missal manuscripts and the very late date of *Breviarium* cover the entire span of pre-Reformation England in this thesis.

The pre-Tridentine Roman Rite was the mother rite, from which all others came. Additionally, the Franciscans used the Roman Rite in their portable breviaries; they did not

---

<sup>3</sup> *Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, i, edited by John Wickham Legg. Henry Bradshaw Society, 1 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), v.

<sup>4</sup> See Chapter I, 16-17 for more information about the illuminated manuscripts credited to the Westminster Abbey.

<sup>5</sup> *Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, i, xii.

<sup>6</sup> *The Sarum Missal Edited from Three Early Manuscripts*, edited by John Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916), i.

<sup>7</sup> See Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England*, 394-395.

<sup>8</sup> Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England*, 425-426; *Breviarium ad Usum Insignis Ecclesiae Sarum*, edited by Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth, 3 volumes (Canterbury: Canterbury University Press, 1879-1886).



have their own Use like the Benedictines or the Dominicans. Two texts were used for the Roman Rite elements of the appendices: an early print edition of *Breviarium Romanum*<sup>9</sup> from 1474 and the *Missale Romanum, Medioani 1474*,<sup>10</sup> published by the Henry Bradshaw Society. The Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève holds the *Breviarium Romanum* and has digitized it, using full-page scans of the original text.

The Uses of specific orders must be considered as well. Hyde Abbey, Winchester, was home to a Benedictine monastic community prior to the Reformation. Its breviary, c. 1300, was published by the Henry Bradshaw Society, drawn from two books from Hyde's library, Bodleian MS Rawlinson Liturg E 1 and Bodleian MS Gough Liturg 8.<sup>11</sup> The Benedictines had a great attachment to their offices and hours, due to the strict scheduling built into their monastic lives. As such, it was very easy to find the Office of the Dead, but more challenging to find the seasonal variations of the Mass of the Blessed Virgin. *The Hyde Breviary*, *The Bec Missal*,<sup>12</sup> and the *Missal of Robert Junieges*<sup>13</sup> offered the standard mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary but with incomplete orders of mass for the season of Advent, the time between the Nativity and the Purification of the Virgin, and Eastertide. Greater emphasis is placed on the hours of the Virgin, or the Little Office. There were chapter masses said for the Virgin as well, but these are not the votive masse that would have been said at a funeral in secular company. It is with the *Ordinale of the Holy Trinity at Fecamp*, c. 1030-1219, that the votive masses are written out more fully.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *Breviarium Romanum* (Turin, Italy: Johannes Fabri and Johanninus det Petro for Pantaleone da Confienza, 1474), last accessed 12 May 2016 <https://archive.org/details/OEXV356>.

<sup>10</sup> *Missale Romanum, Mediolani 1474*, i, edited by Robert Lippe. Henry Bradshaw Society, 17 (London: 1899). The original manuscript is held in the Ambrosian Library at shelf mark SQN III.4.

<sup>11</sup> *The Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey, Winchester: MSS Rawlinson Liturg. E. 1\* and Gough Liturg 8, in the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, i, edited by J.B.L Tollhurst. Henry Bradshaw Society, 69 (London: 1932). See also Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England*, 220-221.

<sup>12</sup> *The Bec Missal*, edited by Dom Anselm Hughes. Henry Bradshaw Society, 94 (Leighton Buzzard: 1963).

<sup>13</sup> *The Missal of Robert of Junieges*, edited by H.A. Wilson. Henry Bradshaw Society 11 (London: 1896).

<sup>14</sup> *The Ordinal of the Abbey of the Holy Trinity Fecamp*, ii, edited by David Chadd. Henry Bradshaw Society, 112 (London: 2002), with the votive masses on 727.

The last breviaries to be considered here are those of Dominican origin. Unlike other orders, the Dominican breviary stood unaltered for long stretches of time. In 1551, the General Chapter of Salamanca changed the contents of both Matins and Feasts of Nine Lessons. The next change to the Dominican Use came with the reforms of Vatican II in the 1960s. Again, these reforms changed elements that medieval participants would have recognized. As such, breviaries that pre-date these changes are critical. The Breviary of Alphonso V of Aragon, c. 1436-1443, is a manuscript source.<sup>15</sup> The *Missale Ordinis Praedicatorum* from 1483,<sup>16</sup> the *Breviarium Praedicatorum* from c. 1477,<sup>17</sup> and the *Diurnal Fratrum Praedicatorum* from c. 1490-1491<sup>18</sup> are all incunabula from the third quarter of the fifteenth century. The *Missale Ordinis Praedicatorum* is housed at the Universiteitsbibliotheek, Ghent. It has no pagination, but it is fully digitized. On the digital counter, the Mass of Requiem begins on 594. The Bayerische Staats Bibliothek has digitized the *Breviarium Praedicatorum* and the *Diurnal Fratrum Praedicatorum*. These items are displayed online with full-page scans, but without pagination by original or modern hands. The Office of the Dead from the *Breviarium* begins on the digital page 412# (#indicating verso) and runs to 415#. The Office of the Dead from the *Diurnal* runs from 260# to 271#.

The sources are not exhaustive. In the future, each one of the Uses could be more thoroughly explored and dissected. However, in the present work, they serve to illustrate the diversity of the English liturgy during the period of 1216-1509, particularly as it related to the Office of the Dead and the votive masses offered for the deceased.

---

<sup>15</sup> BL Additional MS 28962, c. 1436-1443.

<sup>16</sup> *Missale Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Venice: Nicholai de Frankfordia, 1484), last accessed 12 May 2016, <https://books.google.be/books?vid=GENT900000177833>

<sup>17</sup> *Breviarium Fratrum Praedicatorum* (Venice: Franz Renner and Petrus de Bartua, 1477-1478) <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00036179/images/>

<sup>18</sup> *Diurnale Fratrum Praedicatorum*, (Venice: Andreas Torresanus, 1490-1491), last accessed 12 May 2016, <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00035739/images/>.

In agreement with Roman Rite
Westminster variation
Sarum variation
Benedictine variation
Dominican variation

If one or more variations concur yet disagree with Rome, geographical Use is given precedence over monastic Uses and Westminster.

Monastic uses are given precedence over Westminster (i.e., if the Benedictine and Westminster Uses concur, they will be encoded to the Benedictine variation).

	Benedictine	Dominican	Roman Rite	Sarum	Westminster
Antiphon	Placebo domino in regione vivorum	Placebo domino in regione vivorum	Placebo domino in regione vivorum	Placebo domino in regione vivorum	Placebo domino in Regione vivorum
Psalm	Psalm 114: Dilexi	Psalm 114: Dilexi	Psalm 114: Dilexi	Psalm 114: Dilexi	Psalm 114: Dilexi
Antiphon	Heu me quia incolatus	Heu me quia incolatus	Heu me quia incolatus	Heu me quia incolatus	Heu me quia incolatus
Psalm	Psalm 119: Ad dominum	Psalm 119: Ad dominum	Psalm 119: Ad dominum	Psalm 119: Ad dominum	Psalm 119: Ad dominum
Antiphon	Dominus custodit te	Dominus custodit te	Dominus custodit te	Dominus custodit te	Dominus custodit te
Psalm	Psalm 120: Levavi	Psalm 120: Levavi	Psalm 120: Levavi	Psalm 120: Levavi	Psalm 120: Levavi
Antiphon	Si iniquitates observaveris	Si iniquitates observaveris	Si iniquitates observaveris	Si iniquitates observaveris	Si iniquitates observaveris domine
Psalm	Psalm 129: De profundis	Psalm 129: De profundis	Psalm 129: De profundis	Psalm 129: De profundis	Psalm 129: De profundis
Antiphon	Opera manuum tuarem	Opera manuum tuarem	Opera manuum tuarem	Opera manuum tuarem	Opera manuum tuarum
Psalm	Psalm 137: Confitebor	Psalm 137: Confitebor	Psalm 137: Confitebor	Psalm 137: Confitebor	Psalm 137: Confitebor
Versus	A porta inferi	Requiem eternam	Requiem eternam	A porta inferi	Requiem eternam
Response	Erue domine	Et lux	Et lux	Erue domine	Et lux
Antiphon	Tuam deus deposcimus pietatem	Audivi vocem de caelo	Audivi vocem de caelo	Audivi vocem de caelo	Audivi vocem de caelo
Psalm	Magnificat	Magnificat	Magnificat	Magnificat	Magnificat
	Pater noster	Pater noster	Pater Noster	Pater noster et Ave Maria	Pater noster
Oracio	Deus cui proprium est miserere	(prayer pending identity of person)	(prayer pending identity of person)	Fidelium Deus	Deus cui proprium est miserere
Oracio	Audiva nos domine deus noster et beatissime (for the king)			Inclina domine aurem tuam	Inclina domine aurem tuam
<i>Pro corpore praesenti</i>				Deus cui proprium est miserere	
<i>In anniversariis</i>	Deus indulgenciarium	Deus indulgenciarium	Deus venie largitor et humane	Deus indulgenciarium	Deus indulgenciarium
Psalm	Psalm 145: Lauda anima mea	Psalm 145: Lauda anima mea	Psalm 145: Lauda anima mea	Psalm 145: Lauda anima mea	Psalm 145: Lauda anima mea
Psalm	Psalm 142: Voce mea				Psalm 142: Voce mea
Versus	Requiem Eternam	Requiem Eternam	Requiem Eternam	Requiem Eternam	Requiem Eternam
Versus	A porta inferi	A porta inferi	A porta inferi	A porta inferi	A Porta inferi
Collecta/Responsa		Requiescant in pace	Requiescant in pace		Exultabunt
Versus		Domine exaudio	Domine exaudio	Credo videre bona	
Responsa			Et clamor	Non intres in iudicium	
Oracio		Deus venie largitor et humane	Deus venie largitor et humane	Suscipe domine servum	
		Fidelium Deus			
		Requiescant in pace			

In agreement with Roman Rite
Westminster variation
Sarum variation
Benedictine variation
Dominican variation

If one or more variations concur yet disagree with Rome, geographical Use is given precedence over monastic Uses and Westminster.

Monastic uses are given precedence over Westminster (i.e., if the Benedictine and Westminster Uses concur, they will be encoded to the Benedictine variation).

	Benedictine	Dominican	Roman Rite	Sarum	Westminster
Antiphona	Dirige domine deus meus in conspectu	Dirige domine deus meus in conspectu	Dirige domine deus meus in conspectu	Dirige domine deus meus in conspectu	Dirige domine deus meus in conspectu
Psalm	Psalm 5: Verba mea	Psalm 5: Verba mea	Psalm 5: Verba mea	Psalm 5: Verba mea	Psalm 5: Verba mea
<i>Alt</i>		<i>Psalm 6: Domine ne</i>			
Antiphona	Convertere domine et eripe animam meam	Convertere domine et eripe animam meam	Convertere domine et eripe animam meam	Convertere domine et eripe animam meam	Convertere domine et eripe animam meam
Psalm	Psalm 6: Domine ne	<i>Psalm 7:2 Domine deus meus in te speravi</i>	Psalm 6: Domine ne	Psalm 6: Domine ne	Psalm 6: Domine ne
<i>Alt</i>		Psalm 6: Domine ne			
Antiphona	Nequando rapiat ut leo animam meam	Nequando rapiat ut leo animam meam	Nequando rapiat ut leo animam meam	Nequando rapiat ut leo animam meam	Nequando rapiat ut leo animam meam
Psalm	Psalm 7: Domine deus	<i>Psalm 7:4 Domine deus meus si feci istud</i>	Psalm 7: Domine deus	Psalm 7: Domine deus	Psalm 7: Domine deus
<i>Alt</i>		Psalm 7: Domine deus			
Versus	Requiem eternam dona eis	A porta in feri	A porta inferi	A porta inferi	Requiem eternam dona eis
Responsa	Et lux perpetua luceat eis	Erue domine animas eorum	Erue domine animas eorum	Erue domine animas eorum	Et lux perpetua luceat eis
	Pater Noster	Pater Noster	Pater Noster	Pater Noster	Pater Noster
Leccio I	Job 7:16: Parce mihi Domine	Job 7:16: Parce mihi Domine	Job 7:16: Parce mihi Domine	Job 7:16: Parce mihi Domine	Job 7:16: Parce mihi Domine
Responsa	Credo quod redemptor meus vivit	Credo quod redemptor meus vivit	Credo quod redemptor meus vivit	Credo quod redemptor meus vivit	Credo que redemptor meus vivit
Versus	Quem visurus sum ego	Que visurus sum ego	Quem visurus sum ego ipse	Quem visurus sum ego ipse	Quem visurus sum ego ipse
Lectio II	Job 10:1-7: Tedet animam	Job 10:1-7: Tedet animam	Job 10:1-7: Tedet animam	Job 10:1-7: Tedet animam	Job 10:1-7: Tedet animam
Responsa	Qui Lazarum resuscitasti	Qui Lazarum resuscitasti	Qui Lazarum resuscitasti	Qui Lazarum resuscitasti	Qui Lazarum resuscitasti
Versus	Requiem eternam dona eis domine	Qui ventures est iudicare vivos et mortuos	Qui ventures est iudicare vivos et mortuos	Qui ventures est iudicare vivos et mortuos	Requiem eternam dona eis domine
Lectio III	Job 10:8-12 Manus tuae	Job 10:8-12 Manus tuae	Job 10:8-12 Manus tuae	Job 10:8-12 Manus tuae	Job 10:8-12 Manus tuae
Responsa	Domine quando veneris	Domine quando veneris	Domine quando veneris	Domine quando veneris	Domine quando veneris
Versus	Commissa mea pavesco	Commissa mea pavesco	Commissa mea pavesco	Commissa mea pavesco	Commissa mea pavesco
Antiphona	In loco pascue ibi me collocavit	In loco pascue ibi me collocavit	In loco pascue ibi me collocavit	In loco pascue ibi me collocavit	In loco pascue ibi me collocavit
Psalm	Psalm 22: Dominus regit	Psalm 22: Dominus regit	Psalm 22: Dominus regit	Psalm 22: Dominus regit	Psalm 22: Dominus regit
Antiphona	Delicta juventutis	Delicta juventutis	Delicta juventutis	Delicta juventutis	Delicta juventutis
Psalm	Psalm 24: Ad te domine	Psalm 24: Ad te domine	Psalm 24: Ad te domine	Psalm 24: Ad te domine	Psalm 24: Ad te domine
<i>Psalma longa</i>		<i>Psalm 26: Dominus illuminatio</i> Requiescat in pace			
Antiphona	Credo videre bona	Credo videre bona Domini in terra	Credo videre bona Domini in terra	Credo videre bona Domini in terra	Videam domine voluntatem
Psalm	Psalm 26: Dominus illuminatio	Psalm 26: Dominus illuminatio	Psalm 26: Dominus illuminatio	Psalm 26: Dominus illuminatio	Psalm 26: Dominus illuminatio
Versus	Anima mea turbata est valde	In memoria aeterna erit Justus	Collocet eum dominus cum principibus	In memoria aeterna erit Justus	Anima mea turbata est valde
Responsa	Sed tu domine usquequo	Ne mala non timebunt	Cum principibus populi sui pater nost	Ab auditione mala non timebit	Sed tu domine usquequo
Leccio IV	Job 13:22-28: Responde Michi	Job 13:22-28: Responde Michi	Job 13:22-28: Responde Michi	Job 13:23: quanta habeo iniquitates	Job 13:22-28: Responde Michi
Responsa	Subvenite sancti dei occurrite angeli	Heu michi domine quia peccavi	Memento mei deus quia ventus est vita	Heu michi domine quia peccavi	Subvenite sancti dei occurrite
Versus	Requiem eternam dona eis domine	Anima mea turbata est valde	De profundis	Anima mea turbata est valde	Requiem eternam dona eis
Leccio V	Job 14:1-6 Homo natus	Job 14:1-6 Homo natus	Job 14:1-6 Homo natus	Job 14:1-6 Homo natus	Job 14:1-6 Homo natus
Responsa	Heu michi domine quia peccavi	Ne recorderis peccata mea Domine	Heu michi	Ne recorderis peccata mea Domine	Heu michi domine quia peccavi
Versus	Anima mea turbata est valde	Dirige domine deus meus in conspectu	Anima mea turbata est valde	Dirige domine deus meus in conspectu	Anima mea turbata est valde
Leccio VI	Job 14:13-16: quis michi hoc	Job 14:13-16: quis michi hoc	Job 14:13-16: quis michi hoc	Job 14:13-16: quis michi hoc	Job 14:13-16: quis michi hoc
Responsa	Ne recorderis peccata mea	Domine secundum actum	Ne recorderis peccata mea	Domine secundum actum	Libera me domine de viis inferni
Versus	Non intres a iudicium	Amplius lava me Deus ab injusticia	Dirige domine deus meus in conspectu	Amplius lava me Deus ab injusticia	Clamantes et dicentes advenisti redemptor
<i>Alternative</i>					R: Ne recorderis peccata mea domine V: Non intres in iudicium cum servis tuis
Antiphona	Complaceat tibi domine ut eripias	Complaceat tibi domine ut eripias	Complaceat tibi domine ut eripias	Complaceat tibi domine ut eripias	Complaceat tibi domine ut eripias
Psalm	Psalm 39: Expectans	Psalm 39: Expectans	Psalm 39: Expectans	Psalm 39: Expectans	Psalm 39: Expectans
Antiphona	Sana domine animam	Sana domine animam	Sana domine animam	Sana domine animam	Tu autem domine
Psalm	Psalm 40: Beatus qui intelligit	Psalm 40: Beatus qui intelligit	Psalm 40: Beatus qui intelligit	Psalm 40: Beatus qui intelligit	Psalm 40: Beatus qui intelligit
Antiphona	Situit anima mea ad deum	Situit anima mea ad deum	Situit anima mea ad deum	Situit anima mea ad deum	Situit anima mea ad deum
Psalm	Psalm 41: Quemadmodum	Psalm 41: Quemadmodum	Psalm 41: Quemadmodum	Psalm 41: Quemadmodum	Psalm 41: Quemadmodum
Versus	Credo videre bona domini	Ne tradas bestiis	Ne tradas bestiis	Requiem eternam	Audivi vocem de caelo dicentem
Responsa	In terra viventium	Et animas	Et animas	Et lux	
Lectio VII	Job 17:1-3; 11-15: Spiritus meus	Job 17:1: Spiritus meus attenuabitur	Job 17:1: Spiritus meus attenuabitur	Job 17:1: Spiritus meus attenuabitur	Job 17:1: Spiritus meus attenuabitur
Responsa	Peccantem me cotidie	Peccantem me quotidie et non poenitentem	Peccantem me cotidie	Peccantem me quotidie et non poenitentem	Peccantem me cotidie et non poenitentem
Versus	De profundis clamavi	Deus in nomine tuo salvum	Deus in nomine tuo salvum	Deus in nomine tuo salvum	Deus in nomine tuo salvum
Lectio VIII	Job 19:20-27: Pelli meae	Job 19:20: Pelli meae consumptis	Job 19:20: Pelli meae consumptis	Job 19:20: Pelli meae consumptis	Job 19:20: Pelli meae consumptis
Responsa	Domine secundum actum meum	Memento mei deus	Domine secundum actum meum	Requiem aeternam dona eis	Domine secundum actum meum
Versus	Quoniam iniquitatem	Et non revertetur oculus meus ut videat bona	Amplius lava me domine	Qui Lazarum resuscitasti	Amplius lava me domine
Leccio IX	Job 10:18-22: Quare de vulva	Job 10:18: Quare de vulva eduxisti me	Job 10:18: Quare de vulva eduxisti me	Job 10:18: Quare de vulva eduxisti me	Job 10:18: Quare de vulva eduxisti me
Responsa	Libera me domine	Libera me domine	Libera me domine	Libera me domine	Memento mei deus quia ventus
Versus	Audivi vocem de caelo dicentem	Dies illa dies irae calamitatis	Clamantes et dicentes	Dies illa dies irae calamitatis	Et non revertetur oculus meus

	Benedictine	Dominican	Roman Rite	Sarum	Westminster
Versus			Quando caeli movendi		
Responsa		Quid ergo miserrimus quid dicam	Dies ille	Quid ergo miserrimus quid dicam	Libera me domine (alternative)
Versus		Nunc Christe te petimus miserere	Dum veneris	Nunc christe te petimus miserere	Tu dixisti domine peccantem
Versus		Creator omnium rerum	Requiem eterna	Creatorum omnium rerum	Nunc Christe te petimus miserere quesumus
		Libera me domine	Libera me domine		Parce fili dei parce quia credo
Psalm	Psalm 119: Ad dominum cum tribularer				Audivi vocem de caelo dicentem
Psalm	Psalm 141 Voce mea				Psalm 119: Ad dominum cum tribularer
Versus	Requiem eternam dona eis domine				Psalm 141 Voce mea
Versus	A porta inferi				Requiem eternam dona eis
					A porta inferi

In agreement with Roman Rite
Westminster variation
Sarum variation
Benedictine variation
Dominican variation

If one or more variations concur yet disagree with Rome, geographical Use is given precedence over monastic Uses and Westminster.  
 Monastic uses are given precedence over Westminster (i.e., if the Benedictine and Westminster Uses concur, they will be encoded to the Benedictine variation).

	Benedictine	Dominican	Roman	Sarum	Westminster
Antiphona	Exultabunt Domina ossa	Exultabunt Domina ossa	Exultabunt Domina ossa	Exultabunt Domina ossa	Exultabunt Domina ossa
Psalm	Psalm 50: Miserere mei, Deus	Psalm 50: Miserere mei, Deus	Psalm 50: Miserere mei, Deus	Psalm 50: Miserere mei, Deus	Psalm 50: Miserere mei, Deus
Antiphona	Exaudi domine orationem	Exaudi domine orationem	Exaudi domine orationem	Exaudi domine orationem	Exaudi domine orationem
Psalm	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus Deus in Sion	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus Deus in Sion	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus Deus in Sion	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus Deus in Sion	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus Deus in Sion
Antiphona	Me suscepit dextera tua	Me suscepit dextera tua	Me suscepit dextera tua	Me suscepit dextera tua	Me suscepit dextera tua
Psalm	Psalm 62: Deus Deus meus ad te de luce	Psalm 62: Deus Deus meus ad te de luce	Psalm 62: Deus Deus meus ad te de luce	Psalm 62: Deus Deus meus ad te de luce	Psalm 62: Deus Deus meus ad te de luce
<i>Alt Psalm</i>	Psalm 66: Deus misereatur nostri et benedicat	Psalm 66: Deus misereatur nostri et benedicat			
Antiphona	Eruisti domine animam meam	A porta inferi, erue Domine	A porta inferi, erue Domine	A porta inferi, erue Domine	Eruisti domine animam meam
Psalm	Isaiah 38: Ego dixi in dimidio dierum meorum	Isaiah 38: Ego dixi in dimidio dierum meorum	Isaiah 38: Ego dixi in dimidio dierum meorum	Isaiah 38: Ego dixi in dimidio dierum meorum	Isaiah 38: Ego dixi in dimidio dierum meorum
Antiphona	Omnis spiritus laudet	Omnis spiritus laudet	Omnis spiritus laudet	Omnis spiritus laudet	Omnis spiritus laudet
Psalm	Psalm 148: Laudate	Psalm 148: Laudate	Psalm 148: Laudate	Psalm 148: Laudate	Psalm 148: Laudate
Versus	In memoria eterna erit justus	Benedictus	Audivi voce de caelo dicentes	Requiem Eternam	Requiem Eternam
Responsa	Ab auditione mala non timebit		Beati mortui		
Antiphona	Ego sum resurrection et vita	Ego sum resurrection et vita	Ego sum resurrection et vita	Ego sum resurrection et vita	Omne quod dat michi pater
Psalm	Benedictus	Benedictus	Benedictus	Benedictus	Benedictus
	Pater Noster	Pater Noster	Pater noster	Pater Noster	Pater Noster
Psalm	Psalm 129: De profundis	Psalm 129: De profundis	Psalm 129: De profundis	Psalm 144: Exaltabo	Psalm 129: De profundis
Psalm	Psalm 141: Voce mea	Psalm 145: Lauda anima mea			Psalm 141: Voce mea
Versus	Requiem Eternam			Requiem Eternam	Requiem Eternam
Responsa	Et lux perpetua luceat eis			Et lux perpetua luceat eis	Et lux perpetua luceat eis
Versus	A porta inferi	A porta inferi	A porta inferi	A porta inferi	A porta inferi
			Requiescant in pace	Credo videre bona Domini	
		Domine exaudi	Domine exaudi	In ventium	
			Et clamor		

	In agreement with Roman Rite
	Westminster variation
	Sarum variation
	Benedictine variation
	Dominican variation

If one or more variations concur yet disagree with Rome, geographical Use is given precedence over monastic Uses and Westminster.

Monastic uses are given precedence over Westminster (i.e., if the Benedictine and Westminster Uses concur, they will be encoded to the Benedictine variation).

Season	Order of Mass	Benedictine	Dominican	Roman	Sarum	Westminster	
Advent	Officium/Introitus	Rorate caeli desuper	Rorate caeli desuper	Rorate caeli desuper	Rorate caeli desuper	Rorate caeli desuper	
	Psalm	Isaiah 45:8 -- Et justicia oriatur	Isaiah 45:8 -- Et justicia oriatur	Isaiah 45:8 -- Et justicia oriatur	Isaiah 45:8 -- Et justicia oriatur	Isaiah 45:8 -- Et justicia oriatur	
	Oratio	Deus qui de beate marie virginis utero	Deus qui de beate marie virginis utero	Deus qui de beate marie virginis utero	Deus qui de beate marie virginis utero	Deus qui de beate marie virginis utero	
	versus		Credimus eius apud te intercessionibus				
	Leccio	Isaiah 11:1-5	Isaiah 7:10-15	Isaiah 7:10-15	Isaiah 7:10-15	Isaiah 11:1-5	
	Gradale	Tollite Portas	In sole posuit tabernaculum	Tollite Portas	Tollite Portas	In sole posuit tabernaculum	
	Versus	Quis ascendet	a summo caelo egressio eius	Quis ascendet in montem domini	Quis ascendet in montem domini	A summo caelo egressio eius	
	Alleluia						
	Versus	Diffusas est gracia	Virga Jesse floruit	Ave Maria gracia plena	Ave Maria gracia plena	Ave Maria gracia plena	
	Sequencia				Mittit ad virginem Missus Gabriel de caelis		
	Evangelium	Luke 1:26-38	Luke 1:26-38	Luke 1:26-38	Luke 1:26-38	Luke 1:26-38	
	Offertorium	Ave Maria gracia plena dominus tecum	Ave Maria gracia plena dominus tecum	Ave Maria gracia plena dominus tecum	Ave Maria gracia plena dominus tecum	Ave Maria gracia plena dominus tecum	
	Secretorum	Intercession quesuus domine Beate Marie In mentibus nostris quesumus	In mentibus nostris quesumus	In mentibus nostris quesumus	In mentibus nostris quesumus	Deus qui filium tuum pro nostra	
	Prefacio		Et te in veneracione beate marie		Et te in veneracione beate marie	Et te in veneracione beate Marie	
	Communio	Ecce Virgo concipiet	Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet	Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet	Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet	Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet	
	Postcommunio	Celesti munere saciati quesumus omnipotens Graciam tuam quesumus domine	Graciam tuam quesumus domine	Graciam tuam quesumus domine	Graciam tuam quesumus domine	Sumptum quesumus domine	
	Christmas	Officium	Salve sancta parens	Salve Sancta parens enixa puerperal Regem	Vultum tuum deprecabuntur omnes	Vultum tuum deprecabuntur omnes	Salve sancta parens
		Psalm	Gloria	Postpartum virgo inviolate	Eructavit cor meum verbum. Amen.	Eructavit cor meum verbum. Amen.	Quia concupivit rex speciem
		Oratio	Deus qui salutis eterne beate marie	Deus qui salutis eterne beate marie	Deus qui salutis eterne beate marie	Deus qui salutis eterne beate marie	Deus qui salutis eterne beate marie
		Epistola	Titus 3:4-7	Titus 3:4-7	Titus 3:4-7	Titus 3:4-7	Galatians 4:3-7
Gradale		Benedicta et venerabilis	Benedicta et venerabilis	Speciosus forma	Speciosus forma	Benedicta et venerabilis es virgo	
Versus		Virgo Dei genitrix	Virgo dei genitrix quem totus non capit orbis	Eructavit cor meum verbum. Amen.	Eructavit cor meum verbum. Amen.	Virgo Dei genitrix	
Versus			Virgo Jess Floruit	Post partum virgo inviolate permanisti	Post partum virgo inviolate permanisti	Per te dei genitrix nobis est vira perdita data	
Sequencia					Laetabundus		
Alleluia		Alleluia	Gaude Maria virgo cunctas hereses				
Versus		Post Partum	Quae gabrielis archengli dictis credidisti				
Versus			Du virgo Deum hominem genuisti et post partum				
Versus			Dei genitrix intercede pro nobis				
Evangelium		Luke 2:15-20	Luke 2:15-20	Luke 2:15-20	Luke 2:15-20	Luke 2:33-35	
Alternatives						Luke 2:15-20 Matthew 21:4	
Offertorium		Felix namque es sacra virga	Felix namque es sacra virga	Felix namque es sacra virga	Offerentur regi virgines	Felix namque es sacra virga	
Secretum	Muneribus nostris quesumus domine Suscipe domine sacrificum placationis	Muneribus nostris quesumus domine	Muneribus nostris quesumus domine	Oblatis domine muneribus suppliciter Muneribus nostris quesumus	Oblatis domine muneribus suppliciter		
Prefacio		Quia per incarnate		Quia per incarnate	Quia per incarnate		
Communio	Beata viscera Marie virginis	Beata viscera Marie virginis	Beata viscera Marie virginis	Diffusa est gracia in labiis tuis	Beata viscera Marie virginis		
Postcommunio	Hec nos communio domine purget Liber nos ab omni malo	Hec nos communio domine purget	Hec nos communio domine purget	Da quesumus misericors deus Hec nos communio domine purget	Veram verbi tui omnipotens pater		
Paschali	Officium	Salve sancta parens	Salve sancta parens enixa puerperal	Salve sancta parens enixa puerperal	Salve sancta parens enixa puerperal	Salve sancta parens	
	Psalm				Benedicta in mulieribus		
	Oratio	Concede nos famulos tuos	Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus	Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus	Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus	Graciam tuam quesumus domine	
	Leccio	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	
	Responsa (before Easter)	Benedicta et venerabilis	Benedicta et venerabilis es virgo maria				
	Alleluia (after Easter)						
	Versus	Post partum virgo inviolate Per Te Dei Genitrix Virga Jesse floruit	Virgo dei genitrix que totus non capit orbis in tua Virgo Jesse floruit			Post partum virgo inviolate Per Te Dei Genitrix	
	Evangelium	Luke 11:27-28 OR John 19:25-27	John 19:25-27 (Easter to Pentecost only)	John 19:25-27	John 19:25-27	John 19:25-27	
	Offertorium	Felix namque es	Recordare virgo mater	Beata es virgo maria que omnium portasti	Felix namque	Felix namque	
	Secretum	Tua domine propiciatione	Tua domine propiciatione	Tua domine propiciatione	Tua domine propiciatione	Accepta tibi sit quesumus domine	
	Prefacio	Licet enim castitas Majestatem tuam Quia felix et gloriosa	Et te in veneracione		Et te veneracione		
	Communio	Beata viscera	Ave regina caelorum mater regis angelorum	Beata viscera	Beata viscera	Beata viscera	

	In agreement with Roman Rite
	Westminster variation
	Sarum variation
	Benedictine variation
	Dominican variation

If one or more variations concur yet disagree with Rome, geographical Use is given precedence over monastic Uses and Westminster.

Monastic uses are given precedence over Westminster (i.e., if the Benedictine and Westminster Uses concur, they will be encoded to the Benedictine variation).

Season	Order of Mass	Benedictine	Dominican	Roman	Sarum	Westminster
	Communio				Vera fides genitis purgavit	
	Postcommunio	Sumptis domine salutis nostre subsidiis	Sumptis domine salutis nostrae subsidiis da	Sumptis domine salutis nostre subsidiis	Sumptis domine salutis nostre subsidiis	Beate et gloriose dei genitricis
Rest of the year	Officium	Salve sancta parens enixa puerperal	Salve sancta parens enixa puerperal	Salve sancta parens enixa puerperal	Salve sancta parens enixa puerperal	Salve sancta parens enixa puerperal
	Psalm	Benedicta tu in mulieribus et benedictus	Postpartum virgo inviolate	Virgo dei genitrix quem totus non	Benedicta in mulieribus	Quia concupiit rex speciem Benedicta tu in mulieribus
	<i>Psalm (in commemoracionibus)</i>					
	Oracio	Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus	Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus	Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus	Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus	Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus
	Leccio	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16	Ecclesiastes 24:14-16
	Leccio					Ezekiel 44
	Gradale	Benedicta et venerabilis es virgo maria	Benedicta et venerabilis es virgo maria	Benedicta et venerabilis es virgo maria	Benedicta et venerabilis es virgo maria	Benedicta et venerabilis es virgo maria
	Versus	Virgo dei genitrix	Virgo dei genitrix	Virgo dei genitrix	Virgo dei genitrix	Virgo dei genitrix
	Alleluia and versus	Post partum virgo inviolate; Per te dei genitrix nobis est vita	Virgo Jesse floruit Surrexit dominus et occurens mulieribus Ascendens christus in altum capitaum (Easter & Asc)	Virga Jesse floruit, virgo deum et hominem	Post partum. Per te dei genitrix Virgo Jesse floruit Salve virgo mater dei Virtutes caeli te venerantur Optine sacris precibus (and others)	Post partum. Per te dei genitrix
	Responsa	Ave Maria gratia plena dominus				
	Tractus		Gaude Maria virgo cunctas	Gaude Maria virgo cunctas		Gaude Maria virgo cunctas
	Versus			Dum virgo deum et hominem genuisti		Dum virgo deum et hominem genuisti
	Versus		Dei genitrix Que Gabrielis archangeli	Dei genitrix intercede pro nobis		Dei genitrix intercede pro nobis Que gabrielis archangeli
	Evangelium	Luke 11:27-28	Luke 2:15-20	Luke 11:27-28	Luke 11:27-28	Luke 11:27-28
	Alt Evangelium		Luke 11:27-28			John 19:25-27
	Offertorium	Felix namque es sacra virgo maria	Recordare virgo mater	Felix namque es sacra virgo maria	Felix namque es sacra virgo maria	Felix namque es sacra virgo maria Diffusa est gracia in labiis tuis
	Secretum	Tua domine propiciacione	Tua domine propiciacione	Tua domine propiciacione	Tua domine propiciacione	Tua domine propiciacione
	Prefacio	Licet enim castitas Majestatem tuam promis	Et te in veneracion		Et te veneracione	Et te veneracione
	Communio	Alma dei genitrix succurre precantibus	Ave regina caelorum mater regis angelorum	Beata viscera	Beata viscera	Beata viscera
	Alt Communio	Beate viscera			Vera fides genitis purgavit	
	Postcommunio	Sumptis domine salutis nostre subsidiis	Sumptis domine salutis nostrae subsidiis da	Sumptis domine salutis nostre subsidiis	Sumptis domine salutis nostre subsidiis	Sumptis domine salutis nostre subsidiis



	In agreement with Roman Rite
	Westminster variation
	Sarum variation
	Benedictine variation
	Dominican variation

If one or more variations concur yet disagree with Rome, geographical Use is given precedence over monastic Uses and Westminster.

Monastic uses are given precedence over Westminster (i.e., if the Benedictine and Westminster Uses concur, they will be encoded to the Benedictine variation).

	Benedictine Rite	Dominican Rite	Roman Rite	Sarum Rite	Westminster Rite
Oratio	Benedicta sit sancta trinitas....	Benedicta sit sancta trinitas....	Benedicta sit sancta trinitas	Benedicta sit sancta trinitas	Benedicta sit sancta trinitas
Psalm	Benedicamus patrem et filium	Benedicamus patrem et filium	Benedicamus patrem et filium	Benedicamus patrem et filium	Benedicamus patrem et filium
Oratio	Omnipotens sempiterne deus	Omnipotens sempiterne deus	Omnipotens sempiterne deus	Omnipotens sempiterne deus	Omnipotens sempiterne deus
Epistola	II Corinthians 13:13	II Corinthians 13:11-13	II Corinthians 13:11-13	II Corinthians 13:11-13	II Corinthians 13:11-13
Epistola				Romans 11:33-36	
Responsorium/Gradale	Benedictus es domine qui intueris abyssos	Benedictus es domine qui intueris abyssos	Benedictus es domine qui intueris abyssos	Benedictus es domine qui intueris abyssos	Benedictus es domine qui intueris abyssos
Versus	Benedicite deum coeli quia fecit	Benedicite deum coeli quia fecit	Benedicite deum coeli quia fecit	Benedicite deum coeli quia fecit	Benedictus es in firmamento caeli et laudabilis
Alleluia					
Versus	Benedictus es domine deus partum	Benedictus es domine deus partum	Benedictus es domine deus partum	Benedictus es domine deus partum	Benedictus es domine deus partum
		Benedicant te Domine Benedicant te caeli, terra, mare, et Omnia Benedictus es domine deus atrum Surrexit Dominus de sepulchro, de pro nobis Ascendens christus in altum capituum duxit			
<i>Temp Resurr</i>					
<i>Temp Ascens</i>					
Evangelium	John 15:26-16:4	John 15:26-16:4	John 15:26-16:4	John 15:26-16:4	John 15:26-16:4
Offertorium	Benedictus sit deus pater unigenitusque dei		Benedictus sit deus pater unigenitusque dei	Benedictus sit deus pater unigenitusque dei	Benedictus sit deus pater unigenitusque dei
Secreta	Sanctifica quesumus domine per tui sancti	Sanctifica quesumus domine per tui sancti	Sanctifica quesumus domine per tui sancti	Sanctifica quesumus domine per tui sancti	Sanctifica quesumus domine per tui sancti
Prefacio	Qui cum unigenito	Qui cum unigenito	Qui cum unigenito	Qui cum unigenito	Qui cum unigenito
Communio	Benedicimus deum celi et coram omnibus	Benedicimus deum celi et coram omnibus	Benedicimus deum celi et coram omnibus	Benedicimus deum celi et coram omnibus	Benedicimus deum celi et coram omnibus
Postcommunio	Proficiat ad salute corporis et anime domine deus	Proficiat ad salute corporis et anime domine deus	Proficiat ad salute corporis et anime domine deus	Proficiat ad salute corporis et anime domine deus	Proficiat ad salute corporis et anime domine deus

	In agreement with Roman Rite
	Westminster variation
	Sarum variation
	Benedictine variation
	Dominican variation

If one or more variations concur yet disagree with Rome, geographical Use is given precedence over monastic Uses and Westminster.  
 Monastic uses are given precedence over Westminster (i.e., if the Benedictine and Westminster Uses concur, they will be encoded to the Benedictine variation).

Occasion	Order of Mass	Benedictine	Dominican	Roman	Sarum	Westminster
Regular	Officium	Requiem eternam	Requiem eternam	Requiem eternam dona eis domine et lux	Requiem eternam dona eis domine et lux	Requiem eternam dona eis domine et lux
	Alternative				Omnipotens sempiterne Deus (day of burial)	
	Psalmus	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus	Psalm 64: Te decet hymnus
	Versus					
	Oratio	Deus cui proprium	Deus cui proprium	Deus cui proprium (body present)	Deus cui proprium (others for time of year and body present)	Deus cui proprium
	Leccio	Revelation 14:13	Revelation 14:13	I Corinthians 15:51-57	II Maccabees 12:43-46	II Machabees 12:43
	Leccio	I Thess 4:12-17	I Thes 4:12-17	I Thes 4:12-17	Revelation 14:13	Revelation 14:13
	Leccio	Job 19:25-27	II Macabees 12:42-46 (anniversaries only)	II Macabees 12:42-46	I Thess 4:12-17	I Thess 4:12-17
	Leccio	II Machabees 12:42-46		Revelation 14:13	I Corinthians 15:20-22; 49-57	I Corinthians 15:51-57 (Easter only)
	Leccio	I Corinthians 15:51-57				
	<i>Leccio a Paschali solament</i>					Romans 6:9-10 & 4:25.
	Gradale	Si ambulem in medio umbre mortis	Requiem eternam dona eis domine et lux	Requiem eternam dona eis domine et lux	Requiem eternam dona eis domine et lux	Requiem eternam dona eis domine et lux
	Versus	Virga tua et baculus tuus ipsa me consolata	Animae eorum in bonis demorentur	In memoria eterna erit Justus ab	Absolve domine animas eorum	Absolve domine animas eorum
	<i>Gradual for special occasions</i>			Si ambulem in medio (for multiple celebrants) Virga tua et baculus tuus ipsa me consolata	Animae eorum in bonis demorentur Si ambulem in medio umbre mortis (for kings) Virga tua et baculus tuus ipsa me consolata	
	Tractus	De profundis clamavi	Absolve domine animas omnium fidelium	Absolve domine animas omnium fidelium	De profundis clamavi	De profundis clamavi
	Versus	Fiant aures tue intendentes in orationem	Et gratia tua illis succurente mereantur	Et gratia tua illis succurente mereantur	Fiant aures tue intendentes	Fiant aures tue intendentes
	Versus	Si iniquitates observaveris	Et lucis eterne beatiudine perfrui	Et lucis eterne beatiudine perfrui	Si iniquitates observaveris	Si iniquitates observaveris
	Versus	Quia apud te propitiatio est et propter			Quia apud te propiciacio	Quia apud te propiciacio
	<i>Alternative Tractus</i>	Sicut cervus desiderat (if I Thess used)	Sicut cervus desiderat (w/ the alt grad)		Sicut cervus desiderat	
	Versus		Situvit anima mea		Situit anima mea	
	Versus		Fuerit mihi lacrymae		Fuerunt michi lacrimae	
	<i>Alternative Tractus</i>	Qui Lazarum (if Job 19 used)			Commovisti (for kings)	Commovisti (for kings)
	Sequencia					De profundis christe mens humana
	Evangelium	John 11:21-28	John 11:21-28	John 11:21-28	John 11:21-27 (when the body is present)	John 11:21-27 (body is present)
	Evangelium	John 5:21-24	John 6:37-40 (anniversaries only)	John 6:37-40	John 6:37-40	John 6:37-40
	Evangelium	John 5:24-29		John 5:25-29	John 5:24-29	John 5:25-29
	Evangelium/Leccio	John 5:51-55		John 15:51-57	John 5:21-24	John 15:51-57
	Evangelium	John 6:37-40			John 6:35-40 John 6:54-55	
	Offertorium	Domine Jesu Christe rex glorie libera animas	Domine Jesu Christe rex glorie libera animas	Domine Jesu Christe rex glorie libera animas	Domine Jesu Christe rex glorie libera animas	Domine Jesu Christe rex glorie libera animas
	<i>Alternative Off.</i>	O pie deus qui primum hominem (w/ John 5:24-29)			O pie deus	
	<i>Oblacionem</i>	Hostias et preces tibi domine offerimus	Hostias et preces tibi domine offerimus	Hostias et preces tibi domine offerimus	Hostias et preces tibi domine offerimus	Hostias et preces tibi domine offerimus
	<i>Genulflectendo</i>	Quam olim	Quam olim	Quam olim	Tu suscipe pro animabus illis	Tu suscipe pro animabus illis
	Secretum	Propitiare domine quesumus anime		Propitiare quesumus domine anime	Suscipe quesumus misericors pater oblacionem	Suscipe quesumus misericors
	Alternative				Propiciare domine quesumus Suscipe domine pro anima famuli (on day of burial)	
	Communio	Lux eterna luceat eis domine.	Lux eterna luceat eis domine.	Lux eterna luceat eis domine.	Lux eterna luceat eis domine	Lux eterna luceat eis domine
versus	Requiem eternam dona eis	Requiem eternam dona eis	Requiem eternam dona eis	Requiem eternam dona eis	Requiem eternam dona eis	
Communio	Qui es domine requies post laborem (w/ John 5:24-29)			Pro quorum memoria corpus Christi sumitur, dona eis		
versus				Pro quorum memoria sanguis Christi		
Postcommunio	Praesta quaesumus omnipotens	Praesta quaesumus omnipotens	Praesta quaesumus omnipotens	Praesta quaesumus omnipotens	Praesta quaesumus omnipotens	
Alternative				Presta quesumus domine ut anima famuli tui (on day of burial)		
Anniversary	Oratio	Deus indulgentiarum	Deus indulgentiarum	Deus indulgentiarum domine da anime	Deus indulgentiarum domine da anime	Deus indulgentiarum domine da anime
	Secretum	Propitiare domine supplicationibus	Propitiare domine supplicationibus	Propitiare quesumus domine anime	Propitiare quesumus domine anime famuli tui N	Suscipe domine clementissime pater pro
	Postcommunio	Presta domine quesumus ut anima	Presta domine quesumus ut anima	Praesta quaesumus omnipotens	Presta domine quesumus ut anime famulorum	Hiis sacrificiis quesumus omnipotens

**Appendix Eight: Dates of Death and Burial, with Duration of Above Ground Exposure  
(includes day of death and day of burial)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Date of Death</b>	<b>Date of Burial</b>	<b>Duration of Exposure</b>
John	19 October 1216	23 October 1216	5 days
Henry III	16 November 1272	20 November 1272	5 days
Edward I	7 July 1307	27 October 1307	113 days
Edward II	21 September 1327	20 December 1327	91 days
Edward III	21 June 1377	5 July 1377	15 days
Richard II	14 February 1400	6 March 1400	21 days
Henry IV	20 March 1413	by 9 April 1413	<21 days
Henry V	31 August 1422	7 November 1422	69 days
Henry VI	21 May 1471	24 May 1471	4 days
Edward IV	9 April 1483	20 April 1483	12 days
Edward V	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
Richard III	22 August 1485	25 August 1485	4 days
Henry VII	21 April 1509	11 May 1509	21 days

## Appendix Nine: Initial Burial Sites and Agency, 1216-1509

Name	Year of Death	Place(s) of Burial	Site Chosen By
John	1216	Worcester Cathedral (body); Croxtton Abbey (heart and viscera)	Self
Henry III	1272	Westminster Abbey (body); Fontevraud Abbey (heart, 1291)	Self
Edward I	1307	Westminster Abbey	Unknown
Edward II	1327	Gloucester Cathedral (body); Greyfriars (heart, 1358)	Usurper
Edward III	1377	Westminster Abbey	Self
Richard II	1399	King's Langley	Usurper
Henry IV	1413	Canterbury Cathedral	Self
Henry V	1422	Westminster Abbey (body); Saint- Maur-de-Fossés (heart and viscera)	Self
Henry VI	1471	Chertsey Abbey	Usurper
Edward IV	1483	St. George's Chapel, Windsor	Self
Edward V	1483?	Unknown	Unknown
Richard III	1485	Greyfriars, Leicester	Usurper
Henry VII	1509	Westminster Abbey (body and heart)	Self

Appendix Ten: Miracles of Henry VI in Circulation Prior to the  
Battle of Bosworth, 22 August 1485

Miracle #	Date of Onset	Date of Relief	Date of Report	Summary of Event Invoking Henry
1	31 August 1481	31 August 1481	Prior to Translation	Drowned boy resurrected
29	10 June 1484	10 June 1484	7 June 1485	Alice Parkyn saved from devilish weight of sand
30	c. 1474	11 April 1484	By 30 August 1484	Simonitta Pelton regained sight in one eye
31	(ongoing)	25 July 1484	29 August 1484	William Chesshyr regained lost eyeball
32	(ongoing)	22 July 1484	by 31 August 1484	Henry Tukke cured of blindness
33	1484	1484	by 31 August 1484	Agnes Shene found child after fire
34	1483	1 September 1484	1 September 1484	Robert Vertlet healed of lameness at the tomb of Henry
35	unknown	unknown	1 September 1484	Hervius Acke healed of lameness
36	3 days near death	4 days after invocation	1 September 1484	John Hill healed of a fever
37	prior to 1483	8 September 1484	8 September 1484	Henry Walter struck by a catapult at sea during reign of Edward IV, saw apparition of Henry VI, then healed at Henry VI's tomb years later
38	27 April 1484	27 April 1484	8 September 1484	Child Thomas Scott fell out of a tree and died, but the abbess of Burnham invoked Henry to resurrect him
39	1481	1481	8 September 1484	Agnes Alyn freed of 10 days of demonic possession
40	21 July 1484	21 July 1484	11 August 1484	Man survived hanging and testified at Chertsey and Windsor
41	1482	16 September 1484	16 September 1484	Alienora Usband healed at Windsor.
42	unkown	unknown	16 September 1484	John Colman, infant, cured. Father visited Windsor
43	c. March 1484	13 September 1484	13 September 1484	Richard Whytby of Mount St. Michael, after suffering for six months, walked to Windsor and was cured. Unclear whether this is 1484 or 1485
44	13 September 1484	13 September 1484	13 September 1484	Cask of wine broke; Henry stopped the flow. Uncertain whether this is 1484 or 1485
45	prior to 20 March 1485	20 March 1485	Unknown	Joan Walter, age 13, suffered swelling of legs for months, healed by invocation on Palm Sunday. Uncertain whether this is 1485 or 1486.
46	1484	1484	Unknown	Agnes Freeman cured of the King's Evil, parents refusing to take her to Richard III.
47	1471	1478	21 September 1485	Nun suffered with epilepsy for seven years, healed when a fellow nun prayed over her to Henry, came to Windsor seven years thereafter
58	Saturday, 5 October 1476 or 1482	7 October 1476 or 1482	prior to 2 November 1485	Alicia Barbur, possessed and blind, was healed by Henry
74	1481	prior to 12 August 1484	1485	Margaret Tryll healed of the King's Evil while Henry was at Chertsey.
108	24 June 1484	24 June 1484	1485	William Lamhall evaded death during a revolt
123	16 April 1484	22-23 June 1484	23 May 1485	Alicia Smyth had colic for three months til invocation

List of Abbreviations

BL	London, British Library
<i>CChR</i>	<i>Calendar of Charter Rolls</i>
<i>CCR</i>	<i>Calendar of Close Rolls</i>
<i>CFR</i>	<i>Calendar of Fine Rolls</i>
<i>CLR</i>	<i>Calendar of Liberate Rolls</i>
<i>CPR</i>	<i>Calendar of Patent Rolls</i>
<i>A Collection of Ordinances</i>	<i>A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, made in divers reigns</i> , edited by John Nichols. London: John Nichols for the Society of Antiquaries, 1790.
<i>A Collection of Wills</i>	<i>A Collection of All the Wills, Now Known to Be Extant, of the Kings and Queens of England, Princes and Princesses of Wales, and Every Branch of the Blood Royal from the Reign of William the Conqueror to that of Henry the Seventh Exclusive</i> , edited by John Nichols. London: John Nichols for the Society of Antiquaries, 1780.
<i>Foedera</i> (Record Commission)	<i>Foedera, etc.</i> , edited by Thomas Rymer. 4 volumes. London: Record Commission 1816-1869.
<i>Foedera</i> (The Hague)	<i>Foedera, etc.</i> , edited by Thomas Rymer. 10 volumes. The Hague: Johannem Neulme, 1739-1745.
Froissart, <i>Chroniques</i>	Jean Froissart. <i>Chroniques de Jean Froissart</i> , edited by Siméon Luce, et. al. 15 volumes. Société de l'Histoire de France. Paris: 1869-1975.
Froissart, <i>Oeuvres</i>	Jean Froissart. <i>Oeuvres de Jean Froissart, Chroniques</i> , edited by J.M. B.C. Kervyn de Lettenhove. 25 volumes. Brussels: Victor Devaux and Co., 1867-1877.

<i>Issues of the Exchequer</i>	<i>Issues of the Exchequer, Being a Collection of Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue, from King Henry III to King Henry VI, inclusive</i> , edited by Frederick Devon. London: John Murray, 1837.
<i>Liber Regie Capelle</i>	<i>Liber Regie Capelle</i> , edited by Walter Ullman. Henry Bradshaw Society, 92. London: Boydell Press 2010.
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004-2016. Online edition ( <a href="http://www.oxforddnb.com">www.oxforddnb.com</a> ).
PROME	<i>The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England</i> , edited by Chris Given-Wilson (general editor), Paul Brand, Seymour Phillips, W.M. Ormrod, Geoffrey Martin, Anne Curry, and Rosemary Horrox. Leicester: Scholarly Digital Editions and The National Archives, 2005. Online edition ( <a href="http://www.sd-editions.com/PROME">www.sd-editions.com/PROME</a> ).
RS	Rolls Series
SGC	Windsor, St. George's Chapel Archive
TNA	Kew, The National Archives
WAM	London, Westminster Abbey Muniments

## Bibliography

### Unpublished Manuscripts:

Canterbury, Canterbury Cathedral Library

DCc-ChAnt/C/92

London, British Library (BL)

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| Additional MS 6113        | Book of heraldry once belonging to Sir William Detheck   |
| Additional MS 6298        | Collections from Various Sources Respecting the Order of the Garter  |
| Additional MS 7099        | Extracts from the Account Books of Henry VII   |
| Additional MS 18851       | Dominican Breviary of Isabella of Castile  |
| Additional MS 28962       | Dominican Psalter and Hours of Alphonso V  |
| Additional MS 38133       | Sir Thomas Phillips, Collections: genealogical, legal, and historical  |
| Additional MS 45131       | Wriothesley's Heraldic Collections, Volume I   |
| Additional MS 45132       | Wriothesley's Heraldic Collections, Volume II  |
| Additional MS 45133       | Wriothesley's Heraldic Collections, Volume III   |
| Additional MS 46354       | Wriothesley's Heraldic Collections, Volume IV  |
| Arundel MS 26             | Garter Knight MS, once belonging to Sir William Detheck  |
| Cotton MS Cleopatra F III | Acts of the Privy Council, 1389-1421   |
| Cotton MS Galba E XIV     | John of Newbury, Computus of the Household of Isabella, Late Queen of England (30 September 1358 - 4 December 1359)            |
| Cotton MS Faustina A III  | Cartulary of Westminster Abbey   |
| Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII | Miscellaneous Historical and Heraldic Papers   |
| Cotton MS Vitellius F XII | Greyfriars London Register   |
| Egerton MS 2642           | Robert Commaundre, "The Book of Heraldrye and other thinges together with the Order of Coronacions"                            |
| Harley MS 297             | Collection of State Papers (Henry VII-Henry VIII)  |
| Harley MS 433             | Register of Grants   |
| Harley MS 541             | Miscellanea  |
| Harley MS 544             | Miscellanea from Stowe's collection  |
| Harley MS 642             | Basilica Oeconomica, or Several Ordinances Rules & Orders for the government of the Howsehold of the Kings & Queens of England |
| Harley MS 1354            | Heraldic Miscellanea   |
| Harley MS 1440            | Heraldic Miscellanea   |
| Harley MS 1776            | Heraldic Miscellanea   |
| Harley MS 3504            | Treatises of several parts of Heraldry & Creations, with the manner of keeping parliament, &c.                                 |
| Harley MS 4380            | Jean Froissart, <i>Chroniques</i> , Volume IV, Part II   |



Harley MS 6072	Miscellanea
Harley MS 6079	Treatise of Heraldry
Harley MS 6466	Miscellanea copied by Mr. Humphrey Wanley, 1691-1696

## Kew, The National Archives (TNA)

C 1	Court of the Chancery
DL 10	Duchy of Lancaster, Royal Charters
DL 29	Duchy of Lancaster, Accounts of Auditors, Receivers, Feodaries, and Ministers
E 23/3	Exchequer, The Will of Henry VII
E 36/215	Exchequer, The King's Book of Payments (Henry VIII)
E 36/266	Exchequer, The Black Book of the Exchequer
E 101	Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, Accounts Various
E 361	Exchequer, Pipe Office: Enrolled Wardrobe and Household Accounts
E 363	Exchequer, Pipe Office: Exannual Rolls
E 368	Exchequer, Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, Memoranda Rolls
E 403	Exchequer of Receipt: Issue Rolls and Registers
LC 5	Lord Chamberlain's Department, Miscellaneous Records
LC 9	Lord Chamberlain's Department, Accounts and Miscellanea
SC 1	Special Collections: Ancient Correspondences of the Chancery and Exchequer
SP 1	State Papers of Henry VIII

## London, Westminster Abbey Muniments (WAM)

WAM 1692  
 WAM 6300  
 WAM 6318B  
 WAM 6389\*, 6389\*\*, 6389\*\*\*  
 WAM 19664  
 WAM 20344  
 WAM 62481-62485  
 WAM 64922

## Windsor, St. George's Chapel Library (SGC)

SGC MSG/1  
 SGC MSG/2

SGC IVB 3  
 SGC XIX.76.9  
 SGC XVII.61.2  
 SGC 58.C.4

Worcester, Worcester Cathedral Library and Archive

A 147	Sexton's Notebook from 1785-1804
Artefact 5A	John's Thumb
Artefact 5D	Piece of John's Stole
Account Book 274/57	
Additional MS 438	Amalgamation of old manuscripts
B1693	King John's Will

### Legal References

CO/5313/2013: Queen (Plantagenet Alliance) v. Secretary of State for Justice, University of Leicester, and Others

### Broadcasts

*The Return of the King*. Live television broadcast. Leicester, UK. Channel 4, 22 March 2015.

*The Burial of the King*. Live television broadcast. Leicester, UK. Channel 4, 26 March 2015.

### Published Primary Sources:

Adam of Domesday. *Historia de Rebus Gestis Glastoniensibus*, edited by Thomas Hearne. 2 volumes. Oxford: Sheldon Theatre, 1727.

*Annales Monastici*, edited by H.R. Luard. 5 volumes. Rolls Series, 36. London: 1863-1868.

*Antiquarian Repertory*, edited by Francis Grose and Thomas Astle. 4 volumes. London: Edward Jeffrey, 1807-1809.

Baker, Geoffrey le. *Galfridi le Baker de Swynebroke, Chronicon*, edited by Edward Maunde Thompson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.

*Baptism, Marriage, and Burial Registers of St. George's Chapel*, edited by Edmund H.

Fellowes and Elisabeth R. Poyser. Windsor: Oxley and Son for the Dean and Canons of St. George's Chapel in Windsor Castle, 1957.

*The Beaulieu Cartulary*, edited by S.F. Hockley. Southampton Records Series, 17.

Southampton: Southampton University Press, 1974.

*The Bec Missal*, edited by Dom Anselm Hughes. Henry Bradshaw Society, 94. Leighton Buzzard: 1963.

Bicchieri, Cardinal Guala. *Letters and Charters of Cardinal Guala Bicchieri, Papal Legate in England 1216-1218*, edited by Nicholas Vincent. Canterbury and York Society, 83. Woodbridge: 1996.

Blacman, John. *Henry the Sixth: a Reprint of John Blacman's Memoir with Translation and Notes*, edited by M.R. James. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1919.

Blackstone, William. *Commentaries on the Laws of England, Volume I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1765; republished online by the Avalon Project, Lillian Goldman Law Library, 2008. Last accessed 12 May 2016.

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject\\_menus/blackstone.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/blackstone.asp).

*The Book of Common Prayer*. Church of England website edition. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <https://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/book-of-common-prayer/>.

*Breviarium Fratrum Praedicatorum*. Venice: Franz Renner and Petrus de Bartua, 1477-1478. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00036179/images/>.

*Breviarium ad Usus Insignis Ecclesiae Sarum*, edited by Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth. 3 volumes. Canterbury: Canterbury University Press, 1879-1886.

*Breviarium Romanum*. Turin, Italy: Johannes Fabri and Johanninus det Petro for Pantaleone da Confienza, 1474. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <https://archive.org/details/OEXV356>.

*British Library Harleian Manuscript 433*, edited by Rosemary Horrox and P.W. Hammond. 2 volumes. Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing Limited, 1979.

*The Brut or The Chronicles of England*, edited by Frederick W.D. Brie. 2 volumes. Early

English Text Society, 131 and 136. London: 1906-1908.

*Calendar of Charter Rolls, Henry III-Henry VIII.* 6 volumes. London, 1903-1927.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Henry III-Henry VII.* 61 volumes. London, 1902-1963.

*Calendar of Fine Rolls, Edward I-Henry VI.* 19 volumes. London, 1911-1939.

*Calendar of Liberate Rolls, Henry III.* 6 volumes, London: 1914-1964.

*Calendar of Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland, 1198-1492.* 14 volumes.

London: 1893-1960.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Henry III-Henry VII.* 54 volumes. London: 1891-1916.

Capgrave, John. *The Chronicle of England*, edited by Francis Charles Hingeston. Rolls Series,

1. London: 1858.

-----, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, translated by Francis Charles Hingeston.

Rolls Series, 7. London: 1858.

*Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscript in the Library of the College of Arms.* London: Printed

by S. and R. Bentley, 1829. [Marked as unpublished, although distributed]

*A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the College of Arms*, edited by Louise Campbell and

Francis Steer, 2 volumes. London: College of Arms, 1988.

*Catechism of the Catholic Church, With Modifications From the Editio Typica.* New York:

Image for Doubleday, 1995.

Chauliac, Guy de. *The Cyrurgie of Guy de Chauliac*, edited by Margaret S. Ogden. Early

English Text Society, 265. London: 1971.

*Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani*, edited by H.T. Riley. 7 works in 12 volumes. Rolls Series,

28. London: 1863-1876.

*The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301*, edited by Antonia Gransden. London:

Nelson, 1964.

*A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century and for the first*

*time printed from MSS in the British Museum to which are added Numerous Contemporary Illustrations*, edited by Nicholas Harris Nicolas. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green, 1827.

*The Chronicle of Pierre Langtoft in French verse from the earliest period to the Death of King Edward I*, edited by Thomas Wright. 2 volumes. Roll Series, 47. London: 1866-1868.

*Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, edited by William Stubbs. 2 volumes. Rolls Series, 76. London: 1882-3.

*Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, edited by Richard Howlett. 2 volumes. Rolls Series, 82. London: 1885.

*Chronicque de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Dengleterre*, edited and translated by Benjamin Williams. Vaduz: Kraus Reprints, 1964.

*A Collection of All the Wills, Now Known to Be Extant, of the Kings and Queens of England, Princes and Princesses of Wales, and Every Branch of the Blood Royal from the Reign of William the Conqueror to that of Henry the Seventh Exclusive*, edited by John Nichols. London: John Nichols for the Society of Antiquaries, 1780.

*A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, made in divers reigns*, edited by John Nichols. London: John Nichols for the Society of Antiquaries, 1790.

*The Coronation of Richard III: The Extant Documents*, edited by Anne F. Sutton and P.W. Hammond. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1983.

*The Crowland Chronicle Continuations: 1459-1486*, edited by Nicholas Pronay and John Cox. London: Alan Sutton for Richard III and Yorkist History Trust, 1986.

*Councils and Synods with Other Documents relating to the English Church, 1205-1265*, edited by F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

*De Antiquis Legibus Liber: Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londiarum et quedam, que*

*contingebant teporibus illis ab annos MCLXXVIIIo ad annum MCCLXXIV cum Appendice*, edited by Thomas Stapleton. Camden Society, Old Series, 34. London: 1846.

*Diurnale Fratrum Praedicatorum*. Venice: Andreas Torresanus, 1490-149. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00035739/images/>.

*English Historical Documents, Volume III: 1189-1327*, edited by Henry Rothwell. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1975.

*Eulogium (Historiarum sive Temporis): Chronicon ab Orbe Condito Usque ad Annum Domini MCCCCLXVI a Monacho quodam Malmesburiensi Exaratum. Accedunt continuationes duae, quarum una ad annum M.CCC.XIII., altera ad annum M.CCCC.XC. pe ducta est*, edited by F.S. Haydon. 3 volumes. Rolls Series, 9. London: 1858-1863.

*Exerpta Historica, or Illustrations of English History*, edited by S. Bentley. London: Samuel Bentley, 1831.

Fabyan, Robert. *The New Chronicles of England and France*, edited by Henry Ellis. London: F.C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Co.; Cadell and Davies; J. Mawman; and J. Johnson and Co., 1811.

Fisher, John. *The English Works of John Fisher*, edited by John Mayor. Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 27. New York: 1876.

*Foedera, Conventiones, Literae, et Cujuscunq[ue] Generis Acta Publica*, edited by Thomas Rymer. 4 volumes in 7 parts. London: Record Commission, 1816-1869.

*Foedera, Conventiones, Literae, et Cujuscunq[ue] Generis Acta Publica*, edited by Thomas Rymer. 10 volumes. The Hague: Johannem Neulme, 1739-1745.

Froissart, Jean. *Chroniques de Jean Froissart*, edited by Siméon Luce, G. Raynaud, L. Mirot, and A. Mirot. 15 volumes. Société de l'Histoire de France. Paris: 1869-1975.

- . *Oeuvres de Froissart, Chroniques*, edited by J.M. B.C. Kervyn de Lettenhove. 25 volumes. Brussels: Victor Devaux, 1867-1877.
- Gesta Henrici Quinti: Deeds of Henry V*, edited by John Taylor and F. Roskell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- The Great Chronicle of London*, edited by A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley. London: George W. Jones at the Sign of the Dolphin, 1938.
- The Grey Friars of London: Their History with the Register of Their Convent and an Appendix of Documents*, edited by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford. Aberdeen: The University Press, 1915.
- Guybert, Philbert. *The charitable physitian: with the Charitable apothecary. Written in French by Philbert Guibert Esquire, and physitian regent in Paris: and by him after many severall editions, reviewed, corrected, amended, and augmented. And now faithfully translated into English, for the benefit of this kingdome by I.W.* London: Thomas Harper, 1639.
- Hall, Edward. *Hall's Chronicle, containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods.* London: Printed for J. Johnson; F.C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilnie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme; Caell and Davies; and J. Mawman, 1809.
- Henrici VI Angliae Regis Miracula Postuma: Ex Codice Musei Britannici Regio 13 C VIII*, edited by Paul Grosjean. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1935.
- Henry III Fine Rolls Project*. Project website and appended blog. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.finerollshenry3.org.uk>.
- Historia et cartularium monasterii Sancti Petri Gloucestriae*, edited by William Hart. 3 volumes. Rolls Series, 33. London: 1863-1867.

*Henrici Quinti, Regis Angliae*, edited by Benjamin Williams. Vaduz: Krauz Reprints, 1964.

Henry of Huntingdon. *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon, comprising the History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Accession of Henry II, Also the Acts of Stephen, King of England and Duke of Normandy*, edited and translated by Thomas Forrester. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853.

Higden, Ranulph. *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, Monachi Cestrensis; together with the English Translation of John of Trevisa and of an unknown writer in the 15th century*, edited by C. Babington (volumes 1-2) and J. R. Lumby (volumes 3-9). 9 volumes. Rolls Series, 41. London: 1865-1886.

*Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi*, edited by George B. Stow, Jr. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.

*Incerti Scriptoris Chronicon Angliae de Regnis Trium Regum Lancastrensi-um, Henrici IV, Henrici V et Henrici VI*, edited by J.A. Giles. London: D. Nutt of Fleet Street, 1848.

*Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and Anonymous Writers*, edited and translated by H.T. Riley. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854.

*Issues of the Exchequer, Being a Collection of Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue, from King Henry III to King Henry VI, inclusive*, edited by Frederick Devon. London: John Murray, 1837.

John of Reading, *Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis, 1346-1367*, edited by James Tait. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914.

*Kirkstall Abbey Chronicle*, edited by John Taylor. Thoresby Society, 42. 1952.

*L'Histoire de Guillaume Le Maréchal, comte de Striguil et De Pembroke*, edited by Paul Meyer. 3 volumes. Société de L'Histoire de France. Paris: 1891-1901.

*Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, edited by John Wickham Legg. 3 volumes.



Henry Bradshaw Society, 1, 5, and 12. Bury St. Edmunds: Boydell Press, 1999 [Henry Bradshaw Society, 1896].

Leland, John. *Joannis Lelandi Antiquarii, De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, edited by Thomas Hearne. 6 volumes. London: Benjamin White, 1774.

*Leofric Missal*, edited by Nicholas Orchard. 2 volumes. Henry Bradshaw Society, 113 and 114. London: 2002.

*Les Registres de Boniface VIII: Recueil Des Bulles de Ce Pape*, edited by Georges Digard, Maurice Faucon, and Antoine Thomas. 4 volumes. Paris: Librairie Des Écoles Française D'Athènes & De Rome, 1885.

*Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Volume I: 1509-1514*, edited by J.S. Brewer. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862.

*Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII*, edited by James Gairdner. 2 volumes. Rolls Series, 24. London: 1861-1863.

*Liber Regalis*, edited by Frederick Lygon, Earl Beauchamp. London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1870.

*Liber Regie Capelle*, edited by Walter Ullman. Henry Bradshaw Society, 92. London: Boydell Press 2010 [Henry Bradshaw Society, 1959].

Machyn, Henry. *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London (1550-1563)*, edited by J.G. Nichols. Camden Society, Old Series, 42. London: 1848.

Mancini, Dominic. *The Usurpation of Richard III*, translated by C.A.J. Armstrong. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1984.

Matthew of Westminster. *Flores Historiarum per Mathaeum Westmonasteriensem collecti*, edited by H.R. Luard. 3 volumes. Rolls Series, 95. London: 1890.

*The Missal of Robert of Jumieges*, edited by H.A. Wilson. Henry Bradshaw Society, 11. London: 1896.

*Missale Ordinis Praedicatorum*. Venice: Nicholai de Frankfordia, 1484. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <https://books.google.be/books?vid=GENT900000177833>

*Missale Romanum, Mediolani 1474*, edited by Robert Lippe. 2 volumes. Henry Bradshaw Society, 17 and 33. London: 1899-1907.

*The Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey, Winchester: MSS Rawlinson Liturg. E. 1\* and Gouch Liturg 8, in the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, edited by J.B.L. Tolhurst. 6 volumes. Henry Bradshaw Society, 69, 70, 71, 76, 78, and 80. London: 1932-1942.

Mondeville, Henri. *Chirurgie de Maître Henri de Mondeville*, translated and edited by E. Nicaise. Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer Baillière and Co., 1893.

----- . *The Surgery of Master Henry de Mondeville, Surgeon of Philip the Fair, King of France, written from 1306 to 1320*, translated by Leonard D. Roseman. Xlibris Corporation, 2003.

Monstrelet, Enguerrand de. *The Chronicles of Enguerrand de Monstrelet*, edited by Thomas Johnes. 13 volumes. London: William Smith, 1840.

Murimuth, Adam. *Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum. Robertus de Avesbury De gestis mirabilibus regis Edwardi Tertii*, edited by E.M. Thompson. Rolls Series, 93. London: 1889.

*The Ordinal of the Abbey of the Holy Trinity Fecamp*, edited by David Chadd. 2 volumes. Henry Bradshaw Society, 111 and 112. London: 2002.

Paré, Ambroise. *The workes of that famous chirurgion Ambrose Parey translated out of Latine and compared with the French*, translated by Thomas Johnson. London: Thomas Johnson, 1634.

Paris, Matthew. *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani. Chronica Majora*, edited by H.R. Luard. 7 volumes. Rolls Series, 57. London: 1872-1884.

----- . *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani. Historia Anglorum, sive, ut vulgo*

*dicitur, Historia minor. Item, ejusdem Abbreviato chronicorum Angliae*, edited by F. Madden. 3 volumes. Rolls Series, 44. London: 1866-1869.

*The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England (PROME)*, edited by Chris Given-Wilson, Paul Brand, Seymour Phillips, W.M. Ormrod, Geoffrey Martin, Anne Curry, and Rosemary Horrox. Leicester: Scholarly Digital Editions and The National Archives, 2005. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.sd-editions.com/PROME>.

*Privilèges accordés à la Couronne de France par le Sainte-Siège*, edited by Adolphe François Lucien Tardif. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1855.

Ralph of Coggeshall. *Chronicon anglicanum, De expugnatione Terrae Sanctae libellus; Thomas Agnellus De morte et sepultura Henrici regis Angliae junioris; Gesta Fulconis filii Warini; Excerpta ex Otiis imperialibus Gervasii Tilebutiensis*, edited by Joseph Stevenson. Rolls Series, 66. London: 1875.

*The Receyt of Ladie Kateryne*, edited by Gordon Kipling. Early English Text Society, 296. London: 1996.

*The Red Book of the Exchequer*, edited by Hubert Hall. Rolls Series, 99. London: 1896.

*Registrum Henrici Woodlock, Diocesis Wintoniensis A.D. 1305-1316*, edited by Anthony Goodman. Canterbury and York Society, 44. London: 1941.

*Registrum Liber Irrotularius et Consuetudinarius Prioratus Beatae Mariae Wigorniensis*, edited by William Hale. Camden Society, Old Series, 91. London: 1865.

*Registrum Thome Bourghier, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi AD 1454-1486*, edited by F.R.H. Du Boulay. Canterbury and York Society, 54. Oxford: 1957.

*Richard III: The Great Debate*, edited by Paul Kendall. Chatham, UK: The Folio Society, 1965.

*Richard III: A Source Book*, edited by Keith Dockray. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997.

Roger of Hoveden. *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, edited by William Stubbs. 4

volumes. Rolls Series, 51. London: 1868-1871.

Roger of Wendover. *Liber Qui Dicitur Flores Historiarum*, edited by Henry G. Hewlett. 3

volumes. Rolls Series, 84. London: 1886-1889.

*Rolls of Divers Accounts for the Early Years of the Reign of Henry III*, edited by Fred A.

Cazel. Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 49 (82). London: 1982.

Rous, John. *Johannes Rossi, Antiquarii Warwicensis, Historia regum Angliae E. codice MS in*

*Bibliotheca Bodlejana descripsit, notisque & indice*, edited by Thomas Hearne.

Oxford: 1745.

----- . *The Rous Roll with a Historical Introduction on John Rous*, edited by Charles

Ross. London: Alan Sutton 1980.

*The Sarum Missal, edited from Three Early Manuscripts*, edited by John Wickham Legg.

Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916.

Smythe, John. *The Lives of the Berkeleys, Lords of the Honour, Castle, and Manor of*

*Berkeley in the County of Gloucester from 1066-1618*, edited by Sir John MacLean. 2

volumes. Gloucester: John Bellows, 1883.

*Testamenta Eboracensia, or the Wills Registered at York Illustrative of the History, Manners,*

*Language, Statistics, etc., of the Province of York, From the Year MCCC Downwards,*

edited by J. Raine. 4 volumes. Surtees Society, 4. London: 1836.

*Three Chronicles of the Reign of Edward IV*. Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1988.

*Three Coronation Orders*, edited by John Wickham Legg. London: Harrison and Sons, 1900.

Usk, Adam. *Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421*, edited by Chris Given-Wilson. Oxford:

Clarendon Press, 1997.

Vergil, Polydore. *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, Comprising the Reigns of*

*Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III*, edited by Sir Henry Ellis. Camden Society, Old

Series, 24. London: 1844.

- Walsingham, Thomas. *The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica majora of Thomas Walsingham*, edited and translated by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss. 2 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011.
- Walter of Coventry. *The Historical Collections of Walter of Coventry*, edited by William Stubbs. 2 volumes. Rolls Series, 58. London: 1872-1873.
- Walter of Guisborough. *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough*, edited by Harry Rothwell, Camden Society, Third Series, 89. London: 1957.
- The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III*, edited by Benjamin Wild. Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 58 (96). London: 2012.
- The Westminster Chronicle, 1381-1394*, edited and translated by L.C. Hector and Barbara F. Harvey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- The Will of King Henry VII*, edited by Thomas Astle. London: T. Payne and B. Whit, 1775.

### Secondary Sources

- Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England, 1200-1400*, edited by Jonathan Alexander and Paul Binski. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1987.
- Allmand, Christopher. *Henry V*. London: Methuen London, 1992.
- Appleby, Jo, Piers D. Mitchell, Claire Robinson, Alison Brough, Guy Ruttly, Russell A. Harris, David Thompson, and Bruno Morgan. "The Scoliosis of Richard III, Last Plantagenet King of England: Diagnosis and Clinical Significance." *The Lancet*, 383 (31 May 2014): 1944.
- Archer, Ian W.. "City and Court Connected: The Material Dimensions of Royal Ceremonial, ca. 1480-1625." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 71, no. 1 (March 2008): 157-179.
- Ariès, Philippe. *The Hour of Our Death*, translated by Helen Weaver. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Ashdown-Hill, John. *The Last Days of Richard III and the Fate of His DNA*. Stroud: The

- History Press, 2013 [2010].
- Ayloff, Joseph. "An Account of the Body of King Edward the First, as It Appeared on Opening His Tomb in the Year 1774." *Archaeologia*, 3 (January 1775): 376-414.
- Bacon, Francis. *The History of King Henry the Seventh*, edited by J.R. Lumby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1889.
- Badham, Sally. "Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Westminster Abbey: The Origins of the Royal Mausoleum and its Cosmati Pavement." *The Antiquaries Journal*, 87 (September 2007): 197-219.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Whose Body? Monuments Displaced from St. Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Westminster Abbey." *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 160 (2007): 129-146.
- Bandé, Alexandre. *Le Coeur du Roi: Les Capetiens et les sépultures multiples xiiiè-xve siècles*. Paris: Tallandier, 2009.
- Baldwin, David. "King Richard's Grave in Leicester." *Transactions of the Leicester Archaeological and History Society*, 60 (1986): 21-24.
- Barrett, Paul M. "Is Funeral Home Chain SCI's Growth Coming at the Expense of Mourners?" *Bloomberg Business Week*, 24 October 2013. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-10-24/is-funeral-home-chain-scis-growth-coming-at-the-expense-of-mourners>.
- Beard, C.R. "The Tomb and Achievements of King Henry VI at Windsor." In *Fragmenta Armamentaria, Volume II, Part 1*, edited by Francis Henry Cripps Day. Frome: Butler and Tanner, 1936.
- Bell, Doyne C. *Notices of the Historic Persons Buried in the Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula in the Tower of London*. London: John Murray, 1877.
- Bennett, Michael. "Edward III's Entail and the Succession to the Crown, 1376-1471." *English*

*Historical Review*, 113, no. 452 (June 1998): 580-609.

- Biggs, Douglas. "Henry IV and the Long Parliament of 1406." In *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs, 185-205. Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2003.
- . "An Ill and Infirm King: Henry IV, Health, and the Gloucester Parliament of 1407." In *The Reign of Henry IV: Rebellion and Survival 1403-1413.*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs, 180-209. Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2008.
- Binski, Paul. "The *Liber Regalis*: Its Date and European Context." In *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*, edited by Dillian Gordon, Lisa Mommas, and Caroline Elan, 233-246. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997.
- . *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- . *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power, 1200-1400*. London: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Blackley, F.D. "The Tomb of Isabella of France, wife of Edward II of England." *International Society for the Study of Church Monuments*, 8 (1983): 161-164.
- . "Isabella of France, Queen of England 1308-1358 and the Late Medieval Cult of The Dead." *Canadian Journal of History*, 14 (1980): 23-47.
- Blair, Claude. *European Armour, circa 1066 to circa 1700*. London: B.T. Batsord, 1978 [1958].
- Bland, Olivia. *The Royal Way of Death*. London: Constable, 1986.
- Bloch, Marc. *The Royal Touch*, translated by J.E. Anderson. New York: Dorset Press, 1961.
- Bond, Edward A. "Notices of the Last Days of Isabella, Queen of Edward the Second, drawn from an Account of the Expenses of her Household." *Archaeologia*, 35 (January 1853): 453-469.

Branner, Robert. *Studies in Architecture, Volume VII: St. Louis and the Court Style in Gothic Architecture*. London: A. Zwemmer, 1965.

British Library. "Detailed Record for Harley 4380." *Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts*.

Last accessed 5 May 2016. <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=7232&CollID=8&NStart=4380>.

British Library. *Henry VIII: Man and Monarch*. Online Exhibition. Posted 26 March 2009.

Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/henryviii/>.

----- . *Magna Carta: Law, Liberty, and Legacy*. Exhibition, 13 March - 1 September 2015.

Broughton, Philip Delves. "Tragic French boy king's heart finds a final resting place after 209 years." *The Telegraph*, 8 June 2004. Last accessed 12 May 2016.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1463951/Tragic-French-boy-kings-heart-finds-a-final-resting-place-after-209-years.html>.

Brown, Elizabeth A.R.. "Death and the Human Body in the Later Middle Ages: The Legislation of Boniface VIII on the Division of the Corpse." *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 12 (1981): 221-270.

----- . "Authority, the Family, and the Dead in Late Medieval France." *French Historical Studies*, 16, no. 4 (Autumn 1990): 803-832.

Brown, R. Allen, H.M. Colvin, and A.J. Taylor. *The History of the King's Works, Volume I: The Middle Ages*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963.

Buckle, Alexandra. "Entumbid Right Princely': the Re-Interment of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick and a Lost Rite." In *The Yorkist Age: Proceedings of the 2011 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Hannes Kleineke and Christian Steer, 399-415. London: Donnington, 2013.

Buckley, Richard, Mathew Morris, Jo Appleby, Turi King, Deirdre O'Sullivan, and Lin



- Foxhall. "The King in the Car Park': New Light on the Death and Burial of Richard III in the Greyfriars Church, Leicester, in 1485." *Antiquity*, 87 (2013): 519-538.
- Burden, Joel. "How Do You Bury a Deposed King?: The Funeral of Richard II and the Establishment of Lancastrian Royal Authority in 1400" In *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs, 35-54. Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2003.
- Burgess, Clive. "St. George's College, Windsor: Context and Consequences." In *St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Fourteenth Century*, edited by Nigel Saul, 63-96. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005.
- Caferro, William. *John Hawkwood: An English Mercenary in Fourteenth Century Italy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Camporesi, Piero. *The Incorruptible Flesh: Bodily Mutilation and Mortification in Religion and Folklore*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Camadine, David. "The Context, Performance, and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition', c. 1820-1977." In *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by E.J. Hobsbawm and T.O Ranger, 102-148. London: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Carloli, J., H. Emlyn, and J. Lind. "The Vault, Body, and Monument of Edward IV in St. George's Chapel at Windsor." *Vetusta Monumenta*, 3 (1790): 1-4, plates VII, VIII, and IX.
- Carpenter, David A. *The Reign of Henry III*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1996.
- Catto, Jeremy. "Religion and the English Nobility in the Later Fourteenth Century." In *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper*, edited by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl, and Blair Worden, 43-55. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1981.
- Chaplais, Pierre. *Piers Gaveston: Edward II's Adopted Brother*. Oxford: Clarendon Press,

1994.

- Charlier, Philippe et al. "The Embalmed Heart of Richard the Lionheart (1199 AD): A Biological and Anthropological Analysis." *Scientific Reports*, 28 February 2013. Last accessed 12 May 2016, doi:10.1038/srep01296.
- Chrimes, S.B. *Henry VII*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1977.
- Church, Stephen D. "King John's Testament and the Last Days of His Reign." *English Historical Review*, 125, no. 514 (June 2010): 505-528.
- Clark, James G. "Thomas Walsingham Reconsidered: Books and Learning at Medieval St. Albans." *Speculum*, 77, no. 3 (July 2002): 832-860.
- Cocke, Thomas. "The Henry VII Chapel: The Royal Connection." In *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer, 315-326. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- , "The Repository of Our English Kings: The Henry VII Chapel as Royal Mausoleum." In *Architectural History*, 44 (2001): 212-220.
- Condon, Margaret. "God Save the King! Piety, Propaganda and the Perpetual Memorial." In *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer, 59-97. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- , "The Last Will of Henry VII, Document and Text." In *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer, 99-140. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Craze, Michael. *Lectures on Worcester Cathedral*. Worcester: B.J. Lander and Sons, undated pamphlet.
- Crooke, John. "The Physical Setting of the Cult of St. Wulfstan." In *St. Wulfstan and his World*, edited by Julia S. Barrow and N.P. Brooks, 189-217. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Crouch, David. "The Troubled Deathbeds of Henry I's Servants: Death, Confession, and

- Secular Conduct in the Twelfth Century.” *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 34, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 24-36.
- Cunningham, Sean. *Richard III: A Royal Enigma*. Frome: Butler and Tanner, for The National Archive, 2003.
- Cunnington, Phillis, and Catherine Lucas. *Costume for Births, Marriages, and Deaths*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1972.
- Cuttino, G.P., and Thomas W. Lyman. “Where is Edward II?” *Speculum*, 53, no. 3 (July 1978): 522-543.
- Dahmus, Joseph. *William Courtenay: Archbishop of Canterbury*. London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966.
- Daniell, Chris. *Death and Burial in Medieval England 1066-1550*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Dart, John. *Westminsterium*. London: 1742.
- Davies, Richard G.. “Richard II and the Church.” In *Richard II: The Art of Kingship*, edited by Anthony Goodman and James L. Gillespie, 83-106. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Day, J.R.F. “The Heraldic Funeral.” *Coat of Arms*, no. 190 (Summer 2000). Last accessed 12 May 2016. [http://www.theheraldrysociety.com/articles/college\\_of\\_arms/heraldic\\_funerals.htm](http://www.theheraldrysociety.com/articles/college_of_arms/heraldic_funerals.htm).
- Delorme, Philippe Delorme. *Louis XVII, la verite: Sa mort au Temple confirmee par la science*. Paris: Pygmalion, 2000.
- Denholm-Young, N. “Thomas de Wykes and His Chronicle.” *English Historical Review*, 61, no. 240 (May 1946): 157-179.
- Dietz, Armin. *Ewige Herzen: Kleine Kulturgeschichte der Herzbestattungen*. Munich: Medie & Medizin Verlagsgesellschaft mbh, 1998.
- Dillon, Harold, Viscount Dillon, and W.H. St. John Hope. “Inventory of the Goods and

Chattels belonging to Thomas, duke of Gloucester and seized in his castle at Pleshy, co. Essex 21 Richard II (1397); with their values, as shown in the escheator's accounts."

*Archaeological Journal*, 54 (1897): 275-308.

Dillon, P.W.. "Remarks on the Manner of Death of King Richard the Second." *Archaeologia*, 27 (January 1840): 75-95.

Dodd, Gwilym. "Changing Perspectives: Parliament, Poetry and 'Civil Service' under Richard II and Henry IV." *Parliamentary History*, 25, no. 3 (2006): 299-322.

Dodson, Aidan. "The King is Dead." In *The Unbroken Reed: Studies in the Culture and Heritage of Ancient Egypt in Honour of A.F. Shore*, edited by C. Eyre, A. Leahy and L.M. Leahy. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1994.

----- . *The Royal Tombs of Great Britain: An Illustrated History*. London: Duckworth & Co., 2004.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion of England, 1400-1580*. New York: Yale University Press, 1992.

Duffy, Mark. "Arthur's Tomb and Its Context." In *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death, and Commemoration*, edited by Steven Gunn and Linda Monckton, 77-89. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009.

----- . *Royal Tombs of Medieval England*. Stroud: Tempus, 2003.

Dyer, Christopher. *Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages: Social Change in England c. 1200-1520*. Revised Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Edwards, John. *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*. New York: Yale University Press, 2011.

Edwards, Rhoda. *The Itinerary of King Richard III, 1483-85*. London: Alan Sutton for the Richard III Society, 1983.

Eire, Carlos. *From Madrid to Purgatory: The Art and Craft of Dying in Sixteenth-Century Spain*. Cambridge University Press: New York, 1995.

Engel, Ute. *Worcester Cathedral: An Architectural History*, translated by Hilary Heltay.

Chichester: Phillimore and Co., 2007.

Evans, Michael. *The Death of Kings: Royal Deaths in Medieval England*. London:

Hambledon and London, 2003.

“An Extract relating to the Burial of K. Edward IV. From a MS of the late Mr. Anstis, now in the Possession of Thomas Astle, Esquire.” *Archaeologia*, 1 (1770): 348-355.

Farris, Charles. “The New Edwardians? Royal Piety in the Yorkist Age.” In *The Yorkist Age: Proceedings of the 2011 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Hannes Kleineke & Christian Steer, 44-63. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2013.

Fehrmann, Antje. “The Chantry Chapel of Edward IV.” In *Windsor: Medieval Archaeology, Art, and Architecture of the Thames Valley*, edited by Laurence Kern and Eileen Scarff, 177-191. Leeds: The British Archaeological Association and Maney Publishing, 2002.

Fisher, Anne. “Why Your Funeral Will Probably Be Run By a Woman.” *Fortune* website, 20 August 2015. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://fortune.com/2015/08/20/funeral-directors-women/>.

Finucane, R.C. *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1977.

———. “Sacred Corpse, Profane Carrion: Social Ideals and Death Rituals in the Later Middle Ages.” In *Mirrors of Mortality*, edited by Joachim Whaley, 40-60. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1981.

Forrest, Ian. *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England*. London: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Flood, W.H. Gratton. “The English Royal Chapel under Henry V and Henry VI.”

*Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 10, no. 4 (July-September 1909): 563-567.

Forsyth-Moster, Toria. "The Pembridge Helm." *Herefordshire Through Time*, Herefordshire Council website. 26 February 2013. Last accessed 12 May 2016.  
<http://htt.herefordshire.gov.uk/1094.aspx>.

Gairdner, James. *History of the Life and Reign of Richard the Third, to which is added The Story of Perkin Warbeck*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898.

Galbraith, V.H. "Thomas Walsingham and the St. Albans Chronicle 1272-1422." *English Historical Review*, 47 (1932): 12-30.

Gardner, Arthur. *Alabaster Tombs of the Pre-Reformation Period in England*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Gaude-Ferragu, Murielle. "'Le Coeur 'Couronné': Tombeaux et Funérailles de Coeur en France à la Fin du Moyen Age." *Micrologus: Natura, Scienze e Società Medievali*, 11 (2003): 241-266.

Giesey, Ralph. *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*. Genève, France: Librairie E. Droz, 1960.

----- . "Models of Rulership in French Royal Ceremonial." In *Rites of Power*, edited by Sean Wilentz, 41-64. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

Gittings, Clare. "Sacred and Secular: 1558-1660." In *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, edited by Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings, 147-173. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

Gittos, Brian and Moira. "Motivation and Choice: The Selection of Medieval Secular Effigies." In *Heraldry, Pageantry, and Social Display in Medieval England*, edited by Peter Coss and Maurice Keen, 143-168. Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2002.

Given-Wilson, Chris. "The Earl of Arundel, The War With France, and the Anger of King

- Richard II." In *The Medieval Python: The Purposive and Provocative Work of Terry Jones*, edited by R.F. Yeager and Toshiyuki Takamiya, 27-38. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.
- . "The Exequies of Edward III and the Royal Funeral Ceremony in Late Medieval England." *English Historical Review*, 124, no. 507 (April 2009): 259-282.
- . "The Funeral of Henry V." A paper presented at *Beyond Agincourt: The Funeral Achievements of Henry V*, Westminster Abbey, London, 28 October 2015.
- . *Henry IV*. London: Yale University Press, 2016.
- . "Richard II and His Grandfather's Will." *English Historical Review*, 93, no. 367 (April 1978): 320-337.
- . "Richard II, Edward II, and the Lancastrian Inheritance." *English Historical Review*, 109, no. 432 (June 1994): 553-571.
- Goodman, Anthony. *The Loyal Conspiracy: The Lords Appellant under Richard II*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971.
- . "Sir Thomas Hoo and the Parliament of 1376." *British Institute of Historical Research*, 12 (1968): 139-149.
- Gransden, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England, c. 550-1307*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.
- . *Historical Writing in England: c. 1307- the Early Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Green, Mary Anne Everett. *Lives of the Princesses of England*. 2 volumes. London: Henry Colburn, 1852.
- Green, Valentine. *An Account of the Discovery of the Body of King John, in the Cathedral Church of Worcester, July 17th 1797*. London: V. and R. Green, 1797.
- Griffiths, Ralph. *King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461*. London:

Ernest Benn, 1981

----- . "The Sense of Dynasty in the Reign of Henry VI." In *Patronage, Pedigree, and Power in Later Medieval England*, edited by Charles Ross, 13-31. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1979.

----- . "Succession and the Royal Dead in Later Medieval England." In *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c. 1000- c.1600*, edited by F. Lachaud and M. Penman, 97-109. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.

Hallam, Elizabeth. "The Eleanor Crosses and Royal Burial Custom." In *Eleanor of Castile 1290-1990: Essays to Commemorate the 700th Anniversary of Her Death 28 November 1290*, edited by David Parsons, 9-22. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1991

----- . "Royal Burial and the Cult of Kingship in France and England, 1060-1330." *Journal of Medieval History*, 8 (1982): 359-380.

Hammond, P.W., and W.J. White. "The Sons of Edward IV: A Re-Examination of the Evidence on their Deaths and on the Bones in Westminster Abbey." In *Richard III: Loyalty Lordship and Law*, edited by P.W. Hammond, 104-147. London: Richard III and Yorkist History Trust, 1986.

Hammond, P.W., and Anne F. Sutton. *Richard III: The Road to Bosworth Field*. London: Constable 1985.

Hargreaves, A.S., and R.I. MacLeod. "Did Edward V suffer from Histiocytosis X?" *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 87, no. 2 (February 1997): 98-101.

Harper, John. *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: a Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Harris, Oliver D. "'Une tresriche sepulture': the tomb and chantry of John of Gaunt and Blanche of Lancaster in Old St Paul's Cathedral, London." *Church Monuments*, 25



(2010): 7-35.

Harvey, Barbara. *Westminster Abbey and Its Estates in the Middle Ages*. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Harvey, John H. "Architectural History from 1291 to 1558." In *A History of York Minster*, edited by G.E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Healey, Tim. "Hundreds of Worshippers Pray for the Soul of King Richard III at Holy Cross Priory." *The Leicester Mercury*, 23 March 2015. Last accessed 12 May 2016.  
<http://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/Hundreds-worshippers-pray-soul-King-Richard-III/story-26218485-detail/story.html>.

Herrup, Cynthia. "The King's Two Genders." *Journal of British Studies*, 45, no. 3 (July 2006): 493-510.

Hicks, Michael. *Edward V*. Stroud: Tempus, 2003.

----- . "A Story of Failure: The Minority of Edward V." In *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England*, edited by Charles Beem, 195-210. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

----- . *The Wars of the Roses*. London: Yale University Press, 2010.

Holmes, G.A. *Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth Century England*. Cambridge University Press, 2007 [1957].

Hope, W.H. St. John. "Discovery of the Remains of King Henry VI in St. George's Chapel, Windsor." *Archaeologia*, 62, no. 2 (1911): 533-42.

----- . *On the Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England with special references to those in the Abbey Church of Westminster*. London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1907.

----- . "The Funeral Monument and Chantry Chapel of King Henry the Fifth." *Archaeologia*, 65 (1915): 129-186.

- . *Windsor Castle: An Architectural History, Collected and Written by Command of Their Majesties Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V.* 2 volumes. London: Country Life 1913.
- Horrox, Rosemary. "Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V, Longleat Miscellaneous Manuscript Book II." In *Camden Miscellany*, 29. London: Royal Historical Society, 1987.
- . "Purgatory, Prayer, and Plague: 1150-1380." In *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, edited by Peter C. Jupp, and Clare Gittings, 90-118. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph. "Prince Arthur's Funeral." In *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death, and Commemoration*, edited by Steven Gunn and Linda Monckton, 64-76. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009.
- Howgrave-Graham, R.P. "The Earlier Royal Funeral Effigies." *Archaeologia*, 98 (January 1961): 159-169.
- Howell, Margaret. "The Children of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence." In *Thirteenth Century England IV*, edited by P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd, 57-72. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992.
- Hunt, Alice. *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Huntington, Richard, and Peter Metcalf. *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Hutchinson, G. Evelyn. "Attitude Towards Nature in Medieval England: The Alphonso and Bird Psalters." *Isis*, 65, no. 1 (March 1974): 5-37.
- James, Tom Beaumont. "John of Eltham, History and Story." In *Fourteenth Century England II*, edited by Chris Given-Wilson, 63-80. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002.

- Jardin, Henry. *Report to the Right Hon. The Lord Chief Baron, and the Hon. The Barons of His Majesty's Court of Exchequer in Scotland, by King's Remembrance, Relative to the Tomb of Robert the Bruce and the Cathedral Church of Dunfermline*. Edinburgh: Hay, Gall, and Co., 1821.
- Jones, Michael K., and Malcolm G. Underwood. *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Kantorowicz Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997 [1957].
- Kendall, Paul. *Richard III*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1955.
- Kselman, Thomas. "Death in Historical Perspective." *Sociological Forum*, 2, no. 3 (Summer 1987): 591-597.
- The Late Medieval English College and Its Context*, edited by Clive Burgess and Martin Heale. Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2008.
- "Latin Mass to Be Offered to Mark Reinterment of Richard III." *The Catholic Herald*. 4 March 2015. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2015/03/04/latin-mass-to-be-offered-to-mark-reinterment-of-richard-iii/>.
- Lauro, Brigitta. *Die Grabstätten der Habsburger: Kunstdenkmäler einer europäischen Dynastie*. Vienna: Brandstatter, 2007.
- Lawne, Penny. "Edmund of Woodstock, Earl of Kent (1301-1330): A Study of Personal Loyalty." In *Fourteenth Century England VI*, edited by Chris Given-Wilson, 27-48. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009.
- Laynesmith, J.L. *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . "The Women in Richard III's Life." Talk given at the University of York,

York, UK, 26 November 2013.

Levine, Mortimer. "Richard III—Usurper or Lawful King?" *Speculum*, 34, no. 3 (June 1959): 391-401

Lindley, Phillip. "Absolutism and Regal Image in Ricardian Sculpture." In *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*, edited by Dillian Gordon, Lisa Mommas, and Caroline Elan, 60-84. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997.

----- . *Gothic to Renaissance: Essays on Sculpture in England*. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995.

----- . "The singular mediacions and praiers of the holie companie of Heven': Sculptural Functions and Forms in Henry VII's Chapel." In *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, edited by Tim Tatton-Brown, and Richard Mortimer, 259-294. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.

Lindsay, Philip. *On Some Bones in Westminster Abbey: A Defence of King Richard III*. Portway Bath: Cedric Chivers, 1969.

Litten, Julian. "The Funeral Effigy: Its Function and Its Purpose." In *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, edited by Anthony Harvey and Richard Mortimer, 3-19. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.

----- . "The Reenactment of the Funeral of Prince Arthur." In *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death, and Commemoration*, edited by Steven Gunn and Linda Monckton, 167-179. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009.

Loomis, Roger Sherman. "Edward I, Arthurian Enthusiast." *Speculum*, 28, no. 1 (January 1953): 114-127.

Maitland, Frederick, and William Pollock. *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*. 2 volumes. London: 1898.

Mann, James. *The Funeral Achievements of Edward the Black Prince*. London: William

Cloves and Sons, 1951.

Marafioti, Nicole. *The King's Body: Burial and Succession in Late Anglo-Saxon England*.

Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Martindale, Jane. "The Sword on the Stone: Some Resonances of a Medieval Symbol of Power

(The Tomb of King John in Worcester Cathedral)." In *Anglo-Norman Studies XV: Proceedings of the XV Battle Conference and of the XI Colloquio Medieval of the*

*Officina di Studi Meddievali*, edited by Marjorie Chibnall, 199-241. Woodbridge:

Boydell Press, 1992.

Boydell Press, 1992.

Mathew, Gervase. *The Court of Richard II*. London: John Murray, 1968.

Matheson, Lister M.. "Printer and Scribe: Caxton, the *Polychronicon*, and the *Brut*."

*Speculum*, 60, no. 3 (July 1985): 593-614.

McKenna, John. "Piety and Propaganda: the Cult of King Henry VI." In *Chaucer and Middle*

*English Studies, in Honour of Rossell Hope Robbins*, edited by Beryl Rowland, 72-88.

London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974.

-----". "Popular Canonization as Political Propaganda: The Cult of Archbishop

Scrope." *Speculum*, 45, no. 4 (October 1970): 608-623.

McNiven, Peter. "The Problem of Henry IV's Health, 1405-1413." *English Historical*

*Review*, 100, no. 397 (October 1985): 747-772.

-----". "Rebellion, Sedition, and the Legend of Richard II's Survival in the Reigns of

Henry IV and Henry V." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 76 (1994): 93-117.

Meyer, Barbara H.. "The First Tomb of Henry VII." *The Art Bulletin*, 58, no. 3 (September

1976): 358-367.

*The Miracles of King Henry VI: Being an Account and Translation of Twenty-Three Miracles*

*Taken From the Manuscript in the British Museum (Royal MS 13c. viii)*, edited by

Ronald Knox and Shane Leslie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.

- Mitchell, Piers D., Hui-Yan Yeh, Jo Appleby, and Richard Buckley. "The Intestinal Parasites of King Richard III." *The Lancet*, 382 (4 September 2013): 888.
- Moore, S.A. "Documents Relating to the Death and Burial of King Edward II." *Archaeologia*, 50 (1887): 215-226.
- Moorman, J.R.H.. "Edward I at Lanercost Priory 1306-7." *English Historical Review*, 67, no. 263 (April 1952): 161-174.
- Morgan, D.A.L.. "The Political After-Life of Edward III: The Apotheosis of a Warmonger." *The English Historical Review*, 112, no. 448 (September 1997): 856-881.
- Morgan, Philip. "Of Worms and War: 1380-1558." In *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, edited by Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings, 119-146. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Mortimer, Ian. "The Death of Edward II in Berkeley Castle." *English Historical Review*, 120, no. 489 (December 2005): 1175-1214.
- , "Sermons of Sodomy: A Reconsideration of Edward II's Sodomitical Reputation." In *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson, 48-60. Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2006.
- Mortimer, Richard. "The History of the Collection." In *The Funeral Effigies in Westminster Abbey*, edited by Anthony Harvey and Richard Mortimer, 21-28. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003
- Nichols, John. *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I, Volume I: 1533-1571*, edited by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clark, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer, et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Norton, Christopher. "Richard Scrope and York Minster." In *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr*, edited by P.J.P. Goldberg 138-213. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2007.
- Oliver, George. *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter and a History of the Cathedral with An*

- Illustrative Appendix*. Exeter: William Roberts, Broadgate, 1861.
- O’Neilly, J.G, and L.E. Tanner. *The Shrine of St. Edward the Confessor*. Oxford: Vivian Ridler for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1966.
- Ormrod, W.M. *Edward III*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011.
- . “The Personal Religion of Edward III. *Speculum*, 64, no. 4 (October 1989): 849-877.
- . “Queenship, Death, and Agency: The Commemorations of Isabella of France and Philippa of Hainault.” In *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval England: Proceedings of the 2008 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Caroline M. Barron and Clive Burgess, 87-103. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2010.
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004-2016. Online edition. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.oxforddnb.com>.
- Pafford, J.H.P. “King John’s Tomb in Worcester Cathedral: An Account of Its Opening in 1529 by John Bale.” *Transactions of the Worcester Archaeological Society*, 35 (1958): 58-60.
- Page, John T. “The Effects of Opening a Coffin.” *Notes and Queries*, s11-XII (311) (December 1915): 465-c-465.
- Palliser, D.M. “Royal Mausolea in the Long Fourteenth Century (1272-1422).” In *Fourteenth Century England III*, edited by W.M. Ormrod, 1-16. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Paravicini Bagliani, Agostino. *The Pope’s Body*. London: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- . “The Corpse in the Middle Ages: The Problem of the Division of the Body.” In *The Medieval World*, edited by Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson, 327-341. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Park, David. *Worcester Cathedral Polychromy Survey 1997*. London: Courtauld Institute of

Art, 1997.

Park, Katherine. *Secrets of Women: Gender, Generation, and the Origins of Human Dissection*. New York: Zone Books, 2006.

Parry, John J. "Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Paternity of Arthur." *Speculum*, 13, no. 3 (July 1938): 271-277.

Parsons, John Carmi. "The Year of Eleanor of Castile's Birth and Her Children by Edward I." *Mediaeval Studies*, 46 (1984): 245-265.

-----, "‘Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour’: The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500." In *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference at King's College London April 1995*, edited by Anne Dugan, 317-337. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997.

Pearce, Susan. "The Hinton St. Mary Mosaic Pavement: Christ or Emperor?" *Britannia*, 39 (2008): 193-218.

"Pembridge Helm." *National Museums Scotland*, museum reference A.1905.489.

Last accessed 5 May 2016. <http://www.nms.ac.uk/explore/collections-stories/art-and-design/pembridge-helm/>.

Pfaff, Richard. *The Liturgy in Medieval England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Phillips, Seymour. *Edward II*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Powicke, Maurice. *King Henry III and the Lord Edward, Volume II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Prestwich, Michael. *Edward I*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Pugh, T.B. "Henry VII and the English Nobility." In *The Tudor Nobility*, edited by G.W. Bernard, 49-110. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.



- . “The Southampton Plot of 1415.” In *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages: A Tribute to Charles Ross*, edited by Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherborne, 62-89. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1986.
- Range, Matthias. *British Royal and State Funerals: Music and Ceremonial since Elizabeth I*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016.
- “Reinterment of King Richard III – Statement from the University of Leicester.” *University of Leicester Press Office*. Last accessed 12 May 2016.  
<http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/press/for-journalists/richard-iii/statements/reinterment-of-king-richard-iii-statement-from-the-university-of-leicester>.
- “Requiem Mass for King Richard III.” *St. Wilfrid’s Catholic Church in York* news archive. 4 March 2015. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.stwilfridsyork.org.uk/blog/post/845-requiem-mass-for-king-richard-iii-2/>.
- Rhodes, Dennis E. *John Argentine, Provost of King’s: His Life and His Library*. Amsterdam: Menno Hertiberger and Co., 1967.
- “Richard III Effect brings almost £60 million to city.” *University of Leicester Press Office*. 9 May 2015. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/press/press-releases/2015/may/richard-iii-effect-brings-almost-ps60-million-to-city>.
- Richardson, Thom. “Armour in England 1325-99.” *Journal of Medieval History*, 37, no. 3 (2011): 304-320.
- Roberts, A.K.B.. *St. George’s Chapel, Windsor Castle, 1348-1416: A Study in Early Collegiate Administration*. Windsor: Oxley, 1947.
- Ross, Charles. *Edward IV*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- . *Richard III*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1981.
- Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, England. *An Inventory of the Historical*

- Monuments in London, Volume I: Westminster Abbey*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1924.
- Sainty, J.C. "Officers of the Greencloth: Provisional Lists 1485-1646." *Institute of Historical Research*. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.history.ac.uk/publications/office/greencloth.html>.
- Saul, Nigel. "Fragments of the Golafre Brass in Westminster Abbey." *Transactions of the Monumental Brass Society*, 15, no. 1 (1992): 19-32.
- . "Richard II and the Vocabulary of Kingship." *English Historical Review*, 110, no. 438 (September 1995): 854-877.
- . *Richard II*. London: Yale University Press 1997.
- . *The Three Richards*. London: Hambleton, 2005.
- Sawday, Jonathan. *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Schramm, Percy. *A History of the English Coronation*, translated by Leopold G. Wickham Legg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Shenton, Caroline. "Edward III and the Coup of 1330." In *The Age of Edward III*, edited by J.S. Bothwell, 13-34. Woodbridge: Boydell for York Medieval Press, 2001.
- Smyth, Kevin. "The Anglican Conference at Lambeth, 1958." *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 47, no. 188 (Winter 1958): 369-378.
- Somerset, FitzRoy, Fourth Baron Raglan. "Patterns in the Ritual of Coronations and Royal Funerals." *Folklore*, 64, no. 1 (March 1953): 257-270.
- Spencer, Brian. "King Henry of Windsor and the London Pilgrim." In *Collectanea Londiniensia: Studies presented to Ralph Merrifield*, edited by Joanna Bird, Hugh Chapman, and John Clark, 235-264. London: London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, 1978.

Spry, J. "A Brief Account of the Examination of the Tomb of King Henry IV in the Cathedral of Canterbury, August 21, 1832." *Archaeologia*, 26 (January 1836): 432-455.

*St. James' Church' at Sutton-on-Hull*, website. <http://suttonstjames.org/index.html>.

*St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: Visual and Political Culture, 1292-1941*. Project website.

Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.virtualststephens.org>.

Stanley, Arthur P. "On an Examination of the Tombs of Richard II and Henry III in Westminster Abbey." *Archaeologia*, 45, no. 2 (January 1880): 309-327.

-----, *The Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey*. Third Edition. London: John Murray, 1869.

-----, *Supplement to the Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey*. London: John Murray, 1869.

Starkey, David. *Henry, Virtuous Prince*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2009.

Stow, George B. "Richard II in Thomas Walsingham's Chronicles." *Speculum*, 59, no. 1 (January 1984): 68-102.

-----, "Book Review: Nigel Saul, 'Richard II.'" *Speculum*, 74, no. 2 (April 1999): 493-496.

Strohm, Paul. *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399-1422*. London: Yale University Press, 1998.

Strong, Patrick and Felicity Strong. "The Last Will and Codicils of Henry V." *English Historical Review*, 96, no. 378 (January 1981): 79-102.

Sumption, Jonathan. *Cursed Kings: The Hundred Years War IV*. London: Faber and Faber, 2015.

Sutton, Anne F. and Livia Visser-Fuchs with R.A. Griffiths. *The Royal Funerals of the House of York at Windsor*. London: Richard III Society, 2005.

Sutton, Anne, and Livia Visser-Fuchs with P.W. Hammond. *The Reburial of Richard, Duke*

- of York 21-30 July 1476*. London: Richard III Society, 1996.
- Sutton, Anne, and Livia Visser-Fuchs. *The Hours of Richard III*. Gloucester: Sutton, 2000.
- Sweet, Rosemary Sweet. "Antiquarianism and history." *Making History: The Changing Face of the Profession in Britain* website. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/resources/articles/antiquarianism.html>.
- Tanner, Joan D. "Tombs of Royal Babies in Westminster Abbey." *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 16 (1953): 25-40.
- Tanner, Lawrence, and William Wright. "Recent Investigations Regarding the Fate of the Princes in the Tower." *Archaeologia*, 84 (1935): 1-26.
- Tatton-Brown, Tim. "The Constructional Sequence and Topography of the Chapel and College Buildings at St. George's Chapel." In *St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages*, edited by Colin Richmond and Eileen Scarff, 3-38. Leeds: Maney Publishing 2001.
- , "The Pavement in the Chapel of St. Edward the Confessor, Westminster Abbey." *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 153, no. 1 (January 2000): 71-84.
- Taylor, Craig. "'Weep thou for me in France': French Views of the Deposition of Richard II." In *Fourteenth Century England III*, edited by W. M. Ormrod, 207-222. Woodbridge: Boydell Press 2004.
- Thompson, Alan. "King Richard III Visitor Centre Celebrates After Attracting 80,000 Visitors in First Year." *Leicester Mercury*, 24 July 2015. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/King-Richard-III-Visitor-Centre-celebrates/story-27471967-detail/story.html>.
- Tout, T.F. *The Captivity and Death of Edward of Carnarvon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1920.

- Twigg, John. *A History of Queens' College Cambridge, 1448-1986*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1987.
- University of Leicester. *The Discovery of Richard III*. Project website. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <https://www.le.ac.uk/richardiii/>.
- Valente, Claire. "The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II." *English Historical Review*, 113, no. 453 (September 1998): 852-881.
- Walker, Simon. "Between Church and Crown: Master Richard Andrew, King's Clerk." *Speculum*, 74, no. 4 (1999): 956-991.
- Ward, Victoria, and Andrew Hugh. "Westminster Abbey: A Royal Wedding Venue Steeped in History." *The Telegraph* web edition, 23 November 2010. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/royal-wedding/8154425/Westminster-Abbey-a-royal-wedding-venue-steeped-in-history.html>.
- Warren, W.L. *King John*. London: Eyre and Spottiswood, 1961.
- Warzynski, Peter. "Richard III: New Row Over Interim Resting Place for King Found Under Leicester Car Park." *Leicester Mercury*. 21 January 2014. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/New-row-interim-resting-place-king/story-20471638-detail/story.html>.
- Watts, J.L.. "The Counsels of King Henry VI, c. 1435-1445." *English Historical Review*, 106, no. 419 (April 1991): 279-298.
- , *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- The Wellcome Library. *The Wellcome Library Catalogue*. Last accessed 7 May 2016. <http://www.wellcomelibrary.org>.
- Westerhof, Danielle. *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2008.

- White, P.J. "Richard III economic impact." *Leicester Finance*, 7 July 2015. Last accessed 12 May 2016. <http://www.leicesterfinance.co.uk/richard-iii-impact/>.
- Wilkinson, Bertie. *The Coronation in History*. London: Published for the Historical Association by G. Philip, 1953.
- Williamson, Magnus. "The Early Tudor Court, the Provinces, and the Eton Choirbook." *Early Music*, 25, no. 2 (May 1997): 229-243.
- Wilson, Christopher. "The Medieval Monuments." In *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, edited by Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, and Margaret Sparks, 451-510. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Wolffe, Bertram. *Henry VI*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1981.
- Wood, Charles T. "The Deposition of Edward V." *Traditio*, 31 (1975): 247-268.
- Woodruff, C. Eveleigh and William Danks. *Memorials of the Cathedral and Priory of Christ in Canterbury*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1912.
- Woodward, Jennifer. *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997.
- Wright, J.R.. "The Accounts of John de Stratton and John Gedeney, Constables of Bordeaux, 1381-1390." *Mediaeval Studies*, 42 (1980): 238-307.
- Wylie, J.H.. *History of England Under Henry the Fourth*. 4 volumes. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1884-1894.
- . *The Reign of King Henry the Fifth*. 3 volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914-1929.
- Young, Charles G. "Ancient Orders of Precedency, from a Volume of Precedents in the College of Arms." In *Heraldic Tracts 1835-1893* (rebound collection at British Library). 1850.

**Unpublished Theses**

Burden, Joel. "Rituals of Royalty: Prescription, Politics and Practice in English Coronation and Royal Funeral Rituals, c.1327 to c.1485." Doctoral thesis, University of York, 2000.

Duch, Anna M. "'My Crown is in My Heart, Not on My Head': Heart Burial in England, France and the Holy Roman Empire from Medieval Times to the Present." Master's thesis, University of North Texas, 2013.

Dryburgh, Paul. "The Career of Roger Mortimer, first Earl of March (c.1287-1330)." Doctoral thesis, University of Bristol, 2002.

Marshall, Alison Frances. "Thomas of Brotherton, Earl of Norfolk and Marshal of England: A Study in Early Fourteenth-Century Aristocracy." Doctoral thesis, University of Bristol, 2006.