

Fragile Lords: Gender, Gentility and Coats of Arms in  
English Domestic Stained Glass,  
c.1450-1560

Volume 1 (of 2)

Oliver Fearon

University of York  
History of Art

April 2019

## Abstract

This is an analysis of domestic armorial stained glass commissioned by a group of families who might be classed within the late medieval English “gentry”. The project utilises five existing case studies of armorial glass, three in-situ and two in museum collections, to examine the ways individuals within these families fashioned aspects of their gender and social status. As the first, extended study to cover late medieval domestic glazing, the thesis begins in 1450 with the earliest comprehensively surviving example of domestic glass. It finishes around 1560 when restrictions on the use of coats of arms became unprecedentedly stringent. The case studies are chosen either for their preservation in-situ or their survival in museum collections. Where possible, the analysis reconstructs these latter examples to augment an appreciation of their original spatial meanings. The analysis adopts an interdisciplinary approach to assess the meanings and perceptions of domestic glazing, probing the meanings of language as well as the surviving glass itself. To explore the case studies, the thesis explores contemporary descriptions of domestic glazing and accounts books. However, due to the general lack of useful primary evidence relating to houses, the analysis supplements this with evidence from ecclesiastical glazing - such as wills, preliminary sketches and glazing contracts. As a relatively untapped source of evidence, domestic armorial glass provides further insights into scholarly debates on expressions of male gentry identity and masculinity, the role and autonomy of women in artistic commissions, the pliable status of coats of arms as a visual system during this period and the function of windows and their suitability for expressing certain social ties.

## Table of Contents

List of Illustrations	6
Acknowledgements	25
Declaration	26
Introduction	27
Literature Review	32
Thesis Outline	39
Chapter 1. Social Relationships in Domestic Glass	41
1.1. Introduction	41
1.2. The Newburghs’ “Genealogie” at East Lulworth, Dorset	43
1.3. An “Alliaunce” at St. Mary’s, Nettlestead, Kent	47
1.4. A “Genealogie” at Beaupré Hall	52
1.5. An “Alliaunce” at Cotehele House	58
1.6. Case Study: Examining “Genealogie” and “Alliaunce” at Athelhampton Hall	62
Chapter 2. Authorship and Gender in Domestic Glass	67
2.1. Introduction	67
2.2.i. The Will of John Langton (d.1467) and his Tomb at St. Mary’s, Leeds	68
2.2.ii. The Will of John Pympe III (d.1496) and Armorial Glazing at St. Mary’s, Nettlestead	71
2.2.iii. Male Authorship: The Armorial Glazing of Athelhampton Hall	76
2.3.i. The Will of Margaret Paston (d.1489) and her Tomb at Mautby	84
2.3.ii. Female Authorship: The Armorial Glazing of Fawsley Hall	85
2.4. Case Study: Exploring Male and Female Authorship in the Armorial Glazing of Cotehele House	92

2.5. Conclusion	97
Chapter 3. Fashioning Gentry Lordship in Armorial Glass	100
3.1. Introduction	100
3.2. Examining Shield Types, “Prowess” and Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Athelhampton Hall	102
3.3. Examining Marshalling and Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Ockwells Manor	113
3.4. Examining Glass Cutting, Abrasion and Emphasis in the Armorial Glazing of Beaupré Hall	122
3.5. Case Study: Constructions of Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Fawsley Hall	130
3.6. Conclusion	137
Chapter 4. The Audiences of Domestic Glazing	139
4.1. Introduction	139
4.2. Entering the Hall and the “Alliaunce” at Ockwells Manor	139
4.3. Exiting the Hall and the “Alliaunce” at Ockwells Manor	143
4.4. Entering the Hall and the “Genealogie” at Fawsley Hall	146
4.5. Stasis and the “Genealogie” at Fawsley Hall	148
4.6. Case Study: Exploring Sightlines and Audiences at Athelhampton Hall	152
4.7. Conclusion	156
Conclusion	158
Appendix I. Ockwells Manor	162
Appendix II. Athelhampton Hall	167
Appendix III. Cotehele House	172

Appendix IV. Fawsley Hall	177
Appendix V. Beaupré Hall	189
Appendix VI. St. Mary's, Nettlestead	194
List of Abbreviations	199
Bibliography	202

## List of Illustrations

Figure 1.1. Clare Roll, c.1456, College of Arms MS 3/16 (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure 1.2. Tomb of Richard Willoughby (d.1471), St. Leonard's, Wollaton, Nottinghamshire, late fifteenth century (Image: <http://southwellchurches.nottingham.ac.uk/wollaton/pmon06.jpg>)

Figure 1.3. Tomb of Sir John Strelley (d.1501) at All Saints, Strelley, Nottinghamshire, early sixteenth century (Image: <http://southwellchurches.nottingham.ac.uk/strelley/pmon05v1.jpg>)

Figure 1.4. *Fürstensaal*, Lüneburg town hall, late fifteenth century (Image: <https://www.monumente-online.de/de/ausgaben/2007/3/ausdruck-staedtischen-herrschaftswillens.php#.Xn3ldm7go1g>)

Figure 1.5. Rheinfelden Town Hall, early sixteenth century (Image: Barbara Giesicke and Mylène Ruoss, "Function, Meaning and Iconography in Civic Stained Glass Donations in Switzerland and Southern Germany," in *Painting on Light: Drawings and Stained Glass in the Age of Dürer and Holbein*, ed. Barbara Butts (The Paul Getty Trust: Los Angeles, 2000), 53.)

Figure 1.6. Brass of Joan Cobham, c.1434, at Cobham, Kent, with red square sed to indicate the arms of Cobham and the green squares used to indicate the arms of her daughters (Image: Nigel Saul, "Bold as Brass: Secular Display in English Medieval Brasses," in *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display*, eds. P. Coss and M. Keen (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002), 190.)

Figure 1.7. Shields in nave aisles of Westminster Abbey, London, thirteenth century (Image: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/rchme/london/vol1/plate-101>)

Figure 2.1. Brass of Sir John Harpedon (d.1438), Westminster Abbey (Image: Nigel Saul. *Death Art and Memory in Medieval England, the Cobham Family and their Monuments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 217.)

Figure 2.2. Brass of Sir Thomas Stahum (d.1470), St. Matthew's, Morley, Derbyshire (Image: Nigel Saul, *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages: History and Representation*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 98.)

Figure 2.3. Brass of Nicholas Kniveton (d.1500) and his wife, All Saints' Church, Muggington, Derbyshire, late fifteenth century (Image: Matthew Ward, "Loyalty and Locality in Tudor Derbyshire: the brass of Nicholas Kniveton, 1500," *Bulletin of the Monumental Brass Society* 125 (February, 2014): 492.)

Figure 3.1. Annotated version of Achievement as illustrated by Brooke-Little. (Image: J.P. Brooke-Little, ed. *Boutell's Heraldry* (London: Frederick Warne, 1973), Plate 1.)

Figure 3.2. Shield with Arms of Henry Raspe, Landgrave of Thuringia (d.1247), thirteenth century (Image: Otfried Neubecker and John Brooke-Little, *Heraldry: Sources, Symbols, and Meaning* (McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976), 72.)

Figure 3.3. Hylton Castle, Sunderland, late fourteenth century (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure 3.4. Bodiam Castle Gate, East Sussex, mid fourteenth century (Image: <https://sites.northwestern.edu/medieval-buildings/bodiam/>)

Figure 3.5. Tournament shield with arms of Behaim von Schwarzbach, fifteenth century (Image: Helmut Nickel, "The Seven Shields of Behaim: New Evidence," *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, 30 (1995), 30.)

Figure 3.6. Tomb of Henry VII, Westminster Abbey, early sixteenth century (Image: Richard Marks and Paul Williamson eds. *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 83.)

Figure 3.7. Richard Beauchamp (d.1439), Earl of Warwick, Rous Roll, made c.1483-4, BL MS Add 48976 (Image: <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/the-rous-roll>)

Figure 3.8. The Buxton Achievement, later fifteenth century (Image: Richard Marks and Paul Williamson eds. *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 291.)

Figure 3.9. Ordinances of Richard Whitting (Image: Richard Marks and Paul Williamson eds. *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 276.)

Figure 3.10. Knight on horseback (furthest left) shown striking with lance and carrying target shield, but not using the two in conjunction, during Battle of Agincourt, Chronicle of St. Albans, fifteenth century (Image: Richard Marks and Paul Williamson eds. *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 30.)

Figure 3.11. Knight striking at opponent with lance, using the two in conjunction, during joust, *Sir Thomas Holme's Book*, c.1448 (Image: Richard Marks and Paul Williamson eds. *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 212.)

Figure 3.12. Cartoon for Armorial Shield of City of Gouda, late sixteenth century (Image: Zsuzsanna van Ruyven-Zeman, et al, eds., *The Cartoons of the Sint-Janskerk in Gouda* (Delft: Eburon, 2011.), 154.)

Figure 3.13. Armorial Shield of City of Gouda (Image: R. A. Bosch, *De 72 Glazen Van de Sint Janskerk in Gouda/The 72 Stained-Glass Windows of Saint John's Church in Gouda* (Delft: Eburon, 2008), 125.)

Figure 3.14. BL MS Lansdowne 874, f.191. (Image: British Library Board)

Figure 3.15. Portrait of John Denston, Holy Trinity Church, Long Melford, Surrey. Fifteenth Century. (Image: <http->



[http://www.cvma.ac.uk/jsp/record.do?mode=LOCATION&photodataKey=20434&sortField=WINDOW\\_NO&sortDirection=ASC&rowsPerPage=20&selectedPage=1&recPagePos=1](http://www.cvma.ac.uk/jsp/record.do?mode=LOCATION&photodataKey=20434&sortField=WINDOW_NO&sortDirection=ASC&rowsPerPage=20&selectedPage=1&recPagePos=1))

Figure 3.16. Portrait of Robert Crane, Holy Trinity Church, Long Melford, Surrey. Fifteenth Century (Image:

[http://www.cvma.ac.uk/jsp/record.do?mode=LOCATION&photodataKey=11298&sortField=WINDOW\\_NO&sortDirection=ASC&rowsPerPage=20&selectedPage=1&recPagePos=12](http://www.cvma.ac.uk/jsp/record.do?mode=LOCATION&photodataKey=11298&sortField=WINDOW_NO&sortDirection=ASC&rowsPerPage=20&selectedPage=1&recPagePos=12))

Figure 3.17. Reconstruction of the planned window of the Church of the Observant Friars in Greenwich, late fifteenth century (Image: Nicholas Rogers, “A Pattern for Princes: The Royal Window at the Greenwich Greyfriars,” in *Saints and Cults in Medieval England: Proceedings of the 2015 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. S. Powell (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2017), Figure 1.)

Figure 3.18. Entry describing instructions for representing Constantine in Greenwich window, BL MS Egerton 2341a, late fifteenth century (Image: British Library Board)

Figure 3.19. Scaled drawing for a stained-glass window for Cardinal Wolsey, early sixteenth century (Image: Richard Marks and Paul Williamson eds. *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 406.)

Figure 3.20. Arms of Henry VII, BL MS Egerton 2341a, late fifteenth century (Image: British Library Board)

Figure 3.21. Arms of Henry VII in *Hours Inscribed by Henry VII to his daughter Margaret*, f187, Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth, late fifteenth or early sixteenth century (Image: Richard Marks and Paul Williamson eds. *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 184.)

Figure 3.22. Arms of Elizabeth of York, BL MS Egerton 2341b (Image: <https://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=40063>)

Figure 3.23. Arms of Elizabeth of York, BL MS Royal 16 FII, f.1, early sixteenth century

(Image:

<https://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=40063>)

Figure 3.24. Arms of De Burgh, Great Malvern Priory, Worcestershire, fifteenth century (Image:

<http://www.richardiiiworcs.co.uk/images/greatmalvern/6201795.jpg>)

Figure 3.25. Shield of de la Pole impaling Stafford. Tracery light A3. Chantry Chapel of St John the Baptist, Church of St Mary the Virgin, Ewelme, Oxfordshire

(Image: [https://vidimus.org/issues/issue-38/feature/attachment/issue\\_38\\_2010\\_feat2/](https://vidimus.org/issues/issue-38/feature/attachment/issue_38_2010_feat2/))

Figure 3.26. Stained glass Standescheibe of Nidwalden, Switzerland 1564, Sułkowski castle in Bielsko-Biała (Image: Jan Mehlich)

Figure 3.27. Detail of abrasion, sVIII, St Mary's Church, Worplesdon, 1533-36. (Image: O. Kondratyeva, "Acid-Etching Technique: Art vs Science," *The Journal of Stained Glass* 38, (2014): 147.)

Figure 3.28. Beauchamp Chapel, St. Mary's, Warwick. Built and glazed, 1439-45. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure 3.29. Virgin in East Window. Beauchamp Chapel, St. Mary's, Warwick. Built and glazed, 1439-45. (Image: Christopher Parkinson)

Figure 3.30. Image of Richard Beauchamp. East Window. Light 1d. St. Mary's Warwick. c.1439-45. (Image: Christopher Parkinson)

Figure 3.31. Canopy of light 3b, showing nimbus with yellow-stained pieces of glass representing stars cut and leaded into a background of ruby glass (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure 3.32. Inserted pieces of glass, measuring approximately 2 cms in diameter from Beauchamp Chapel's tracery lights (Image: Christopher Parkinson)

Figure 3.33. Section of the Dudley Roll. Uppermost shield showing Beauchamp and Mauduit are each *impaled* to signify the marriage of William Beauchamp III (d.1296) and Isabel Mauduit. Both arms are then quartered on the dexter side of the second uppermost shield representing their son and heir, William Beauchamp IV (Image: John Baker "Tudor Pedigree Rolls and their Uses," in *Heralds and Heraldry in Shakespeare's England*, ed. N. Ramsay (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2014), 165.)

Figure 3.34. William Dugdale's drawing of armorial glazing in "Bay Window" of Compton Murdack, Warwickshire (Image: William Dugdale, *The Antiquities of Warwickshire Volume 1* (London: J. Osborn and T. Longman, 1730), 564.)

Figure 3.35. William Dugdale's drawing of armorial glazing in "Canton Window" of Chesterton Hall, Warwickshire (Image: William Dugdale, *The Antiquities of Warwickshire Volume 1* (London: J. Osborn and T. Longman, 1730), 474.)

Figure 4.1. Ground plan showing possible route through hall at Ockwells Manor, Berkshire, from door on south-east corner of hall to door in north-west corner (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.2. Ground plan showing possible route through hall at Ockwells Manor, Berkshire, taken by John Noreys' reeve (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.3. Ground plan showing possible route through hall at Ockwells Manor, Berkshire from door in north-west corner of the hall to door in south-east corner (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.4. Ground plan showing possible route through hall at Fawsley Hall, Northamptonshire from the entrance at east corner to door in south-west side of the hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.5. Ground plan showing possible route taken by Sir Richard Knightley IV's reeve through hall at Fawsley Hall, Northamptonshire (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.6. View of Fawsley's oriel Window from fireplace, showing visibility of lights 3e, 3f and 3g that would likely contained the first shields in the Knightley "genealogie" as well as tracery light A4 that likely contained the coat of arms showing the marriage of Sir Richard Knightley IV and Jane Skenard (Image: Country Life Picture Archive, edited by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.7. Ground plan showing possible route through hall at Athelhampton Hall, Dorset from entrance on south corner of hall to attached rooms at north-west corner of hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.8. Ground plan showing possible route taken by the Martyns' reeve through the hall at Athelhampton Hall, Dorset, from entrance on south corner of hall to area along the north-east wall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.9. Ground Plan showing possible route through hall at Athelhampton Hall, Dorset, from rooms attached on north-west corner of hall to manor's entrance on south corner of hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure 4.10. View of Athelhampton's oriel window showing visibility of light 4c that would have shown the marriage of Thomas Martyn I to Christian Cheverell and light 4d which would have shown the marriage of Sir William Martyn to Isobel Faringdon. During Sir William Martyn's lifetime lights 4e and 4f would have most likely contained shields with the Martyn arms on the *dexter* sides and white glass on the *sinister* sides intended to represent the future marriages expected in the Martyn male line (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure I.1. Ockwells Manor looking towards its eastern face. c.1440-1466. (Image: Anthony Emery, GMHEW 3, Plate 54, 125.)

Figure I.2. Ockwells Manor, Hall. 1446-1466. (Image:  
<http://pololine.com/fotogalerias/ockwellsmanor-43-2013-7-17/3.jpg>)

Figure I.3. Superimposed, zoomed Plan of Windows at Ockwells Manor. (Image created by Oliver Fearon using GMHEW, Vol. 3, Figure. 26, 126.)

Figure I.4. Window neI. Ockwells Manor, c.1446-1466. (Image compiled by Oliver Fearon with photograph from <http://www.cvma.ac.uk>)

Figure I.5. Window neII, Ockwells Manor, c.1446-1466. (Image compiled by Oliver Fearon with photograph from <http://www.cvma.ac.uk>)

Figure I.6. Window neIII. Ockwells Manor, c.1446-1466. (Image compiled by Oliver Fearon with photograph from <http://www.cvma.ac.uk>.)

Figure I.7. Lights a and c from Window SE1 (light b is blank), Ockwells Manor, c.1446-1466. (Image compiled by Oliver Fearon with photographs provided by John Titterton).

Figure I.8. Dorney Court, fifteenth century (Image: Anthony Emery, GMHEW 3, Plate 6, 21.)

Figure I.9. Illustration of Hall at Ockwells Manor by John Nash. Watercolour. (Image: Charles Knight, *Old England: A Pictorial Museum, Volume 2* (London, 1845), 4.)

Figure I.10. Range of Marshalling forms used in Ockwells Manor glazing (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.1 Athelhampton Hall, Dorset, c.1495-1526. Entrance, looking towards hall from the southwest. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.2. Athelhampton Hall, Dorset, c.1495-1526. Ground Plan (Image: Anthony Emery, GMHEW, Vol. 3, Figure. 16, 489.)

Figure II.3. Athelhampton Hall, Dorset, c.1495-1526. Superimposed Ground Plan of hall showing hall windows neI, swI and Oriel. (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.4. Nineteenth-Century Arms in window neI. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.5. Athelhampton Hall, Dorset. Fifteenth Century. Window neII (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.6. Athelhampton Hall, Dorset. Fifteenth Century. Window swI (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.7. Photo showing Oriel and passage to Parlour. Window swI is on the left-hand side of the photo. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.8. Diagram of Oriel Window. Athelhampton Hall, Dorset. Late Fifteenth Century (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure. II.9. Athelhampton Hall, Dorset. Late Fifteenth Century. Oriel Window. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.10. Probable appearance of Oriel glazing after Sir William's construction of the Oriel window (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.11. Early Fifteenth-Century Diapering Style in neIIa and neIIb (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.12. Circular Diapering Pattern used for background of Agnus Dei. Early fifteenth century. St. Vigor, Stratton on the Fosse, Somerset. (Image: Kerry Ayre, *Medieval English Figurative Roundels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 124. Figure 487.)

Figure II.13. Athelhampton Hall, Dorset. Fifteenth Century. Arms of Mohun. Window lights neIIc and neIId (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.14. Diagram showing the use of circular diapering method on the Martyn arms (dexter side) of each shield (Image created by Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.15. Double-circle diapering in arms of Cheverel in light 4e of Oriel Window. Athelhampton Hall. Early Sixteenth Century. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure II.16. Panel showing birds (Image: Kerry Ayre, *Medieval English Figurative Roundels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 96. Figure 374.)

Figure II.17. Panel showing stork rebus from Lincolnshire. Fifteenth Century (Image: Kerry Ayre, *Medieval English Figurative Roundels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 70. Figure 267.)

Figure II.18. Alabaster tomb in St. Marys, Puddletown. Fifteenth Century (Image: Brian Gittos and Moira Gittos, *The Monuments of the Athelhampton Chapel Puddletown* (Puddletown: Puddletown PCC, 2014), 9.)

Figure II.19. Alabaster tomb in St. Marys, Puddletown. Fifteenth Century (Image: Brian Gittos and Moira Gittos, *The Monuments of the Athelhampton Chapel Puddletown* (Puddletown: Puddletown PCC, 2014), 14.)

Figure III.1. Cotehele House looking toward eastern range containing hall on right. (Image: Anthony Emery, GMHEW 3, Plate 225, 526.)

Figure III.2. Cotehele House Plan (Image: Anthony Emery, GMHEW 3, Figure 128, 523.)

Figure III.3. Detailed Plan of Hall at Cotehele (Image made by Oliver Fearon using Ground Plan from Anthony Emery, GMHEW, 3, Figure 128, 523.)

Figure III.4. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Window nII. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.5. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Window nI. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.6. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Window sI. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.7. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Window sII. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.8. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Window sIII. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.9. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Bay Window. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.10. Cotehele House, Cornwall. Hypothetical Reconstruction of Original Sequence in Bay Window (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.11. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Sequence 1. Showing distinctive method for representing eyes; a black circle surrounded by a grey iris (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.12. Donor Portrait of William Kayle, esquire. St. Winnow, Cornwall. 1460s. (Image: <https://www.cornishstainedglass.org.uk/mgsmed/church.xhtml?churchid=264>)

Figure III.13. St. Anne teaching the Virgin to read. Cotehele House Chapel, Window sIa. Later fifteenth century. (Image Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.14. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Sequence 2. Showing boars' heads, with similar eyes to Sequence 1 but with rounded cheeks and extruded tongues (Image made by Oliver Fearon).

Figure III.15. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Sequence 3. Showing simpler method of representing eyes. (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure III.16. Cotehele House, Cornwall. c.1490-1520. Shield showing two styles



represented by Sequence 1 and Sequence 3, with the arms of Holland relating to Sequence 1 and the arms of Edgumbe reflecting the style of Sequence 3. (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.1. Great Hall, Fawsley Hall Northamptonshire. Early Sixteenth Century. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure. IV.2. Superimposed Ground Plan of Hall showing windows, numbered north-west to south-east swI-swV and neI-neII. (Image: John Heward and Robert Taylor. *The Country Houses of Northamptonshire* (London: Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1996), 213. with additions in Photoshop by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.3. South-West Wall of Fawsley Hall, Northamptonshire, showing windows swI, swII and swIII (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.4. North-East Wall of Fawsley Hall showing Oriel, neIII, neII and window neI which was likely inserted in the nineteenth century. (Image: John Heward and Robert Taylor. *The Country Houses of Northamptonshire* (London: Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1996), 213.)

Figure IV.5. Diagram of Hall Window Lights, showing likely composition of windows in 1610s, contemporary with Belcher's drawings (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure. IV.6. Oriel Window, Fawsley Hall. Flattened for legibility. (Image created by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.7. Combined arms of Sir Richard IV and Jane Skenard, originally in I. Oriel A4/ II. Oriel A4 (Image: Bodl MS. Top Northants E.1.7, f.29)

Figure. IV.8. Combined arms of Sir Edmund Knightley and Ursula De Vere originally in II. Oriel A7 (Image: Glasgow Life)

Figure. IV.9. Overview of William Belcher's Drawings and Architectural Divisions (Image compiled from Bodl. MS Top. Northants e.1, f.25v-f.30 with Photoshop editing by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.10. Reconstruction of swI during Belcher's visit to Fawsley Hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.11. Reconstruction of swII during Belcher's visit to Fawsley Hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.12. Reconstruction of swIII during Belcher's visit to Fawsley Hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.13. Reconstruction of swIV during Belcher's visit to Fawsley Hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.14. Reconstruction of swV during Belcher's visit to Fawsley Hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.15. f.28v & f.29 of Belcher MS (Image: MS Top. Northants e1, f.28v & f.29)

Figure IV.16. Diagram showing positions of drawings on f.28v & f.29 in Oriel window's lights (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.17. Diagram showing superimposed glazing in relation to likely position of arms in early seventeenth century (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.18. Photograph of Window, taken 1908, showing position of arms in A7 showing Sir Edmund's marriage to Ursula de Vere (Image: Country Life Picture Archive)

Figure IV.19. Reconstruction of neIII during Belcher's visit to Fawsley Hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.20. Reconstruction of neII during Belcher's visit to Fawsley Hall (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.21. Position of glazing in swI during Sir Edmund Knightley's tenure as Lord of Fawsley (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.22. Position of glazing in swII during Sir Edmund Knightley's tenure as Lord of Fawsley (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.23 Position of glazing in swIII during Sir Edmund Knightley's tenure as Lord of Fawsley (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV. 24. Position of glazing in swIV during Sir Edmund Knightley's tenure as Lord of Fawsley (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.25. Position of glazing in swV during Sir Edmund Knightley's tenure as Lord of Fawsley (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.26. Position of glazing in Oriel during Sir Edmund Knightley's tenure as Lord of Fawsley (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.27. Position of glazing in Oriel during Sir Sir Richard IV'S tenure as Lord of Fawsley (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.28. Tomb of Sir Richard IV Knightley and Jane Skenard (Image: C. B. Newham)

Figure IV.29. Shield on end of Sir Richard Knightley IVs tomb (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.30. Funerary Brass of Sir Edmund Knightley and Ursula de Vere (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.31. Shield of Spenser. c.1526-30. St. Mary's, Brington. 50cms x 38cms. (Image: Richard Marks, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Northamptonshire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 86.)

Figure IV.32. Shield of Margaret de St. John, from II. Oriel 2d (Image: Glasgow Life)

Figure IV.33. Abraded flashed blue glass with yellow stain used for Combemartin arms on shield of Margaret de St. John, from II. Oriel 2d. Photograph taken from the reverse of the shield to expose the abraded areas to view (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.34. Comparison of the manufacture of Golofer arms in I. Oriel 2b/ II. swII 3a and I. Oriel 2g/ II. swII 2c (Image made by Oliver Fearon with photos from Glasgow Life)

Figure IV.35. Comparison of methods of making Combemartin arms in II. Oriel 2g (cut and leaded glass), II. Oriel 2g (abraded flashed blue glass and yellow-stain) and II. Oriel 2e (abraded flashed blue glass and yellow-stain (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.36. Marshalling forms used in Knightley "genealogie" (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.37. Marshalling forms used in Skenard ancestry (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure IV.38. Marshalling forms used in Skenard ancestry (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure V.1. Beaupré Hall, Looking towards the hall's north-west face (Image: Christopher Hussey, "Beaupré Hall, Wisbech" *Country Life* (December 1st, 1923): 756.)

Figure V.2. Ground Plan of Beaupré Hall with Christopher Hussey's rough indications of surviving glass in what appears to have been the manor's hall (Image: Christopher Hussey, "Beaupré Hall, Wisbech" *Country Life* (December 1st, 1923): 760.)

Figure V.3. Hypothetical reconstruction of Window I (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure V.4. Hypothetical reconstruction of Window II (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure V.5 Beaupré Hall, Window III (Image: Christopher Hussey, "Beaupré Hall, Wisbech" *Country Life* (December 1st, 1923): 758.)

Figure V.6. Diagram of Window III (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure V.7. Beaupré Hall, showing north-west side with a red square highlighting position of Window III (Image: [http://www.lostheritage.org.uk/houses/lh\\_norfolk\\_beauprehall\\_info\\_gallery.html](http://www.lostheritage.org.uk/houses/lh_norfolk_beauprehall_info_gallery.html))

Figure V.8. Beaupré Hall, Window IV (Image: Christopher Hussey, "Beaupré Hall, Wisbech" *Country Life* (December 1st, 1923): 758.)

Figure V.9. Diagram of Window IV (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure V.10. Arms of Smith (*gules on a chevron between three bezants or as many crosses paty fitchy sable*) in Stanford-on-Avon church in Northamptonshire (Image, Richard Marks, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Northamptonshire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 236.)

Figure V.11. Arms from shield in II1b, showing Beaupré quartering in larger quartered arms representing Thomas Beaupré II and his marriage to Margaret (née Merys) (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure V.12. Arms of the London Mercers' Company (Image: Richard Marks, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Northamptonshire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 221.)

Figure V.13. East Window Tracery Lights, St. Clement's, Outwell (Image: [http://wisbech.ccan.co.uk/content/catalogue\\_item/outwell-st-clements-12th-century-church-stained-glass-window](http://wisbech.ccan.co.uk/content/catalogue_item/outwell-st-clements-12th-century-church-stained-glass-window))

Figure V.14. Shield from Window IV1c showing marriage of Nicholas III Beaupré (d.1513) and his wife Margaret (née Foderingaye) (Image: [collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O7841/panel-unknown/](http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O7841/panel-unknown/))

Figure V.15. Arms of Sir Robert Bell, Window IV, 2b (Image: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O7845/panel-unknown/>)

Figure V.16. The marriage of Nicholas III Beaupré and Margaret Foderingaye, originally in IId. (Image: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O7832/panel-unknown/>)

Figure V.17. Upper-dexter quarterings from shield showing marriage of Nicholas III Beaupré and Margaret Foderingaye, originally in IId. (Image: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O7832/panel-unknown/>)

Figure V.18. Shield originally in IIe showing arms of Edmund Beaupré. (Image: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O7835/panel-unknown/>)

Figure V.19. Upper-dexter quarterings from shield showing arms of Edmund Beaupré, originally in IIe (Image: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O7835/panel-unknown/>)

Figure VI.1. Exterior view of Nettlestead, looking towards church from south-west. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.2. St. Marys Nettlestead interior, from nave looking towards chancel. Fifteenth Century. (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.3. Plan of Nettlestead Church (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.4 Window I. East Window. St. Mary's, Nettlestead (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.5. Window nIII. Main lights, nineteenth century with fifteenth-century glass in traceries. St. Marys, Nettlestead (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.6. Window sII. Nineteenth Century. St. Marys Nettlestead (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.7. Window sIII. Nineteenth Century. St. Marys Nettlestead (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.8. Window nV. Containing Adventus of Thomas Becket in main lights and angels holding shields filled with white glass in tracery lights. Fifteenth Century. St. Mary's, Nettlestead (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.9. Window nII. SS. Stephen and Lawrence with donors and SS. Matthew and clerical donors. Likely from 1460s. St. Marys, Nettlestead (Image: Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.10. Window nIV. Fifteenth Century. SS. Thomas, Bartholemew and Matthew, St. Marys, Nettlestead (Image: Nigel Morgan)

Figure VI.11. Nettlestead Nave Window Profile. Showing corresponding window light numbers. (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.12. Arms in traceries of nIII (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.13. Arms in traceries of nIV (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.14. Arms in traceries, C1 and C2 of sIII (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.15. Arms in traceries, C1 and C2 of sIV (Image made by Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.16. Angels in Tracery Lights of Window nIII at St. Mary's, Nettlestead, Kent. Mid to Late Fifteenth Century. (Image created by Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.17. Angels in Tracery Lights of Window nIV at St. Mary's, Nettlestead, Kent. Mid to Late Fifteenth Century. (Image created by Oliver Fearon)

Figure VI.18. St. Peter and St. Paul in Salle, Norfolk. East Window, Light C2, c.1440. (Image: <http://therosewindow.com/pilot/Salle/Ew-Frame.htm>)

Figure VI.19. St. Mary Magdalen, Mulbarton in Norfolk. (Image: <https://vidimus.org/issues/issue-35/panel-of-the-month/>)

Figure VI.20. Angels in Tracery Lights of Window nIV at St. Mary's, Nettlestead, Kent. Mid to Late Fifteenth Century. (Image created by Oliver Fearon)



### Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor at the University of York, Sarah Brown, for her continued guidance, patience and encouragement during the process of researching and writing this thesis. My work has greatly benefited from the many stimulating conversations during our supervisions and her great insight has taught me to see windows and buildings in a number of unexpected ways. The project has also benefitted from the dedicated input of Professor Tim Ayers, whose thoughts and questions have greatly aided the evolution of the project. Numerous members of the History of Art Department, especially Dr. Jeanne Nuechterlein and Professor Helen Hills, have also offered helpful suggestions during the project and my studies at York, in general. This thesis has been generously funded by The Burrell Collection, Glasgow, through the AHRC, where my co-supervisor Vivien Hamilton has also provided help and encouragement with the project. Especial thanks is due to numerous members of past and present staff of the Burrell but especially Marie Stumpff for her assistance and facilitation with looking at stained glass from the Fawsley Hall collection. I am also very grateful to Kenny Clark and Ed Johnson at the Burrell who also assisted with looking at glass. I would also like to thank Terry Bloxham at the V&A who has helped when viewing the Beaupré Hall glass. The development of the project is also indebted to discussions with numerous other friends and colleagues from other institutions in the UK and abroad. They are Phillip Lankester, Professor Julian Luxford, Dr. Nigel Ramsay, Dr. Clive Burgess, Dr. Elizabeth New, Dr. Adrian Ailes and Dr. Torsten Hiltmann. Extra special thanks is owed to Dr. Christian Steer and Dr. David Harry whose help, encouragement and friendship, forged through the Harlaxton Medieval Symposium, have spurred me on greatly over the past few years. During this project and my prior postgraduate studies, I have been spurred on by a number of friends at York and further afield who have provided both academic and emotional guidance. They are Maria-Anna Aristova, Cher Casey, Katie Harrison and Megan Stacey. At home in Manchester my parents and brother, Patrick, have helped me in so many ways. However, it is because of my partner, Sadie, that I have been able to persevere. Through her emotional and intellectual support on a daily basis, I have been able to see this project through to its end.

This work was supported by the Arts & Humanities Research Council (grant number AH/M004813/1).

### Declaration

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

I have published part of the analysis of the terms “genealogie” and “alliaunce,” examined in Chapter 1, and some details of the glazing of Cotehele House, which is one of the thesis’ case studies. However, this published work deals with these materials in an extremely brief manner in comparison to the extended discussion they receive in the thesis. The publication in question is Oliver Fearon, “The English Gentry’s Domestic Glass, c.1490-1540: Towards a Contemporary Nomenclature,” in *Le Vitrail dans le Demeure. Des Origines à Nos Jours. Actes du XIIIe Colloque International du Corpus Vitrearum*, ed. K. Boulanger (Ghent: Snoeck, 2018), 312-7.

In addition, I have published work on some of the thesis’ primary sources in a short book chapter. It conducted a brief analysis of the will of Margaret Paston, assessed in Chapter 2 and Thomas Froxmere’s preparatory drawing for a window, explored in Chapter 3. It also discussed the will of John Pympe and the glazing of St. Mary’s Nettlestead, examined in chapters 1 and 2. In the said book chapter, my analysis of these sources is substantially different in its focus to that taken in the thesis. Moreover, in the thesis, I make different conclusions about the archaeology of Nettlestead’s glazing to those drawn in the book chapter. Oliver Fearon, “As Yt Ys Made: Gender and Description in Plans for Armorial Displays by the English Gentry c. 1460–1500,” in *Heraldic Artists and Painters In the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times*, eds. T. Hiltmann and L. Hablot (Ostfildern: Thorbecke Verlag, 2018), 97-113.

## Introduction

This thesis examines the domestic stained glass commissioned by landed families in England during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. As a place where people forged lasting familial bonds, reared children, entertained guests and developed profitable agricultural businesses, the manor was one of the most important centres of elite culture during the later medieval period. The thesis explores the stained glass commissioned within these environments and aims to uncover their intentions through focussing on an analysis of gender and its representation in surviving instances of domestic glazing.

More than any other social group, domestic glass survives in the houses of the late medieval “gentry:” families in the later medieval period who were keen to establish their elite social status through a number of social expectations, outlined below in detail.<sup>1</sup> Although small in size, there is a surviving body of late medieval glass from these houses that enables one to conduct a study of gentry domestic glass. These glazing schemes are preserved both in-situ and in museum collections.<sup>2</sup> Almost all of the surviving glass from these houses shows the coats of arms of their resident families, their ancestors and their social peers, many of which appear to have been arranged in distinct groups or narrative sequences. Whilst some armorial glass survives in parlours, this study focusses specifically on that commissioned for domestic halls, due to the greater survival of glazing schemes from these rooms.<sup>3</sup>

The thesis harnesses this material to investigate the representation and construction of elite identity in the domestic sphere. In particular, the thesis probes the motives for representing ties to specific people, the visual strategies implemented in doing so and the different ways family members may have consumed these arrangements. For the first time, this thesis assesses the motives behind medieval domestic glazing in an extended study.

---

<sup>1</sup> See "Literature Review," included below.

<sup>2</sup> The research conducted for this thesis has benefited from a partnership with Glasgow Life and specifically The Burrell Collection which has provided access to one of the thesis' main case studies from Fawsley Hall in Northamptonshire. It is due to the eclectic collecting interests of Sir William Burrell, the founder of this institution, that such a comprehensive set of medieval windows has survived, thus enabling a study of this kind.

<sup>3</sup> A notable surviving example of gentry glazing from a parlour is that at Lytes Cary in Somerset. It can be demonstrated through comparison with an early family tree to have been placed in the parlour's bay window in the late sixteenth century. The family tree is at Somerset Heritage Centre, Taunton. MS DD\XLY/1; Henry Maxwell-Lyte, "The Lytes of Lytescary," *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society* 38.2 (1892): 1-101; GMHEW 3, 587-9.

The thesis begins its analysis c.1450 with the earliest surviving examples of domestic glass at Ockwells Manor in Berkshire and Athelhampton Hall in Dorset. For reasons outlined below, the thesis finishes c.1560 when a system for policing the use of coats of arms appears to have become formalised within England.<sup>4</sup> It is assumed that this date marks a point after which one's ability to use coats of arms as a means of fashioning one's identity and social status became substantially reduced.

The analysis adopts an empirical approach, examining surviving domestic windows by drawing on textual evidence as well as their own visual and material qualities. Whilst some documentary evidence, such as household accounts and family wills, provide some clues, there are no primary sources that provide specific information about individual motives behind domestic glazing schemes. The thesis therefore uses evidence relating to the commissioning of armorial displays intended for churches. As numerous scholars have argued artistic commissions for ecclesiastical spaces could often be motivated by piety or a wish to obtain prayers for one's soul after death.<sup>5</sup> However, Pamela Graves and Nigel Saul have argued, patrons could also invest in a church's fabric as a means of constructing individual or familial status within a local community.<sup>6</sup> For this reason, the thesis often draws inferentially on ecclesiastical evidence for exploring issues of gender, identity and status in domestic settings.

The thesis is principally focussed on examining the intentions of the 'authors' responsible for planning and commissioning these sequences from glaziers and their workshops. The thesis conceives of 'authors' as individuals who rationalised their plans for commissions of stained glass

---

<sup>4</sup> Adrian Ailes states that "visitations", the process of policing peoples' entitlement to coats of arms, became a routine apparatus of the Crown from 1561 onwards. Adrian Ailes, "The Development of the Heralds' Visitations in England and Wales 1450-1600," *The Coat of Arms* 3rd series, 5.217 (2009): 14.

<sup>5</sup> Clive Burgess, "Time and Place: The Late Medieval English Parish in Perspective," in *The Parish Church in Later Medieval England. Proceedings of 2002 Harlaxton Symposium*, eds. C. Burgess and E. Duffy (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2006), 20; Nigel Saul, "The Gentry and the Parish," in *The Parish Church in Later Medieval England. Proceedings of 2002 Harlaxton Symposium*, eds. C. Burgess and E. Duffy (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2006), 252; Nigel Saul, *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages: History and Representation*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 120-5; Simon Roffey, *The Medieval Chantry Chapel: An Archaeology* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 104-5.

<sup>6</sup> Pamela Graves, "Social Space in the English Medieval Parish Church," *Economy and Society* 18.3 (1989): 297-322; Saul, "The Gentry and the Parish," 251; Nigel Saul, "Bold as Brass: Secular Display in English Medieval Brasses," in *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*, eds. M. Keen and P. Coss (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), 169-94.

through preliminary drawings and notes before submitting them to their glazier, following a process for commissioning artistic projects that Richard Marks and Phillip Lindley have suggested was typical during this period.<sup>7</sup> The analysis adopts the terms “gentry lords,” “landowning men,” “gentlewomen,” “women” and, collectively, “gentry families,” when referring to the 'authors' responsible for commissioning domestic glass.<sup>8</sup> When discussing authorial contexts the terms “gentry lords” and “landowning men” are intended to mean men in possession of a manor and at the head of a household containing his family and a broader body of servants. This definition of a household is taken from Chris Woolgar's analysis of the "great household" in later medieval England.<sup>9</sup> In contrast to the aforementioned male terms, “gentlewomen”, and “women” are taken to mean either the wife or mother of this head male figure.

The following chapters explore five surviving examples of domestic glass and in places use archaeological reconstructions to analyse the placement of glazing within their original architectural settings. Due to the complex nature of studying the history and placement of stained glass in architectural space, the basic details needed to understand the glazing schemes are outlined in the main body of the thesis text. However, at times, footnotes will direct the reader to relevant appendices at the end of the main thesis text in Volume 1 where these issues are discussed at much greater length. Whilst all of the written analysis and archaeology of the domestic glass is contained within Volume 1, the images relating to each chapter and appendix are located in Volume 2.

Many of the examples of domestic glazing in this study have not been researched before to any great degree and the following study represents, in some cases, a first presentation of this material to assist in future scholarly analysis. Some exhibition catalogues, guidebooks and unpublished pamphlets have correctly identified some of the arms in the surviving glass and suggested their likely authors.<sup>10</sup> However, no previous attempts have been made to determine their original arrangements in architectural space or their chronology as commissions of stained glass. The five case studies explored in this thesis are selected based on their retention of glazing within actual domestic space or the extent of their preservation in museums.

---

<sup>7</sup> Richard Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 3-27; Phillip Lindley, “The Commissioning Process,” in *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, eds. R. Marks and P. Williamson (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 90-1.

<sup>8</sup> The same terms are also used in the singular throughout the thesis.

<sup>9</sup> Chris Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 8-15.

<sup>10</sup> These previous sources are cited below in the relevant places.

In some instances, access to surviving evidence has been impeded due to circumstances beyond the author's control. One of the surviving case studies of domestic glass is in private ownership and my attempts to arrange a visit to the property have been unsuccessful. However, scholars who have been permitted entrance in the past have kindly provided me with photographs of this case study.<sup>11</sup> Some of the glazing is situated in houses that are public attractions and are fortunately open to visitors for most of the year. In these cases, I was able to visit these houses and take photographs of the glazing from ground level. However, their remote locations, as well as their health and safety legislation, prevented me from erecting scaffolding that would have permitted for a closer examination of their windows.<sup>12</sup> Despite limitations to accessing in-situ glazing, I have been able to examine two case studies at much closer range due to their locations at the Burrell Collection in Glasgow and the V&A Museum in London. In spite of this closer access to glazing in museums, the study acknowledges that its evidence base is somewhat limited when compared with the surviving material that might be available for study were there fewer obstacles to studying it at close range. A greater degree of access to in-situ glass may have enabled the study to draw more comparisons between the case studies and possibly also make firmer conclusions. Nevertheless, from the available evidence, the thesis is able to make a number of reasonable interpretations regarding the intentions behind domestic sequences of armorial glass.

The first case study is from the mid fifteenth century and survives in-situ in Ockwells Manor, Berkshire, home to John Noreys, a Lancastrian courtier under Henry VI. The manor appears to have been rebuilt and glazed between his inheritance of the house in 1450 and his death in 1466.<sup>13</sup> Its preservation of eighteen armorial windows permits an assessment of its intentions as well as the likely audiences intended to view this glazing on a regular basis.

The second case study is a series of armorial windows made by the Martyn family for their manor at Athelhampton in Dorset. The house was constructed during the fifteenth century and its surviving

---

<sup>11</sup> I would like to thank John Goodall and John Titterton for providing me with photographs of the glazing at Ockwells Manor.

<sup>12</sup> I would also like to thank Rachel Hunt at Cotehele House and the staff of Athelhampton Hall for their assistance when visiting these properties.

<sup>13</sup> GMHEW 3, 124-30; Everard Green, "The Identification of the Eighteen Worthies commemorated in the Heraldic Glass in Hall Windows of Ockwells Manor House," *Archaeologia* 56 (January, 1899): 323-36.

hall glazing demonstrates two glazing campaigns during this period.<sup>14</sup> The preservation of two in-situ windows similarly allows an insight into the Martyns' motives behind their glazing as well as the audiences for whom they were intended.

The third case study is Cotehele House, situated in Cornwall on the cusp of the border with Devon. The manor was built during the fourteenth century by the Edgcumbe family and gradually altered over the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.<sup>15</sup> It is during this later period that the Edgcumbes commissioned the ten surviving armorial shields located in their hall but likely out of their original positions. The glazing enables us to probe the Edgcumbes' motives, yet an examination of their intended audience is more difficult given the lack of evidence regarding their original placement in the building, before the nineteenth century.

The fourth case study comprises two series of glazing from Fawsley Hall in Northamptonshire, commissioned by the Knightley family during the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.<sup>16</sup> This glass is now housed in The Burrell Collection in Glasgow. Through a Collaborative Award with Glasgow Life, which has generously funded this project, the research presented here has benefitted from being able to access first-hand the large number of surviving panels from Fawsley Hall at the Burrell Collection in order to assess the aesthetic and material interests of the Knightleys during the commissioning of their glazing.

---

<sup>14</sup> GMHEW 3, 487-90; H1, 470-4; Anonymous, *Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the County of Dorset, Volume 3: Central* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1970), 8-13; Amanda Colbourne, "Sir William Martyn: The True History of the Builder of Athelhampton Hall," *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 113 (1991): 192-3.

<sup>15</sup> GMHEW 3, 522-8; J.L. Kirby, "Edgcumbe [Edgecombe], Sir Richard, (c. 1443–1489)," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 21st March, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8470>; J.L. Kirby, "Edgcumbe, Sir Peter (1477–1539)," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 21st March, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8469>.

<sup>16</sup> John Heward and Robert Taylor, *The Country Houses of Northamptonshire* (London: Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1996), 211-22; George Baker, *History and Antiquities of the County of Northampton* (London: John Bowyer 1822-30), 381-2; Richard Marks has examined the glazing in the Knightley's parish church of St. Mary's at Fawsley in Richard Marks, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Northamptonshire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 65-71; Dorothy Rice's thesis gives extensive details on the careers of Sir Richard IV (whom she refers to as "Richard Knightley III") and Sir Edmund. Dorothy Rice, *Patterns of Progress and Social Mobility* (PhD diss., University of Leicester, 1996), 103-19.

The fifth case study of glass comes from Beaupré Hall near Outwell in Cambridgeshire and was commissioned by the Beaupré family during the early sixteenth century.<sup>17</sup> The Beauprés' glazing, which survives in the V&A, shows their ancestry from the thirteenth century to the beginning of the sixteenth century. It is of great value to this study due to its preservation of certain techniques representing gentry interests in certain glazing techniques. To assist in understanding the compositions of the aforementioned families, the reader is encouraged to familiarise themselves with the positions of the corresponding family trees in Volume 2. At relevant points in the following chapters, footnotes will direct the reader to specific family trees.

## Literature Review

In seeking to uncover the intentions behind the domestic glazing of the 'gentry,' we must gain an understanding of the ways in which scholars have conceptualised this social group. Most scholars agree that over the later medieval period the gentry remained largely distinct from the nobility. Unlike gentry families, the nobility were defined through their membership to the Peerage - the ranks of Duke, Earl and Baron - and their continued military service to the Crown, as K.B. Macfarlane and Christine Carpenter have discussed.<sup>18</sup> On face value, the gentry are often discussed in relation to their description in parliamentary documents during this period in terms of the ranks, "knight," "esquire" or "gentleman." However, as scholars have noted, the perception of one's social class was determined by numerous factors during this period besides official rank.<sup>19</sup>

Christine Carpenter has stressed that the possession and effective management of land was a crucial means by which landowning families of fifteenth-century Warwickshire might be perceived as

---

<sup>17</sup> Christopher Hussey, "Beaupré Hall, Wisbech" *Country Life* (December 1st, 1923): 754-60; T. D. Atkinson, et al, "Wisbech Hundred: Outwell and Upwell," in *A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 4, City of Ely; Ely, N. and S. Witchford and Wisbech Hundreds*, ed. R. B. Pugh (London: Victoria County History, 2002), 206-19; Francis Blomefield, *An Essay Towards A Topographical History of the County of Norfolk: Volume 7* (London: W. Miller, 1807), 454-78.

<sup>18</sup> K. B. MacFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 268-78; Christine Carpenter, "England: The Nobility and the Gentry," in *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. S. H. Rigby (New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), 261-82.

<sup>19</sup> D. A. L. Morgan, "The Individual Style of the English Gentleman," in *Gentry and Lesser Nobility in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. M. Jones (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 15-35; Philippa Maddern, "Gentility," in *Gentry Culture in Late Medieval England*, eds. R. Radulescu and A. Truelove (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 18-34.



being of gentle rank.<sup>20</sup> As Maurice Keen has observed, one might be able to identify a member of the gentry through their wish to compile an ancient lineage for their family.<sup>21</sup> Keen has also observed that mutual recognition of gentility within communities of landowners was an important aspect of gentry identity. Indeed, families frequently intermarried in their local counties suggesting that in communities of landowners there was a collective recognition of a shared social status.<sup>22</sup> Scholars also agree that advertising one's career as a soldier remained a crucial hallmark of gentry identity during this period, through choosing to represent oneself as a knight on one's tomb.<sup>23</sup> In addition, acts of "conspicuous consumption," or the exhibition of one's financial resources through purchasing expensive products, might have been perceived as another hallmark of gentility. As scholars have noted, acquiring luxury clothing but also commissioning works of art and architecture might qualify as acts intended to display one's great economic resources.<sup>24</sup>

Scholars have also suggested that certain levels of income might denote one's qualification to gentility.<sup>25</sup> Moreover the career of a member of the gentry could be integral to their status. Peter Coss has proposed that members of gentry communities might be identified in the fourteenth century through their roles in local county government, in the offices of sheriff and justice of the peace, overseeing matters of law and order in rural communities.<sup>26</sup> Some scholars also consider their service to members of the local nobility or at the royal court as a defining feature of their status.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Christine Carpenter, "The Fifteenth-Century English Gentry and their Estates," in *Gentry and Lesser Nobility in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. M. Jones (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 36-58; Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, 3.

<sup>21</sup> Maurice Keen, *Origins of the English Gentleman: Heraldry, Chivalry and Gentility in Medieval England, c.1300 - c.1500* (Stroud: Tempus Publishing Limited, 2002), 105-9.

<sup>22</sup> Keen, *Origins*, 112.

<sup>23</sup> Maurice Keen, "Chivalry," in *Gentry Culture in Late Medieval England*, eds. R. Radulescu and A. Truelove (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 35-50; Keen, *Origins*, 71-97. Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, 49., 226.

<sup>24</sup> Kim Phillips, "Masculinities and the Medieval English Sumptuary Laws," *Gender and History* 19 (2007): 23; Anthony Emery, "Late Medieval Houses as an Expression of Social Status," *Historical Research* 78.200 (2005): 140-61; Richard Marks, "An Age of Consumption: Art for England c.1400-1547," in *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, eds. R. Marks and P. Williamson (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 20-1.

<sup>25</sup> Christine Carpenter, *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society 1401-1499* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 57-9.

<sup>26</sup> Peter Coss, "The Formation of the English Gentry," *Past and Present* 147 (1995): 53-6.

<sup>27</sup> Keen, *Origins*, 111.

Given the numerous ways in which the gentry could be defined in later medieval England, it appears more instructive to our analysis of domestic glass to focus on the specific ways in which gentility and gender interacted with one another during this period. Alison James has suggested, in her study of gentry masculinity in fifteenth-century Yorkshire, that a principal means through which some men were able to convey their gentility was through the establishment of a historical connection between their family and their estate. By commissioning a series of tombs for his local church, a male landowner could qualify his gentle status through giving the impression his family had resided at his manor for several generations.<sup>28</sup> Kim Phillips has argued that another feature of gentry male identity was a wish to present one's self as part of a distinct group of men within a male hierarchy. Through legally restricting grades of sumptuous dress to elite men, Phillips has argued that gentry males were able to visibly represent their superiority to lower classes of men for whom luxury fabrics were prohibited.<sup>29</sup> In addition to these two features of gentry masculinity, James and Phillips both acknowledge the importance of "conspicuous consumption" to masculine identity. Through both costly attire and expensive commissions of art and architecture, both scholars agree that possessing luxury items might be deemed a hallmark of gentry masculinity in later medieval England.<sup>30</sup>

To assist in examining the representation of gentry lordship, we must also draw on studies that have explored other aspects of elite masculinity in medieval England. For instance, it appears a principal concern for elite men was to retain control over their patrimonies. For instance, William Aird has argued that William the Conqueror was perceived as an effective father through maintaining control over his ancestral lands despite his heir's attempts to prematurely acquire them.<sup>31</sup> In addition to controlling land, Ruth Karras has also argued for the importance of being able to demonstrate proficiency in armed combat, either on the battlefield or in the tournament joust. Through engaging in such activities, men were able to display their "prowess" and legitimise themselves as elite males in later medieval Europe.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Alison James, "'To Knowe a Gentilman': Men and Gentry Culture in Fifteenth-Century Yorkshire" (PhD diss., University of York 2012), 122-214.

<sup>29</sup> Phillips, "Masculinities," 26.

<sup>30</sup> James, "'To Knowe a Gentilman'," 181., 202; Phillips, "Masculinities," 23.

<sup>31</sup> W. M. Aird, "Frustrated Masculinity: The Relationship between William the Conqueror and his Eldest Son," in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (Longman: London and New York, 1999), 48-52.

<sup>32</sup> Ruth Mazo Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 21-5.

Whilst these social characteristics appear to have been important in authenticating elite manhood, it seems unlikely that they were all necessary for a man to be perceived as a gentry lord. Philippa Maddern has argued that gentility was an ongoing performance where status was constantly negotiated in relation to numerous social factors.<sup>33</sup> Alison James concurs that male gentry identity in fifteenth-century Yorkshire was performative, whereby men might use art and architecture to fabricate aspects of their identity in order to follow a locally prescribed code of gentry masculinity.<sup>34</sup> In examining gentry lordship, we will adopt this approach advocated by Maddern and James. The thesis considers how gentry lords might have commissioned domestic glazing to represent authentic aspects of their identities as the heads of their households and estates. However, the analysis also acknowledges that men could also commission armorial glass to circumvent inconvenient social factors that threatened them from successfully performing their role as lord.

As members of the gentry lord's household, we must also consider the role of his female relatives in the commissioning of domestic glass. Scholars have long noted the patriarchal confines of late medieval society within which women operated. In contrast to men, gentlewomen rarely possessed the same access to property that would have enabled them to exert their independence in the same way as their fathers, husbands or sons. Women's personal autonomy was limited as the inherited property a woman brought to a marriage was often absorbed into her husband's patrimony. The law of "dower" only permitted women an independent share of their husband's property following his death.<sup>35</sup> Despite these restrictions, women were often active agents in supporting their male relatives through providing spiritual aid to their natal families through their artistic commissions. For instance, Kathryn Smith has shown how women from elite medieval families used armorial series in their devotional books as a means of reminding them to pray for certain ancestors.<sup>36</sup> Scholars of later medieval women also agree they were instrumental in ensuring their husbands were appropriately represented in death. Brigitte Kurmann-Schwartz has argued how women played an important role in commissioning their husbands' tombs and endowing religious institutions to secure prayers for their souls.<sup>37</sup> As Barbara Harris has shown, many women also showed support

---

<sup>33</sup> Maddern, "Gentility," 28-31.

<sup>34</sup> James, "To Knowe a Gentilman'," 290.

<sup>35</sup> Barbara Harris, *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers* (Oxford University Press, 2002), 18-9.

<sup>36</sup> Kathryn A. Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England* (London: The British Library, 2003), 57-139.

<sup>37</sup> Brigitte Kurmann-Schwartz, "Gender and Medieval Art," in *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe*, ed. C. Rudolph (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006), 128-58.

for their husbands through commissioning tombs and windows in their local parish churches as a means of soliciting intercessory prayers from the local congregation.<sup>38</sup>

Elite women were also highly attuned to their social role as custodians of the family patrimony and their duty of care to their children. Susan James has demonstrated how women might commission portraiture during the sixteenth century to defend their entitlements to family property.<sup>39</sup> In addition to protecting the patrimony, scholars have also examined women's interest in representing motherhood as a growing acknowledgement of their pastoral role within the family. Pamela Sheingorn has argued how representations of St. Anne, which abounded in the books used by elite families, demonstrate a growing acknowledgement by women of their responsibilities as tutors and councilors to their children.<sup>40</sup> Loveday Lewes Gee has also argued that images of the Virgin in women's books might reflect their identification with her role as a protectress.<sup>41</sup>

The families studied in this thesis expressed their identities through using coats of arms and aspects of their associated visual culture. As Adrian Ailes has argued, coats of arms seem to have been initially adopted in England by the nobility during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as a means of enabling them to distinguish friend from foe on the battlefield.<sup>42</sup> Over the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, elite men began to use coats of arms in artistic projects as a means of personally identifying themselves.<sup>43</sup> As Maurice Keen has outlined, these visual designs were adopted by the gentry during the fifteenth century as a means of representing oneself and the antiquity of one's family.<sup>44</sup> The Crown made numerous attempts throughout the fifteenth century to police people's entitlement to use these visual designs based on their ancestral legitimacy for doing

---

<sup>38</sup> Barbara Harris, *English Aristocratic Women and the Fabric of Piety, 1450-1550* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018), 25-50.

<sup>39</sup> Susan E. James, *The Feminine Dynamic in English Art, 1485-1603: Women as Consumers, Patrons and Painters* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 151-65.

<sup>40</sup> Pamela Sheingorn, "'The Wise Mother': The Image of St. Anne Teaching the Virgin Mary," *Gesta* 32.1 (1993): 69-80.

<sup>41</sup> Loveday Lewes Gee, *Women, Art and Patronage from Henry III to Edward III, 1216-1377* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002), 53.

<sup>42</sup> Adrian Ailes, "The Knight, Heraldry and Armour: The Role of Recognition and the Origins of Heraldry," in *Medieval Knighthood: Papers from the Fifth Strawberry Hill Conference*, eds. C. Harper-Bill and R. Harvey (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1992), 1-21.

<sup>43</sup> Peter Coss, "Knighthood, Heraldry and Social Exclusion in Edwardian England," in *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*, eds. P. Coss and M. Keen (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003), 39.

<sup>44</sup> Maurice Keen, "Heraldry and Hierarchy: Esquires and Gentlemen," in *Orders and Hierarchies in Late Medieval and Renaissance Europe*, ed. J. Denton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 94-109.

so. Thus, in 1417, Henry V issued a writ stating that those in Hampshire, Wiltshire, Sussex and Dorset preparing for the invasion of Normandy should be able to prove their ancestral right to bear arms if wishing to do so in battle.<sup>45</sup> Similarly, in the early sixteenth century the Crown showed signs of engaging in increasingly routine checks on their use. In 1530, Henry VIII instigated the first so-called “heraldic visitation” requiring heralds to survey certain areas of the country and destroy arms for which families could prove no ancestral precedent.<sup>46</sup> Whilst the regulation of their use can be traced to the early fifteenth century, systematic checks did not occur on a regular basis until 1561 as Adrian Ailes and others have shown.<sup>47</sup> Given the many unsuccessful attempts to regulate coats of arms before this date, the period examined in this thesis, c.1450-1560, encapsulates a period of relative liberty with regards to the use of arms and allows one to explore their appropriation by gentry lords and gentlewomen as a means of defining their social status.

Although there is evidence elite families were using coats of arms in an innovative manner, many scholars have disregarded the potential meaning and significance of these interventions into visual culture. This is largely due to the study of “heraldry” being established as a post-medieval discipline. Authoritative heraldic scholars such as Charles Boutell (d.1877) established a set of rules and classifications for using coats of arms and its associated visual designs in his role as a herald, partially based on usages during the medieval period.<sup>48</sup> Heraldry developed as a group of emissaries at medieval European courts, whose responsibility for policing the use of coats of arms developed in the later fifteenth century but only became formally associated with their title, hence the term “heraldry,” in the seventeenth century.<sup>49</sup> For this reason the study uses the term ‘coat of arms’, ‘coats’ or simply ‘arms’, for describing the designs contained within shields.

One means through which gentry families appear to have fashioned their identities was through the use of specific shield types. Despite the variety of shields that appear in artistic projects during this period, scholars have not attempted to examine the meaning behind patrons' choice of shield types,

---

<sup>45</sup> Keen, “Heraldry and Hierarchy,” 103.

<sup>46</sup> Anthony Wagner, *Heralds and Heraldry in the Middle Ages: An Inquiry Into the Growth of the Armorial Function of Heralds* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956), 9.

<sup>47</sup> Ailes, “The Development of the Heralds' Visitations,” 7-23; Jackson W. Armstrong, “The Development of the Office of Arms in England, c.1413-85,” in *The Herald in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. K. Stevenson (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009), 9-28.

<sup>48</sup> J. P. Brooke-Little, ed. *Boutell's Heraldry* (London: Frederick Warne, 1950), passim; Thomas Woodcock and John Martin Robinson, *The Oxford Guide to Heraldry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 50-138.

<sup>49</sup> Torsten Hiltmann, “The Emergence of the Word ‘Heraldry’ in the Seventeenth Century and the Roots of a Misconception.” *The Coat of Arms* 11.2 (2015): 107-16.

preferring instead to classify the different types of shield in use during a given period.<sup>50</sup> Another principal way in which gentry lords and gentlewomen might use coats of arms to construct their identities was through the innovative use of armorial marshalling: the combination of one or more coat of arms on a shield to signify a social relationship. This line of analysis follows the work of Adrian Ailes who has adopted a sympathetic approach to the use of marshalling. Whilst ascribing some essential meanings to certain marshalling forms, Ailes acknowledges it could be a “flexible” tool for expressing ideas about identity and ancestry.<sup>51</sup> Although the thesis will argue that gentry lords adopted a degree of creative license when marshalling their arms in artistic commissions they clearly still abided by some conventions during this period as a means of communicating social relationships. To understand these rules, the reader is referred to Volume 2: *Armorial Glossary*, where armorial terminology and its meanings are visually illustrated to assist in the understanding of this thesis.

The houses of those people who wished to express gentility have also been well-studied by architectural historians, such as Maurice Howard, Nicholas Cooper and Anthony Emery, in terms of their function and historical periodisation.<sup>52</sup> Whilst these studies cover a wide range of examples of domestic architecture they tend to give limited coverage to commissions in other media, such as stained glass. This study seeks to remedy this lacuna by tapping into the specific qualities of stained glass windows that made them appropriate to forms of self-representation.

Scholars have long recognised the contribution made by gentry and elite patrons to stained glass in ecclesiastical settings. In most cases, gentry lords might conduct a comprehensive glazing scheme within their local parish church as a means of expressing their local presence and authority. For instance, Sarah Brown has assessed how the Tame family of Fairford in Gloucestershire commissioned an entire sequence of windows for their local church, financed by their revenues

---

<sup>50</sup> Ottfried Neubecker and John Brooke-Little, *Heraldry: Sources, Symbols, and Meaning* (Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976), 76.

<sup>51</sup> Adrian Ailes, "Heraldic Marshalling in Medieval England," in *Académie Internationale d'Héraldique: VIIIth Colloquium Canterbury*, ed. Cecil Humphrey-Smith (Canterbury: Family History, 1995), 15-25.

<sup>52</sup> Maurice Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics 1490-1550* (London: George Philip, 1987), passim; Nicholas Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry 1480-1680* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), passim; Margaret Wood, *The English Mediaeval House* (London: Bracken Books, 1985), passim; GMHEW 1, passim; GMHEW 2, passim; GMHEW 3, passim.

from the wool trade.<sup>53</sup> However, in other contexts, elite patrons might contribute in a more piecemeal fashion to the glazing of a church interior. During the fourteenth century, the family of Archdeacon Stephen de Mauley commissioned a window for the nave of York Minster. As Brown suggests there may have been an agreement between the cathedral authorities and potential donors allowing them to represent themselves in its windows for donations to the fabric.<sup>54</sup> Similarly, Christopher Norton has argued that Archbishop Richard Scrope (d.1405), who hailed from the Scropes of Masham, prospectively planned the major windows of the Eastern Arm of York Minster which were subsequently commissioned by the Bishops of Durham, Walter Skirlaw and Thomas Langley.<sup>55</sup> Indeed, the glazing of some parts of the gentry house might be understood in relation to traditional patterns of stained glass commemoration, yet some of the interests pursued by men aspiring to gentility, such as representations of ancestry, require us to reassess the temporal aspects of how stained glass projects could come into fruition.

### Thesis Outline

Chapter 1 attempts to establish the different social relationships that landed families expressed through their domestic glazing. For this purpose, the chapter probes descriptions of domestic and ecclesiastical glazing sequences in later medieval England to aid in the interpretation of surviving domestic glazing. Chapter 2 narrows its focus to analyse the likely authors of surviving domestic glazing and examines the different gender roles in which gentry lords and gentlewomen chose to represent themselves. The chapter draws on a number of wills, exploring the ways in which male and female authors sought to construct their identities through commissioning series of arms on tombs and in ecclesiastical glazing. Chapter 3 analyses the ways in which gentry lords sought to influence the design and manufacture of their armorial glazing as a means of fashioning certain aspects of their identities. The chapter draws on a broad range of domestic and ecclesiastical evidence to examine how visual, material and technical aspects of surviving glass enabled gentry lords to construct aspects of their identity necessary for maintaining their domestic authority. Finally, Chapter 4 explores the placement of armorial glazing in different parts of the hall. The chapter analyses the positions of certain windows in relation to the imagined sightlines of viewers

---

<sup>53</sup> Sarah Brown, "The Windows," in *Life, Death and Art: The Medieval Stained Glass of Fairford Parish Church: A Multimedia Exploration*, eds. S. Brown and L. MacDonald (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997), 49-69. For further examples see Richard Marks, *Stained Glass in England during the Middle Ages* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1993), *passim*.

<sup>54</sup> Sarah Brown, 'Our Magnificent Fabrick.' *York Minster An Architectural History, c.1220-1500* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2003), 90-1.

<sup>55</sup> Christopher Norton, "Richard Scrope and York Minster," in *Richard Scrope, Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr*, ed. P.J.P. Goldberg (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2007), 138-213.

moving through or remaining static in the hall, as a means of further understanding the intended audiences of domestic glazing.



## Chapter 1. Social Relationships in Domestic Glass

### 1.1. Introduction

This first chapter seeks to identify the different social relationships gentry families communicated through their domestic glazing sequences. Drawing on late medieval descriptions of similar glazing programmes, the analysis explores the connections that surviving case studies were intended to signify, analysing them in relation to the language used in these sources and examining the visual methods they adopted to convey specific relationships. The analysis explores two terms, “genealogie” and “alliaunce,” to probe the different ways glazing could be used to conceive of a family’s identity and social ties. The ideas expressed through these terms assist in uncovering the meaning of extant glazing from Beaupré Hall, Cotehele House and Athelhampton Hall.

The first part of the chapter contextualises these two terms in relation to their immediate authorial contexts, their etymological origins and their broader semantic uses in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Firstly, the chapter examines a written account by the sixteenth-century antiquarian John Leland of a glazing sequence in the Newburgh family’s residence at East Lulworth in Dorset, which he terms a “genealogie.” Although the description comes from an observer rather than a member of the Newburgh family, Leland’s text is highly useful as one of the most detailed accounts of domestic glazing from this period and offers some insight into the particular ideas the family intended it to convey. Secondly, the chapter examines plans for a prospective armorial glazing campaign in the church of St. Mary’s, Nettlestead, as described in the will of the Kentish esquire, John Pympe III (d.1496), which he refers to as an “alliaunce.” Although describing a project intended for a parish church, the detailed nature of John III’s plans enables us to explore the potential meaning behind similar series of arms in domestic glazing.

The second part of the chapter examines three case studies which reflect the contemporary meanings of the above terms. The first case study examines glazing from Beaupré Hall and draws parallels between the Beauprés’ glazing and the Newburghs’ use of a “genealogie” at East Lulworth. The second case study explores the glazing of the Edgcumbe family at Cotehele House comparing its meaning with John Pympe III’s conception of an “alliaunce” at Nettlestead. The final section draws on the glazing from Beaupré and Cotehele to probe two glazing sequences at Athelhampton Hall.

In working towards definitions of domestic glazing, the chapter reassesses previous classifications of armorial groupings in late medieval houses. Previous definitions offered by scholars have tended towards over-generalisation. Maurice Howard's survey of Tudor domestic buildings has proposed some broad concepts concerning how domestic arms might refer to "the owner, his family ties and his chief local connections... and to his allegiance to the King."<sup>56</sup> Anthony Emery has likewise considered that the glass thought to have been commissioned by John Noreys (d.1466) for his house, Ockwells Manor, represents his "patrons, friends, and associates."<sup>57</sup> Instead of Howard and Emery's summative approach, this chapter intends to compare surviving examples of glass using contemporary language in order to suggest a more precise analysis of intentions behind domestic armorial displays.

In parochial contexts, Peter Newton's work has looked in greater detail at the social relationships expressed in the lost, medieval armorial glass of the Midlands. For his purposes, Newton applied Anthony Wagner's fivefold system for classifying medieval Rolls of Arms according to their intention.<sup>58</sup> Wagner's system encompasses a range of different functions for representing people through arms. Firstly, Wagner classifies "Illustrative Rolls" as manuscripts which include arms to add "illustration or adornment." Secondly, "Occasional Rolls" show "the arms of those present on particular occasions", particularly those involving military warfare. Thirdly, "General Rolls" provide a history of ruling figures, both fictional and historical, including both rulers but also locally powerful men such as shire knights. Fourthly, "Local Rolls" provide a pictorial account of the arms-bearing men in a particular county. Finally, "Ordinaries" provide a list of armorial charges previously in use and are arranged according to their design.<sup>59</sup> Although Newton and Wagner's terms remain helpful when investigating series of arms commissioned for ecclesiastical settings, their usefulness requires revision when investigating armorial displays in domestic settings.

---

<sup>56</sup> Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House*, 42.

<sup>57</sup> GMHEW 3, 125.

<sup>58</sup> Peter Newton, *Schools of Glass Painting in the Midlands 1275-1430, Volume 1* (PhD diss., The Courtauld Institute of Art, 1961), 136-46; Wagner, *Heralds and Heraldry*, 49-55.

<sup>59</sup> Wagner does not give a definition of "Ordinary" in this section, however the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines it as, entry 14.b. "In full ordinary of arms. A book or work of reference in which heraldic charges are arranged by design and referred to the individuals or families who bear them." Anonymous, "ordinary n.," Accessed 9th July 2019, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/132360?rskey=v122bh&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid>.

## 1.2. The Newburghs' "Genealogie" at East Lulworth, Dorset

The first literary source comes from the writings of John Leland, a Tudor antiquarian, who was commissioned in 1533 by Henry VIII to conduct an ambitious project of writing first-hand accounts of buildings throughout England. The resulting work was his *Itinerary*, most likely compiled during the years 1540-45, although never published in his lifetime.<sup>60</sup> As John Chandler states, in the writing of his text, Leland most likely combined his written records of English buildings with a large quantity of notes gathered prior to his travels.<sup>61</sup> His journey through Dorset led him to a manor owned by the Newburgh family at East Lulworth where he recounts, "the genealogie of the Newborows and the name of heires general that they married with be yn glasse windows in a parler in the maner place at Est Lilleworth."<sup>62</sup>

The Newburghs had resided at East Lulworth since 1355, when the lands were granted to John de Novo Burgo by Reginald of East Lulworth.<sup>63</sup> Between the mid fourteenth and the early sixteenth centuries they amassed numerous lands in Dorset. Two Inquisition Post Mortems taken in 1485 state that, besides East Lulworth, John Newburgh owned four manors in the county which he passed to his brother Sir Roger (d.1514).<sup>64</sup> In 1492, Sir Roger's mother granted him a further four estates in Dorset.<sup>65</sup> Whilst also being a prominent landowner in the county, Sir Roger also played a role in county administration, being pricked as sheriff in 1496.<sup>66</sup>

Although we can retrieve a career profile of Sir Roger, there are few extant details about his manor, due to the wholesale rebuilding of a new "Lulworth Castle" on the site in around 1590.<sup>67</sup> Although the destruction of the Newburghs' manor prevents analysis of its glass, Leland's account provides

---

<sup>60</sup> James Carley, "Leland, John (c. 1503–1552), poet and antiquary," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 19th March 2019, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-16416>.

<sup>61</sup> John Chandler, ed., *John Leland's Itinerary: Travels in Tudor England* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1993), xii-xxvii.

<sup>62</sup> Due to their retention of Leland's original Middle English spelling, all quotes of Leland are taken from Lucy Toulmin Smith, ed., *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1535-1543, Volume 3* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1907), 253.

<sup>63</sup> H1, 133.

<sup>64</sup> IPM 1.1., 17-8.

<sup>65</sup> IPM 1.1., 311.

<sup>66</sup> LSEW, 124.

<sup>67</sup> Anonymous, *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset, Volume 2, South East* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1970), 144-151.

some insight into its meaning and appearance. It is clear Leland recognised two distinctive visual features of the glazing scheme: its subject matter (a “genealogie”) and the inclusion of additional written details (“the name of heires general that they married with.”). We will explore the potential meanings of these two components in turn.

The root of the English noun “genealogy” (via the Old French, “généalogie” and Late Medieval Latin “genealogia”) is the Greek word, γενεαλογία, meaning the “tracing of descent.”<sup>68</sup> An early fifteenth-century historical text translated from Latin, *Cursor Mundi*, demonstrates the early integration of this sense of the word into English, when describing the tracing of the steps of descent between Abraham and King David.<sup>69</sup> During this period the term had been adapted to mean a lineage in a more general sense, without highlighting distinct points in someone’s ancestry, as shown in the mid fifteenth-century text, *Lyvys of Seyntys*.<sup>70</sup> By the early sixteenth century, the term had also come to refer to one’s children as well as one’s ancestors, as Gavin Douglas’ early sixteenth-century translation of the *Aeneid* demonstrates.<sup>71</sup>

Leland’s explicit association of East Lulworth’s glazing with the “Newborows” suggests it was almost certainly concerned with tracing their patrilineal descent, given how elite families ensured their surname was transmitted through the male line during this period.<sup>72</sup> As seen in relation to the *Lyvys of Seyntys*, “genealogie” might have referred in a very general sense to the Newburghs’ patrilineal ancestry. Yet, when considering the other features of the scheme, Leland appears to have referred to a more specific set of stages within the Newburgh family line, judging by its inclusion of the names of individual spouses married to Newburgh men. Douglas’ translation of the *Aeneid*

---

<sup>68</sup> Anonymous, “genealogy, n.,” Oxford English Dictionary, Accessed 3rd July 2019, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/77484?redirectedFrom=genealogie#eid>.

<sup>69</sup> “Tuix abraham and king dau, Yee herken nov þe geneologi.” Richard Morris, ed. *Cursor Mundi (The Cursor o The World). A Northumbrian Poem of the XIVth Century in Four Versions* (London: Early English Text Society, 1874-93), 454. The OED cites this as an example of the word meaning “An account of one’s descent from an ancestor or ancestors, by enumeration of the intermediate persons; a pedigree.” Anonymous, “genealogie, n.”

<sup>70</sup> “Me thynkyth it best for me Ageyn to returne in to Italye... For ther is the issu of my genealogy.” Carl Horstmann, ed. *The Lyvys of Seyntys* (London: W. Nichols, 1835) 29; The OED cites this in relation to the entry, “Lineage, pedigree, family stock.” Anonymous, “genealogie, n.”

<sup>71</sup> “Thair sall thow lern all thi genealogy, And what cetie is to the destany.” Gavin Douglas, *The XIII Bukes of Eneados of the Famose Poete Virgill, Volume 5* (London: William Copland, 1553), 131. OED cites this in relation to the third entry for this term, defining it as “Progeny, offspring. *Obsolete.*” Anonymous, “genealogie, n.”

<sup>72</sup> Patricia Crawford, *Blood Bodies and Families in Early Modern England* (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2004), 115; Joel Rosenthal, *Patriarchy and Families of Privilege in Fifteenth-Century England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 23-91.

demonstrates the term could refer to an individual's offspring. However, it is unlikely the glazing scheme represented Sir Roger's children. Lacking a male heir, Sir Roger Newburgh's lands passed after his death to his daughter and her husband, Sir John Marney.<sup>73</sup> It therefore seems likely that the main component of the glazing sequence - the "genealogie" - was concerned with tracing the individual steps in the Newburgh patrilineal line, reflecting the sense of the term used in *Cursor Mundi* and the original meaning derived from its Greek root.

It is clear from Leland's description that a related visual feature of this glazing sequence was the inclusion of female heiresses, whom a series of male Newburgh men had married. These women were represented through names which seem to have been painted onto the glass. Although the term "heires generall" in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter OED) states it could be "used to include heirs female as well as heirs male," the glazing's primary concern with tracking male descent suggests these "heires" were the spouses of respective generations of Newburgh men.<sup>74</sup> As Simon Payling has argued, gentry families frequently sought marriages with potential heiresses as a means of acquiring new estates and expanding their patrimonies.<sup>75</sup> Yet, the acquisition of land through marriage was by no means guaranteed. Many betrothals were contracted before a woman became recognised as her father's heiress, a scenario that usually emerged following his failure to beget a son. Such arrangements might therefore involve tactical forward planning for those seeking to acquire land through such means. Despite their associated risk, such marriages were one means for families, such as the Newburghs, to acquire estates before the dissolution of the monasteries during the 1530s brought about the increased availability of land for purchase.<sup>76</sup> Thus it would appear that whilst tracing their lineage, the Newburghs' glazing was intended to convey their accumulation of the patrimony which Sir Roger had in his possession in the late fifteenth century.

It is possible Leland's use of the term "genealogie" reflected his informed choice of language, based on a familiarity with the ways gentry families described artistic displays of their ancestry. Leland may, indeed, have conversed with the owners of such manors during his travels around the county.

---

<sup>73</sup> M.K. Dale's biography of Sir John Marney refers to Sir Roger's daughter as "a Dorset heiress" suggesting she inherited East Lulworth after her father's death. M.K. Dale, "MARNEY, Sir John (by 1485-1525)," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 29th March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/marney-sir-john-1485-1525>.

<sup>74</sup> Anonymous, "heir, n.," *Oxford English Dictionary*, Accessed 19th March 2019, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/85509?rskey=VeB15S&result=1>.

<sup>75</sup> Simon Payling, "The Economics of Marriage in Late Medieval England: The Marriage of Heiresses," *Economic History Review* 54.3 (2001): 427.

<sup>76</sup> Payling, "The Economics of Marriage," 414.

Some of his writings imply he spoke to local people to inform his understanding of the history of certain buildings, as represented in his account of Sudeley Castle in Gloucestershire.<sup>77</sup> Literary evidence also reveals families like the Newburghs were familiar with synonymous words for describing lineal descent. The Paston family, who emerged as prominent members in the landowning community of Norfolk during the fifteenth century, demonstrate this through their correspondence.<sup>78</sup> When describing the parentage of William de La Pole, Duke of Suffolk, the Norfolk landowner John Paston I (d.1466) states “Item, as for the pedegré of þe seyde Dewk, he is sone to William Pool, Dewk of Suffolk.”<sup>79</sup> Paston’s use of “pedegré” in this sense, indicated de La Pole’s status as his father’s son. The letters of the Stonor family, a landed family living in Oxfordshire during the fifteenth century, demonstrate their capacity to understand words signifying one’s descent from a longer line of ancestors.<sup>80</sup> For instance, writing to the Oxfordshire landowner, Thomas Stonor II (d.1474), Thomas Gate, an escheator for Bedfordshire, stated “it is resonable a gentilman to know his pedegre and his possibilyte: seynt Poule foryete nat to write to the Romayns of what lynage he was descended.”<sup>81</sup> In this instance, Gate reminds Stonor it is necessary to be acquainted with his family history. Gate’s language demonstrates his expectation that Stonor should have been able to comprehend the senses of the terms “pedegre” and “lynage” to mean the ancestry of a particular person, using St. Paul as an exemplar to show the social advantages of knowing one’s family history. As these examples demonstrate, wealthy landowning families were capable of using and understanding singular words - such as “pedegré” and “lynage” - to conceive of ancestral descent in a similar way to Leland. Even if Leland’s account reflects his own choice of language, it seems plausible the Newburghs conceived of their glazing sequence in relation to ideas associated with the word “genealogie” or its late medieval synonyms.

As a record from an observer’s perspective, and with no surviving glass to compare to his account, the usefulness of Leland’s writings are to some degree limited. However, through etymological analysis and comparison with contemporary texts, it is possible to suggest the Newburghs’ “genealogie” was intended to enable the viewer to trace the roots of their family and show their

---

<sup>77</sup> “Sudeley Castell by Winchelcombe was buildid, as it is there comonly spoken, ex spoliis nobilium bello Gallico captorum.” Lucy Toulmin Smith, ed., *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1535-1543, Volume 5* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1910), 221.

<sup>78</sup> Colin Richmond, *The Paston Family in the Fifteenth Century: Volume 1, The First Phase* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 23-30.

<sup>79</sup> Norman Davies et al, eds. *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century, Volume 1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 134-6.

<sup>80</sup> Elizabeth Noble, *The World of the Stonors: A Gentry Society* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009), 67-98.

<sup>81</sup> Cited in Christine Carpenter, ed. *Kingsford’s Stonor Letters and Papers, 1290-1483* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 136.

acquisition of a patrimony through marrying heiresses. Although the word is not represented in gentry sources, it is similar in meaning to terms comprehensible to gentry families such as the Pastons and Stonors. Although an imperfect analytical tool, the ensuing analysis retains “genealogie” in its examination of surviving domestic glazing.

### 1.3. An “Alliaunce” at St. Mary’s, Nettlestead, Kent

Exploration of the will of the esquire John Pympe III (d.1496) reveals how the gentry could conceive of, and define, a different kind of social relationship to that expressed through the Newburghs’ glazing.<sup>82</sup> The will, made on 7th August 1496, outlines detailed plans for two donations of armorial glass to John III’s local parish church, St. Mary’s, Nettlestead in Kent. Before exploring John III’s will, we must briefly gain an overview of the Pympe’s family history. In the fourteenth century, John III’s male ancestors had enjoyed social esteem in Kent, with his great-great grandfather, Sir William Pympe (d.1375), having obtained the rank of knight.<sup>83</sup> John III’s great-grandfather, Regnolde I (d.1426), had been locally important in the Kent community as Justice of the Peace for the county between 1418-20.<sup>84</sup> Regnolde inherited his own father’s manors, Pympe Court and Nettlestead Place, and seemed to have favoured the latter, which he occupied from 1375 onwards. The Pympe’s appear to have initially acquired the estate of Nettlestead through renting the manor and its lands from the Earls of Stafford.<sup>85</sup>

Following the accession of the Tudors in 1485, John III saw a period of professional and financial success. For example, he became a figure of local authority in Kent, being Justice of the Peace four times in 1485, 1490, 1493 and 1494 and Sheriff in 1483. His loyalty to the Tudor regime is suggested by his receipt of a grant of fifty marks a year, made only eight weeks after Henry VII’s victory at Bosworth.<sup>86</sup> He and his siblings also expanded their family’s connections during this time with a number of advantageous marriages to other gentry families in Kent. John III evidently saw his marriage to his wife, Elizabeth Whitehill, as a meaningful advance for his family, due to the

---

<sup>82</sup> TNA PROB 11/11/124.

<sup>83</sup> For the following please refer to Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 6: Pympe’s of Nettlestead.

<sup>84</sup> Whilst the following source refers to him and other descendants as “Reynolde” the thesis refers to him as “Regnolde” given its widespread in other secondary material on St. Mary’s, Nettlestead. J.S. Roskell and L.S. Woodger, “PYMPE, Reynold (c.1371-1426),” *History of Parliament*, Accessed 19th March 2019, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/pympe-reynold-1371-1426>.

<sup>85</sup> IPM 1.1, 551.

<sup>86</sup> N. H. MacMichael, "The Descent of the Manor of Evegate in Smeeth with Some Account of its Lords," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 74 (1960): 40-7; LSEW, 68.

lengthy epitaph that was to be included on his tomb, highlighting her descent from her father, Richard, an apparently esteemed soldier at the English garrison at Guînes near Calais.<sup>87</sup> In addition, his sister, Anne, married the Tudor courtier, Sir Richard Guildford, and his brother, Regnolde Pympe, married Elizabeth Pashley, daughter of John Pashley, who held lands in the county at Smeeth.

The Pympes held a close relationship with St. Mary's during the later medieval period and they may have used it as a mausoleum after their move to Nettlestead in the late fourteenth century.<sup>88</sup> The family had rebuilt the church's nave (Figure VI.1) during the early fifteenth century. Scholars have proposed that Regnolde II (d.1436), and his brother, John III's father, John II (d.1454), were responsible for this work.<sup>89</sup> The Pympes held the church's advowson for most of the fifteenth century, giving them the autonomy to appoint priests to the church and benefice of Nettlestead, and thus an idea of its practical needs.<sup>90</sup>

John III's commitment to St. Mary's is reflected in his will, which contains gifts of stained glass as well as donations relating to the broader architectural and liturgical needs of the church.<sup>91</sup> These donations of glass acted as pious bequests and were probably also intended to memorialise his family whilst seeking prayers for their souls from parishioners, as might be a typical feature of parochial commemoration during this period.<sup>92</sup> However, it would also appear John III conceived of these donations of glass as a means of expressing his social ties to other gentry families in Kent.<sup>93</sup> John III states,

---

<sup>87</sup> "heth bured John(n) Pympe sonne of John(n) Pympe sone of John(n) Sone of Regnolde sone of S[ir] William Pympe knyght that hadde to wiffe Elizabeth the daughter of Richard Whitehill leuetennte of the castell of Genys." TNA PROB 11/11/124; Whitehill's career as Lieutenant of Guînes is mentioned in Arthur Collins, *The Peerage of England: Or, An Historical and Genealogical Account of The Present Nobility* (Arthur Collins, 1715), 474.

<sup>88</sup> The seventeenth-century antiquarian, Thomas Philipott, records the tomb of Margaret de Cobham (d.1337) at Nettlestead, which her husband, Sir William Pymphipe (d.1375), may have moved there or retrospectively commissioned for her. Thomas Philipott, *Villiare Cantianum. Or, Kent Surveyed and Illustrated* (London: William Godbid, 1659), 242.

<sup>89</sup> G. M. Livett, "Nettlestead Church," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 28 (1909): 251-282.

<sup>90</sup> Regnolde II (d.1436) had held the advowson during his lifetime as demonstrated in his Inquisition Post Mortem, IPM 25, 338.

<sup>91</sup> TNA PROB 11/11/124.

<sup>92</sup> Saul, "The Gentry and the Parish," 243-256.

<sup>93</sup> In the following quotation the arabic numbers in parentheses are my own insertions to indicate the individual shields mentioned and to clarify unusual spellings of words.



where as there be certayne blank skoggyngs (escutcheons) in the wyndowe of saint thomas w(i)t(h)in the saide churche I will that there be putt in those skotchyns (escutcheons) (1) the armes of master Sir Thomas Sellinger (St. Leger) and of my Lady his wiffe (2) the armes of my cosen James Sellinger (St. Leger) and of his wiffe (3) the armes of my cossen bartilmewe Sellinger (St. Leger) and of his wiffe (4) the armes of Sir John Cheyne and of his wife (5) the armes of Sir R[i]c[hard] Guildford and of my sister his wiffe (6) the armes of my cosen Edward Guildforde and of his wiffe (7) the armes of my cosen George Guildford and of his wiffe (8) the armes of me and of my wiffe (9) The armes of my broder Regnolde and of his wiffe and I will that a knoleche be sought howe alliaunce of Sellinger (St. Leger), Cheyne and Pympe came first in by mauiage (marriage) and the best chowledge that may be founde to be showde in the said wyndowes by armes in such romes as may be thought most conueniient w(i)t(h)in the wyndowes of the saide church(e).<sup>94</sup>

The first donation of glass is described in the first half of the clause (up to “...The armes of my broder Regnolde and of his wiffe...”). It outlines John III’s plans to have armorial glass fitted in a window dedicated to “St. Thomas,” which probably refers to St. Thomas Becket, given Nettlestead’s close proximity to his shrine at Canterbury and Becket’s popularity as a subject for parish church windows during this period.<sup>95</sup> These arms would be inserted into what seems to have been a series of shields provisionally glazed with white glass (“blank skoggyngs”), the function of which will be examined further in Chapter 2.

A number of factors may have influenced John III’s decision to include these families in the St. Thomas window. Nearly all of these men held significant allegiances to the Tudor Court. Sir Richard Guildford had initially joined the future king in exile in Brittany during Richard III's reign and Sir John Cheyne was elevated to the Peerage, as a Baron, for his continued military support for the first Tudor king.<sup>96</sup> It is probable the St. Legers were also allied to Henry Tudor before his victory at Bosworth in 1485. At the very least, Sir Thomas St. Leger was an opponent of Richard

---

<sup>94</sup> TNA, PROB 11/11/124.

<sup>95</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 75-6.

<sup>96</sup> Sean Cunningham, “Guildford, Sir Richard,” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 1st August 2019, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11723>; Cheyne fought alongside the future king at Bosworth in 1485 and against Lambert Simnel at Stoke in 1487. George Cokayne, et al, eds. *Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Extant, Extinct or Dormant Volume III: Canonteign to Cutts* (London: The St Catherine Press, 1913), 191-92.

III, as demonstrated by his rebellion against the King in 1483.<sup>97</sup> John III may have felt some professional kinship to the other men and their families. Many of those represented had, like John III, either held the position of sheriff or had a close family member who had held the same position. Sir Richard Guildford had held the position of Sheriff of Kent in 1493, Sir John Cheyne's father did in 1454 and, Ralph, the father of the three St. Leger men, had held the post in 1467.<sup>98</sup> However, the most common factor binding these men together was their ownership of land in Kent. The St. Legers (shields 1-3) possessed land at Ulcombe, whilst the Cheynes (shield 4) had resided for some time at Shurland in Eastchurch on the Isle of Sheppey and the Guildfords (shields 5-7) owned manors at Cranbrook and Rolvenden.<sup>99</sup>

In addition to these men, John III included the arms of close family members whose marriages had either granted them their own land in Kent or strengthened his bonds with local landowners. For instance, he includes the arms of his brother Regnolde and his wife Elizabeth (shield 9) who brought her husband the manor of Thevegate, in Smeeth. Similarly, John III includes the arms of his sister whose marriage to the aforementioned Sir Richard Guildford (shield 5) allowed him to draw an even closer link to this powerful landowner. The inclusion of the arms of Sir Richard's sons, Edward and George Guildford (shields 6 & 7), served equally as a means of buttressing John III's connection to the family.<sup>100</sup> The motives behind the choice of these arms are further revealed by examining the next in his two donations of armorial glass to Nettlestead.

The second donation is outlined in the latter part of the above quotation (from "...and I will that a knoleche be sought..." onwards) and appears to be a complementary sequence to the first. John III wanted this glazing sequence to demonstrate a historical connection between his own family, the Cheynes and the St. Leger families based on perceived, prior marital links between them.<sup>101</sup> His description of its subject matter is vague but it would seem that John III desired an inter-connected

---

<sup>97</sup> Douglas Richardson, *Plantagenet Ancestry: A Study in Colonial and Medieval Families*, 2nd Edition (Salt Lake City: Genealogical Publishing Company, 2011), 137.

<sup>98</sup> LSEW, 68.

<sup>99</sup> For the St. Legers see Edward Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 5* (Canterbury: W Bristow, 1798), 385-396; For the Guildfords see Helen Miller, "GUILDFORD, Sir Edward (by 1479-1534)," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 19th March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/guildford-sir-edward-1479-1534>; For the Cheynes see L. S. Woodger, "CHEYNE, William (d.1441)," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 19th March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/cheyne-william-1441>.

<sup>100</sup> This affection is suggested through the appellation "cosen" in the above clause.

<sup>101</sup> "...howe alliaunce of Sellinger, Cheyne and Pympe came first in by mauiage (marriage)..." TNA, PROB 11/11/124.

glazing sequence showing blood connections between the three families.<sup>102</sup> This appears likely seen as it is already possible to establish a link between John III and the Cheynes through his first wife Isabel, daughter of Richard Cheyne.<sup>103</sup>

In fact, the position of the term, “alliaunce,” in the above quotation from the will suggests its meaning stems from, and bears more relevance to, John III’s first donation of glass showing his ties to local landowners. When reading the quotation in full it is clear that the second donation of glass was designed to buttress an already existing “alliaunce” John III perceived between the Pympe, Guildford, St. Leger and Cheyne families, the subject of his first donation of armorial glass to Nettlestead’s St. Thomas window. Whilst this first donation would show the blood connection between the Guildfords and the Pympe - via John III’s sister, Sir Richard Guildford and their children (shields 5-7) - it could not show a blood connection between the Pympe, the St. Legers and the Cheynes. Indeed, John III states the second donation of glass was intended to show “howe alliaunce of Sellinger (St. Leger), Cheyne and Pympe came first in by mauiage (marriage),” suggesting he intended this latter sequence to show connections to these families that the first donation would not. Thus, John III planned his two glazing sequences around two notions of “alliaunce.” In a similar way to the Newburghs’ “genealogie”, the second donation of glass and its conception of “alliaunce” was concerned with tracking descent, whereas the first donation of glass focussed on showing an “alliaunce” based on their regional proximity to one another in Kent.

An examination of the etymology and semantic evolution of “alliaunce” coheres with this sense of the term. The meaning of the standardised equivalent of John III’s term, “alliaunce”, has its roots in the Anglo-Norman word “alliance”, which referred to an “agreement [or] treaty.”<sup>104</sup> The sense of

---

<sup>102</sup> This perceived common ancestry between the families might relate to what Peter Fleming has called the “clannish” nature of Kent gentry society, where many families of varying rank shared common ancestry. Peter Fleming, “Charity, Faith, and the Gentry of Kent, 1422-1529,” in *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History*, ed. T. Pollard (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1984), 36-7; By wishing to show his descent by blood from more socially-esteemed families than his own, Pympe was, here, styling himself and his family in one of the most convincing ways possible during this period. Keen, *Origins*, 105.

<sup>103</sup> Whilst John Pympe’s father can be demonstrated to have been married to an Isabel Cheyne, I have been unable to find a marital connection between either the St. Legers and the Pympe or the Cheynes and the St Legers. Pympe’s wording and perhaps the problems with making these connections suggests some degree of dynastic invention was being attempted by Pympe. For the Pympe’s connection with Isabel Cheyne: Harry Rylands, ed., *The Four Visitations of Berkshire Made and Taken by Thomas Benolte, Clarenceux anno 1532 1566, 1623 & 1665–6* (London: The Harleian Society, 1908), 103.

<sup>104</sup> Anonymous, “alliance, n.,” Oxford English Dictionary, Accessed 5th August 2019, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/5290#eid6814331>.

the term employed in John III's second donation - used to describe bonds of consanguinity - was still in circulation during this period. The OED cites its use in relation to the meaning "union, bond, or connection through consanguinity" referencing its appearance in Caxton's 1481 edition of the *Myrroure of the Worlde*.<sup>105</sup> Yet, another fifteenth-century example of the term suggests the persistence of a meaning similar to its etymological root and John III's first donation of glass. According to OED, "alliaunce" could mean "the state or fact of being united for a common purpose or for mutual benefit, esp. of nations or states", as used in Caxton's 1477 edition of *The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*.<sup>106</sup>

John III's sense of the word "alliaunce" appears to relate primarily to this conception of unity with other local families, based on their common status as Kentish landowners, although these bonds would, of course, have been strengthened by marriages between their families. This sense of solidarity amongst landowning families in the county may have been the result of many of them having to reclaim their lands after the accession of the Tudor dynasty. The Pympe appear to have vacated their lands in the early 1480s when Richard III granted Nettlestead to his ally, Sir John Savage.<sup>107</sup> Given the recent return of their lands following Henry VII's accession, John III's donations to St. Mary's seem to have been intended to emphasise the his family's renewed authority by stressing their associations to other Kentish landowners. Having examined the meanings of the words "genealogie" and "alliaunce" we now turn to apply the first of these terms to the extant glazing from Beaupré Hall.

#### 1.4. A "Genealogie" at Beaupré Hall

Before its demolition in 1966, the manor of Beaupré was situated close to Cambridgeshire's north-eastern border with Norfolk. In the early fourteenth century, John FitzGilbert inherited the estate through his wife Christian St. Omer after which point he and his heirs adopted its name for themselves.<sup>108</sup> The Beauprés appear to have gradually increased their land holdings through purchases and marriages during the later medieval period. When he made his will, Nicholas

---

<sup>105</sup> "Mariages and Alyaunces that they doo and make wyth the sarasyns." William Caxton, trans. *Myrroure of the Worlde* (Westminster, 1481), unpaginated.

<sup>106</sup> "Him that hath made eny aliaunce or promesse with his ennemyes." Earl Rivers, trans. *The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers* (London: Elliot Stock, 1877), f.53v.

<sup>107</sup> Malcolm Mercer, "Kent and National Politics, 1461-1509," in *Late Medieval Kent, 1220-1540*, ed. S. Sweetinburgh (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2010), 264.

<sup>108</sup> Blomefield, *An Essay Towards: Volume 7*, 454-78.

Beaupré III (d.1513) described possession of his lands and manors at Beaupré and Walsingham.<sup>109</sup> Nicholas III also made an advantageous marriage to Margaret Foderingaye, in the process inheriting a great deal of property in Suffolk.<sup>110</sup>

Although no physical evidence remains of the hall, some of its original armorial glazing is preserved in the V&A and impressions of its appearance survives in an early twentieth-century engraving (Figure V.1). Christopher Hussey's account and photographs of the hall in 1923 and antiquarian records also allow for an impression of the glass' layout within some of the house's windows, though one cannot locate all of them within its architectural space (see Figure V.2 for Christopher Hussey's useful, albeit vague, ground plan).<sup>111</sup>

The earliest account of the hall's glazing is from a sixteenth-century heraldic visitation, most probably conducted by the herald William Flower (d.1588). The visitation records two sequences of armorial glass which included some of the surviving panels from the V&A. Although the visitation is useful it does not specify the room in which the windows were located. Moreover, there is also some surviving glass in the V&A which appears to be of an early sixteenth-century date and is not mentioned in Flower's visitation. Nonetheless, Hussey's and Flower's accounts enable us to partially reconstruct the manor's glazing.<sup>112</sup>

The first window (hereafter referred to as I) contained five lights. Each individual light is referred to with the letters a-e, for instance, Ia for the first light, Ib for the second and so on. Light Ia contained the arms of John FitzGilbert, the man who inherited Beaupré Hall from his wife Christian St. Omer and thereafter adopted the surname Beaupré (for the following see Figure V.3). Light Ib contained the arms of Christian's father, Sir Thomas St. Omer. Light Ic housed another instance of John FitzGilbert's arms as in the first light. Light Id, which survives in the V&A, showed the arms of Richard Beaupré, John's son, and his marriage to Catherine Mundeford. Light Ie displayed the arms of Sir Thomas Beaupré I and his marriage to Joan Holbeach.

The second window (hereafter referred to as II) also contained five lights, which are similarly labelled a-e (Figure V.4). Light IIa displayed the arms of Nicholas Beaupré and that of his wife Margaret Holdich. Light IIb, which survives in the V&A, contained the arms of Nicholas' grandson,

---

<sup>109</sup> NRO, Will Register Spurlinge, 93-98.

<sup>110</sup> See Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 5: Beauprés of Beaupré Hall.

<sup>111</sup> Hussey, "Beaupré Hall," 754-60.

<sup>112</sup> For the following paragraphs see a discussion of the visitation and the glass' archaeology in Volume 1: Appendix V. Beaupré Hall, "Antiquarian Evidence and Identification of Arms."

Thomas Beaupré II, and his wife Margaret Merys. Light IIc showed the arms of Thomas II's son, Thomas Beaupré III, and his wife Margaret Ashfield. Light IId, which also survives in the V&A, housed the arms of Nicholas Beaupré III and his wife Margaret Foderingaye. Light IIe held the arms of Nicholas III's son and heir, Edmund Beaupré (d.1567).

The Beauprés also commissioned another series of glass charting the ancestry of Nicholas III's wife, Margaret Foderingaye, which Flower did not describe in his initial visit to the manor. Hussey described and photographed these shields, located in a window in the house (Figure V.5). The said window was composed of two rows with four lights in each. He describes its position as being in one of the "chief windows" in the "drawing-room."<sup>113</sup> In his plan of the hall, Hussey highlights the presence of "stained windows" on the south-east and north-west sides of this room which he indicates was built c.1570 (Figure V.2). It is possible to identify this window when comparing Hussey's plan with an early photograph of the house, which shows a window of two rows of four lights on the south-west side close to the hall's entrance (Figure V.7).

To distinguish this window from windows I and II, the following paragraph refers to it as window III.<sup>114</sup> Each row is referred to hereafter with arabic numbers and each light is referred to from a-d, for instance III,1a for the first light in the first row (Figure V.6). Hussey's photograph of this window (Figure V.5) shows that some of the glass, originally in I and II, was transferred to the second row of Window III between the end of the sixteenth century and his account of the glass in 1923.<sup>115</sup> III,1a contained another shield showing the marriage of Nicholas III to Margaret Foderingaye. The arms in III,1b represented the marriage of Margaret Foderingaye's parents, Thomas Foderingaye II and Elizabeth Dorward. III,1c contained the arms of Sir William Coggeshall (d.1426), Margaret Foderingaye's great-great grandfather. III,1d housed the arms of Thomas Foderingaye I (d.1392), another one of Margaret Foderingaye's great-great grandfathers. Window III thus contained, in its first row of lights, a series of shields which seem to have been commissioned around the same time as those initially in windows I and II, given their stylistic and design similarities to the shields in those windows.

---

<sup>113</sup> Hussey, "Beaupré Hall," 754-60.

<sup>114</sup> Due to a lack of certainty regarding the number of windows on the south-west side of Beaupré, the analysis does not adopt the similar conventions used for describing the positions of windows in domestic spaces in this thesis (i.e. swI for the first window on the south-west side of a domestic space). The window is also of relatively little interest to the overall analysis and thus III is the most convenient term to use for it.

<sup>115</sup> For further details see Volume 1: Appendix V. Beaupré Hall.

Flower's description of windows I and II suggests they were each comprised of five lights. However, from existing photographs and drawings, I have been unable to locate corresponding five-light windows in the sixteenth-century fabric of Beaupré. It is possible that they were located in a long room, built c.1500, which was attached to the "drawing room" on the south-west side and was possibly the original hall of the manor. It is also possible that windows I and II were positioned on the north-west side of this room, as no known photographs or illustrations document the appearance of this part of Beaupré Hall. Therefore, it seems windows I and II were mostly likely located in the south-west room at Beaupré which was most likely its hall. The shields in these windows were then dispersed some time after William Flower saw them in the sixteenth century, some of them being placed in window III in the "drawing room" of the house. It is impossible to determine the original location of the shields showing the ancestry of Margaret Foderingaye, which first appeared in window III. It is possible they were displayed in close proximity to windows I and II, given their stylistic similarity to the surviving glass in these windows.

Before considering this glass in relation to the term "genealogie," it is useful to compare the social profiles of the Beauprés and the Newburghs. By the later medieval period, the Beauprés' patrimony encompassed numerous lands in Norfolk as well as many estates in Suffolk which they acquired through the Foderingaye inheritance. They also held important roles in the county governance of Norfolk. For instance, Nicholas III had been escheator for Norfolk, where he was responsible for surveying the county's lands and properties on behalf of the Crown.<sup>116</sup> Their occupation of Beaupré since the early fourteenth century also meant they could claim a degree of antiquity. The Newburghs similarly held numerous lands in their own county. Sir Roger, in his role as sheriff, was also involved in the county's central administration. Like the Beauprés, the Newburghs had occupied their lands for a number of generations, being able to trace their ancestry at East Lulworth back until at least the mid fourteenth century. Thus, by the early sixteenth century, the histories and status claims of each family were rather similar.

It is unclear how far back the Newburghs' glazing traced their occupation of East Lulworth. However, the Beauprés' glass is specifically concerned with displaying the history of their occupancy at their manor, through showing the former owner Sir Thomas St. Omer before John FitzGilbert (later Beaupré) inherited the house. Although direct visual comparisons with the Newburghs' lost glazing sequence are impossible, some features of the Beauprés' glazing suggest it

---

<sup>116</sup> Colin Richmond, *The Paston Family in the Fifteenth Century: Endings* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 2000), 22.

might have reflected some of its visual aspects. Many of the arms in the sequence show the Beaupré arms *impaled* on the *dexter* side of each shield, such as those seen in Id, IId and IId.<sup>117</sup> As demonstrated, the most likely intended meaning of “genealogie” related to the “tracing of descent” or - in this case - the tracing of the Beaupré’s occupancy of their estate.<sup>118</sup> In order to ‘trace’ the origins of the Newburgh family, one would have needed to see a repeated visual sign - such as the repeated Newburgh arms - in order to follow a line of continuity through their family’s history. This would have been all the more necessary as new arms would be included in each generation as consecutive sons married different women. Repeated sequences of arms were used to show descent in a variety of other contexts during this period. *Impaled* arms are used in later medieval rolls of arms, produced to chart family histories, such as that in the *Clare Roll*, made c.1456 (Figure 1.1). Fifteenth-century gentry families also displayed series of *impaled* arms above their tombs when seeking to memorialise their lineage and solicit prayers for their ancestors’ souls.<sup>119</sup> Examples of these displays include a series of arms on the tomb gable of Richard Willoughby (d.1471) of Wollaton in Nottinghamshire (Figure 1.2) or those above the tomb of Sir John Strelley (d.1501) at All Saints, Strelley (Figure 1.3) in the same county. The use of this repeated visual form in the Beauprés’ glazing suggests that allowing the viewer to track the origins of the family to the hall’s earliest occupants was one of its principal functions.

Secondly, the Beauprés’ sequence appears to reflect similar concerns to that of the Newburghs’, through its detailed representation of heiresses. This is evident through the lost shield from window Ib showing Sir Thomas de St. Omer, the previous owner of Beaupré Hall, and the extant shield from IId showing Nicholas III’s marriage to Margaret Foderingaye, which brought him numerous estates such as South Acre in Norfolk and Brockley in Suffolk.<sup>120</sup> The Beaupré “genealogie” also includes information in a textual format about their accumulation of a patrimony. Each surviving shield is accompanied by a Latin inscription giving the names of both the man and woman represented through the *impaled* shield. Each of the inscriptions also mentions the identity of each woman’s father, along with his occupation as a knight. However, in the case of the shield showing Nicholas III and Margaret’s marriage, in IId, the inscription states that Margaret was also her father’s heiress, “Nich[ol]as Beawpre cepit in uxorem margaretam unam filia et heres thoma[s] fedringaye armiger.” The extent of Margaret’s inheritance would have been further emphasised by the series of shields

---

<sup>117</sup> It suffices for the moment to understand that this sequence uses *impaled* arms. Chapter 3 will discuss further how the *impaled* Beaupré arms are comprised of the *quartered* arms of Beaupré and St. Omer.

<sup>118</sup> Anonymous, “genealogy, n.” And see above.

<sup>119</sup> Saul, *English Church Monuments*, 129.

<sup>120</sup> Richmond, *The Paston Family: Endings*, 21.



from the first row of Window III which track the history of the Foderingaye family. One might therefore conclude that, like the Newburgh's "genealogie," the Beauprés' sequence was also concerned with tracking the family's descent and their accumulation of property through marriage.

Whilst impaled arms are used for the most part to show the arms of both men and women in the Beaupré sequence, more complex forms could be deployed to signify the inheritance of an heiress. For instance, the shield in IId, showing the marriage between Nicholas Beaupré III and Margaret Foderingaye, represents her through a quartered coat of arms impaling the Beaupré arms (Figure V.4). Furthermore, these quartered arms are themselves made up of coats of arms comprised of other quarterings relating to those ancestors from whom she inherited property.<sup>121</sup> Although the complex marshalling forms used to represent Margaret may have singled her out to the viewer, a person who was less familiar with visually dissecting blazon may have resorted to reading the text scrolls in order to interpret the identities of those women represented through the coats of arms.<sup>122</sup>

Despite the brevity of Leland's account, the term, "genealogie," provides a useful means of describing the Beauprés' ancestral sequence, enabling us to account in greater detail for the type of social relationship it conveys. As a term describing the intended meaning of domestic arms, it is more specific than Maurice Howard's suggestion that they show "the owner, his family ties."<sup>123</sup> The term is also more appropriate to the subject matter than any of Wagner's categories of Rolls of Arms. One could argue the Beauprés' sequence is akin to an Illustrative Roll, providing visual narrative to the family's history. Peter Newton has, for instance, likened the arms of Anglo-Saxon kings in the lost glass of Austry, Warwickshire to an Illustrative Roll.<sup>124</sup> However, the subject matter of the Beauprés' scheme and its specificity with regards to their landed concerns would suggest describing them as such would be an oversimplification.

To summarise, the term, "genealogie," is useful for characterising the Beauprés' glazing sequence, as displayed across windows I, II and partially III. Due to its etymological roots and continued meaning as a form of "tracing of descent," the term accurately accounts for the Beauprés' intention to assist the viewer in understanding their patrilineal descent. Specifically, it seems the Beauprés' "genealogie" was intended to show the occupation of their manor since the thirteenth century and

---

<sup>121</sup> See Appendix V. Beaupré Hall, Cambridgeshire. "Antiquarian Evidence and Identification of Arms."

<sup>122</sup> Chapter 4 returns to examine the intention behind the inclusion of text scrolls in the Beauprés' glass.

<sup>123</sup> Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House*, 42.

<sup>124</sup> Newton, *Schools of Glass Painting in the Midlands*, 141.

suggest the growth of their patrimony during this period through marriages to Christian St. Omer and Margaret Foderingaye. To communicate these messages, the Beauprés relied on the use of *impaled* arms to suggest the continuity of their male line. The women they married were also represented through this type of marshalling and were represented on the *sinister* sides of each shield. When representing an heiress, more complex marshalling forms were used to represent her inheritance from multiple ancestors. The extent of this inheritance might also be displayed further through a separate sequence of armorial glazing. Like the Newburghs' glass, the Beauprés' glazing also used text scrolls to identify the women represented and - in Margaret Foderingaye's case - her identity as an heiress.

### 1.5. An “Alliaunce” at Cotehele House

Whilst partly concerned with displaying ancestral descent, the domestic glazing commissioned by landed families might also be concerned with showing other kinds of social ties. The glazing of Cotehele House in Cornwall, situated close to the county's eastern border with Devon, reveals the Edgcumbe family's interest in exhibiting their relationships with local landowners, mirroring John Pympe III's conception of an “alliaunce” at St. Mary's, Nettlestead.

The Edgcumbes had occupied Cotehele (Figure III.1) since the fourteenth century when Peter Edgcumbe I appears to have acquired the manor through his marriage to Hilaria de Cotehele.<sup>125</sup> Anthony Emery argues that Cornwall and Devon were sparsely populated with the residences of the nobility during the later medieval period and instead were presided over by a group of landed knights, such as the Courtenays of Powderham and the Carews of Mohuns Ottery.<sup>126</sup> Following their arrival at Cotehele, the Edgcumbes made advantageous marriages with some of these families, which enabled them to embed their status in the landed society of the south west.

The armorial glass in Cotehele House reflects the ties the Edgcumbes made with these landed families.<sup>127</sup> The glazing is located in Cotehele's hall, which is oriented from east to west and is fitted with six two-light windows - three to the north and three to the south - as well as a bay window of eight lights on the south-west side of the hall (see Figure III.3 for a ground plan of the hall). A patrilineal narrative is placed in the north windows, nII and nI (respectively Figures III.4 & III.5), which we will return to examine in Chapter 2.

---

<sup>125</sup> See Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 3: Edgcumbes of Cotehele.

<sup>126</sup> GMHEW 3, 448-9.

<sup>127</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix III. Cotehele House.

Along the south side of the hall - in windows sIa, sIb and sIIIb - are shields showing the arms of landowners in the south west of England (Figures III.6-III.8). Wymond Raleigh, whose arms are in sIb, held lands in Fardel in Devon, only twenty miles from Cotehele and Sir William Trevanion, represented in sIa, resided at a manor of the same name in the county.<sup>128</sup> Sir William Courtenay, whose arms are in sIIIa, held ancestral lands at Powderham Castle in Devon and Sir William St. Maur, whose arms are in sIIb, held the manor of Babcary in Somerset.<sup>129</sup> In this sense, the choice of men represented is similar to John Pympe III's "alliaunce" through the representation of local lords in these window lights.

In showing allegiances based on local estate ownership, the Edgcumbes' shields were similar to examples in late medieval secular buildings in Germany and Switerland where coats of arms to show common interests in land within a distinct geographical region were used. For instance, the fifteenth-century wall paintings in the *Fürstensaal* in Lüneburg's town hall show the coats of arms of the House of Brunswick-Lüneburg which comprised the town's landowning elite (Figure 1.4).<sup>130</sup> The shields at Cotehele might also be compared to the armorial shields, or *Standesscheibe*, commissioned for Swiss town halls during the later medieval period which demonstrated familial allegiances to individual cantons, or administrative districts of the country, such as those surviving in-situ in Rheinfeldern town hall (Figure 1.5).<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Some details on the wealth of Wymond Raleigh are revealed in a biography of his son Walter Raleigh (d.1581). Helen Miller, "RALEGH, Walter (1504/5-81)," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 21st March 2019, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/raleigh-walter-15045-81>; Roger Virgoe, "TREVANION, John, (by 1483-1539 or later)," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 5th August 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/trevanion-john-1483-1539-or-later>

<sup>129</sup> L.M. Kirk and A.D.K. Hawkyard, "COURTENAY, Sir William I," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 21st March 2019, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/courtenay-sir-william-i-1485-1535>; For Sir William St. Maur see W. Phelps, *The History and Antiquities of Somersetshire* (London: J.B. Nichols, 1836), 442.

<sup>130</sup> Hansjörg Rümelin and Gisela Jaacks, "Bild und Raum: Die Bilder der Herzöge, Könige und Kaiser im Fürstensaal des Lüneburger Rathauses," in *Das Lüneburger Rathaus: Ergebnisse der Untersuchungen 2008 bis 2011, Band 1*, ed. J. Ganzert (Petersberg: Imhof Verlag, 2014), 305-27.

<sup>131</sup> Barbara Giesicke and Mylène Ruoss, "Function, Meaning and Iconography in Civic Stained Glass Donations in Switzerland and Southern Germany," in *Painting on Light: Drawings and Stained Glass in the Age of Dürer and Holbein*, ed. B. Butts (Los Angeles: The Paul Getty Trust, 2000), 46.

Besides being landowning men, the individuals shown in sI-sIII were also linked to the Edgcumbes through their marriage to Sir Peter II's sisters, Agnes, Elizabeth and Margaret.<sup>132</sup> Like John Pympe III's inclusion of his own sister and her husband in Nettlestead's St. Thomas window, the Edgcumbes' decision to include these lords was equally motivated by their status as members of their extended family.

The most common marshalling form used in this series is *impaled* arms, which appears to have been favoured for its ability to show a marital connection between the Edgcumbes and the Raleigh, Trenanion and St. Maur families.<sup>133</sup> In a similar case, parents might use such a marshalling form to represent their daughters' marriages to their respective husbands as a means of showcasing their connection to other local landed families, which can be seen on the funerary brass of Joan Cobham (d.1434) at Cobham in Kent (Figure 1.6). John Pympe III seems to have intended for his shields in the St. Thomas window at Nettlestead to also adopt *impaled* marshalling forms. John III's will asked for the St. Thomas window to include "the armes of Sir R[i]c[h]ard Guildeford and of my sister his wiffe." His description of the arms to be included suggested they were to be *impaled* - containing male arms on the *dexter* side and female arms on the *sinister* (given the use of the phrase "and of" to distinguish between the arms belonging to people mentioned). Through adopting this *impaled* marshalling form, the shields in Nettlestead's St. Thomas Window would have therefore enabled John III to show a direct connection between his family and the Guildfords by placing both of their arms alongside one another on the same shield. The Edgcumbes' shields reflect a similar attempt to draw direct links to landowners through the use of this marshalling form.

The Edgcumbes also used *unmarshalled* arms as a means of suggesting an historical connection to the Courtenays, with whom they shared numerous points of connection during the later fifteenth century. The Courtenays had occupied Powderham Castle in Devon for several generations. Sir William Courtenay (d.1539) was tied to the family as Margaret Edgcumbe's second husband. In addition, Sir Peter II and Sir William Courtenay had also been members of parliament for their respective counties and had also served as Esquire to the Body of the King: Sir Peter II to Henry VII in 1489 and Sir William to Henry VIII in 1512.<sup>134</sup> Sir Peter II appears to have wished to honour

---

<sup>132</sup> Wymond Raleigh had married Elizabeth Edgcumbe, Sir William Trevanion had married Agnes, William St. Maur had been Margaret Edgcumbe's first husband and Sir William Courtenay was her second. See Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 3: Edgcumbes of Cotehele.

<sup>133</sup> Nearly all of the coats of arms representing these local men use *impaled* arms: showing the male arms on the *dexter* side with the Edgcumbe arms on the *sinister* side.

<sup>134</sup> Kirby, "Edgcumbe, Sir Peter (1477–1539)."; Kirk and Hawkyard, "COURTENAY, Sir William I."

a lasting bond with the Courtenays through his donation of his tin works in Devon to Sir William Courtenay and his heirs.<sup>135</sup> Brian Ragen has argued that, in contrast to *impaled* arms, an *unmarshalled* coat reflects a broader definition of an individual as part of their male line.<sup>136</sup> Although the husband of Margaret, it appears the Edgcumbes chose to represent their links to the Courtenays in a general sense through their sponsorship of Sir William and his lineage. The aforementioned shields would therefore indicate the Edgcumbes chose to use *impaled* as well as *unmarshalled* arms to represent an “alliaunce” at Cotehele, displaying their ties to local landowners in Cornwall and Devon.

The glazing at Cotehele House is better defined in relation to the term “alliaunce” than by previous terms scholars have used to describe armorial groupings. In particular, the conception of “alliaunce” as an “agreement” which bonded a family to others through their local proximity, but possibly also through marital connections, is a more accurate definition than Howard’s suggestion that domestic arms showed a gentry lord’s “local ties.”<sup>137</sup> The term “alliaunce” is also a more appropriate means of describing the Cotehele glass than Peter Newton’s use of “Local Rolls” to characterise armorial sequences, which show lords within a certain locality. For instance, Newton suggests a lost sequence of fourteenth-century glass installed by Antekin de Martival in his church in Noseley, Leicestershire, might be described as a “Local Roll,” given its depiction of his connections to families in the county.<sup>138</sup> Although this category of armorial rolls might be useful for understanding the lost series at Noseley, it appears domestic glazing from the late fifteenth century involved a more complex range of local and marital ties which can be more accurately conveyed through reference to John Pympe III’s conception of an “alliaunce.”

This term, “alliaunce,” is a fitting characterisation for the relationships shown at Cotehele as they suggest an “agreement” between men through their geographical proximity to the Edgcumbes at Cotehele and furthermore through their marital ties to Agnes, Elizabeth and Margaret Edgcumbe.<sup>139</sup> This type of bond was principally communicated through the use of *impaled* arms.<sup>140</sup> Within this

---

<sup>135</sup> Nicholas Orme, ed. *Cornish Wills 1342-1540* (Exeter: Devon & Cornwall Record Society, 2007), 182.

<sup>136</sup> Brian Ragen, "Semiotics and Heraldry," *Semiotica* 100 (1994): 13.

<sup>137</sup> Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House*, 42.

<sup>138</sup> Newton, *Schools of Glass Painting in the Midlands*, 144.

<sup>139</sup> The sense of the word “agreement” is part of the etymological root of “alliance.” Anonymous, “alliance, n.” And see above, 1.3. An “Alliaunce” at St. Mary’s, Nettlestead, Kent.

<sup>140</sup> The use of these impaled arms is however different to those seen at Beaupré where they are used to track descent. In these windows at Cotehele, they are used to emphasise the numerous attachments of the Edgcumbes to other landowners through the marriage of Sir Peter II’s sisters.

sequence, the arms of Sir William Courtenay indicate that men with a particularly strong connection to the family could be represented through *unmarshalled* arms.

### 1.6. Case Study: Examining “Genealogie” and “Alliaunce” at Athelhampton Hall

Having examined the ways glass from Beaupré Hall and Cotehele House reflect the terms “genealogie” and “alliaunce,” the analysis now turns to consider how different aspects of the glazing at Athelhampton Hall in Dorset reflect the social relationships conveyed by these words and how their meanings were signalled visually.

The Martyns moved from Yeovilton in Somerset to the manor of Athelhampton (Figure II.1) after acquiring it through the marriage of Sir Robert Martyn I (d.1375) to his second wife Agnes Loundres.<sup>141</sup> Dorset possessed few residences of the nobility during the later medieval period and instead most of the land was owned by monastic houses and gentry families.<sup>142</sup> The Martyns managed to occupy their manor continuously throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries until the death of Nicholas Martyn (d.1595) who, lacking a male heir, passed the estate to his daughters and eventually into the ownership of the Brune family.<sup>143</sup>

The hall at Athelhampton is tucked in amongst a cluster of sixteenth-century buildings (see Figure II.3 for ground plan). It consists of four bays positioned on a south-east to north-west axis and appears to have been built during the fifteenth century.<sup>144</sup> The hall’s oriel window appears to have been added in a separate campaign of glazing in the later fifteenth century, which we will explore further in Chapter 2. Before examining the relevance of “genealogie” and “alliaunce” to the Martyns’ glass, we must briefly establish an overview of their glazing. There are two windows in the hall containing medieval armorial glass. The first is comprised of four lights and is situated across the hall’s second and third bays on the north east side, hereafter referred to as neII (Figure II.5). Its oriel window is situated on the south west side of the hall's fourth bay (Figure II.7)

These windows were most likely commissioned between the mid fifteenth and mid sixteenth centuries.<sup>145</sup> The oriel window displays the patrilineal line of the Martyns from the early fourteenth

---

<sup>141</sup> See Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 2: Martyns of Athelhampton; H1, 471.

<sup>142</sup> GHMEW 3, 444.

<sup>143</sup> H1, 471.

<sup>144</sup> GMHEW 3, 487-90.

<sup>145</sup> For further analysis of this window and its authorship see Chapter 2 and Volume I: Appendix II. Athelhampton Hall, especially “Stylistic Analysis” and “Number of Sequences.”

century to the late sixteenth century. Like that showing the origins of the Beauprés at Beaupré Hall, the sequence appears to begin with the Martyns' arrival at Athelhampton in the mid-fourteenth century. In the fourth and uppermost row (see Figures II.8 & II.9), the Martyns' dynastic narrative is arranged across eight lights of the oriel window (4a-4h). The sequence exhibits eight Martyn men and their marriages depicted in turn, from Sir Robert Martyn in the early fourteenth century through to Nicholas Martyn at the end of the sixteenth. All of the shields of arms are arranged identically, with each one being encircled by mantling and surmounted by the Martyn crest. Each marriage is represented through *impaled* arms with the Martyn arms on the *dexter* side of each shield and the arms of each successive spouse appearing on each of the *sinister* sides. The use of the shields to show their patrilineal line suggests the family's intention to represent a Martyn "genealogie." The family's interest in enabling the viewer to trace their occupation of Athelhampton is suggested not only by the large number of shields but also by the repeated *impaled* Martyn arms used to signify the descent of the patrilineal line.

Like the Newburghs' "genealogie," the sequence also represents the heiresses that the Martyn men married over the course of the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. For instance, the shield in light 4b shows Richard Martyn's marriage to Elizabeth, who the antiquarian John Hutchins describes as the "heir" of Henry Pydel of Athelhampton.<sup>146</sup> Likewise, light 4d shows the marriage of Sir William Martyn and Isabel Faringdon which brought the family the nearby manor of Tincleton.<sup>147</sup>

The Martyns' glazing in window neII conceives of their social relationships in a way that might be compared to the Edgcumbe's "alliaunce" at Cotehele House. Like in the Edgcumbes' glass, the men in these windows were linked to the Martyns through their local proximity. Many of the men shown lived in close geographical proximity to Athelhampton, either in Dorset or the south of England, such as the Faringdons (in neIIa) who lived at the nearby manor of Tincleton during the fifteenth century. Until the early fifteenth century, the Mohun family, whose arms are housed in neIIc, had initially resided at Dunster Castle in Somerset and later at Hall in Cornwall. Having initially moved to Athelhampton from Somerset, the Martyns' enduring connection to the county is suggested by their continued possession of property there.<sup>148</sup> Although having relocated to Cornwall, it is

---

<sup>146</sup> H1, 471.

<sup>147</sup> H1, 471; L.S. Woodger, "FARINGDON, Thomas (d.1444)," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 19th March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/faringdon-thomas-1444>.

<sup>148</sup> As mentioned in the inquisition post mortem of Thomas I (d.1485). IPM 1.1, 48.

possible the Martyns continued to feel a degree of affinity with the Mohuns, given their long history of holding Dunster Castle in the preceding centuries.

Some of the arms in neII also show local families who were associated with the Martyns through marital links in their family. The arms in neII d show the arms of Pydel, a family who appear to have held land close to Athelhampton, before it passed to Thomas I's father, Richard, who acquired it through his marriage to the heiress Elizabeth Pydel.<sup>149</sup>

The representation of the Martyns' relationships with these men links to one method of showing an "alliaunce" as seen at Cotehele House. Although the Edgcumbes mostly used *impaled* arms to show their ties to landowners through the marriage of Agnes, Elizabeth and Margaret, the family also used *unmarshalled* arms to show a connection to the landowner Sir William Courtenay. Although only one instance of using *unmarshalled* arms occurs at Cotehele, it is prevalent - as we will see - in other instances where ties of local landownership are shown, such as, at Ockwells Manor (see Figure I.6).<sup>150</sup> Elite men had used *unmarshalled* arms as a means of showing their ties to one another since the thirteenth century, as shown in Westminster Abbey's nave aisles, where Henry III's shields show his connections to his noble allies (Figure 1.7). Instead of foregrounding marital connections as a binding link between these men, the use of *unmarshalled* arms gives an impression of support and ties of kinship between the families represented.<sup>151</sup>

## 1.7. Conclusion

As this chapter has demonstrated, different aspects of the selected case studies reflect the meanings of the words "genealogie" and "alliaunce," which were used during this period to describe the social relationships communicated through the stained glass sequences of gentry families.

Glass from Beaupré Hall and Athelhampton Hall appear to reflect the meanings of the term, "genealogie," used by Leland to describe the Newburgh's glazing at East Lulworth. The etymology of the word as well as the social contexts and visual details of these case studies suggest such glazing sequences were intended to assist the viewer in tracing the roots of a family's dynasty, specifically their history of occupying their lands and manor. At the same time, these sequences

---

<sup>149</sup> As the antiquarian John Hutchins states, a Henry Pydel is mentioned as holding land at Athelhampton in 1300, suggesting this may have been Thomas I's great-grandfather. H1, 470.

<sup>150</sup> This will be explored further in Chapters 3 & 4.

<sup>151</sup> Ragen, "Semiotics," 13.



might suggest a family's accumulation of a patrimony through bridal inheritance over several generations. Descent was typically communicated through the repeated use of *impaled* arms on the *dexter* sides of coats of arms in a series. Specific heiresses might be represented through these arrangements of *impaled* arms and in some cases, text scrolls could also make the identity of individual heiresses explicit to the viewer. At Beaupré Hall heiresses were also represented through the use of complex marshalling forms to show the precise ancestors from whom they had inherited property.

Some of the glazing from Cotehele House and Athelhampton Hall reflects the meaning of the term "alliaunce," used by the Kentish esquire, John Pympe III, to characterise ties to other local landowners in Kent. The glazing at Cotehele House shows that these connections might be illustrated through showing a family's connection through marriage to local landowners. In this case the local lord would be represented through using impaled arms, showing his arms on the *dexter* side of the shield and her natal family's arms on the *sinister* side. However, in most cases - such as the Martyns' shields in neII and swI at Athelhampton Hall - these ties were shown through using *unmarshalled* arms to imply one's connection not just to a single lord but also to their broader male lineage from whom they inherited their arms.<sup>152</sup>

An examination of this glass in relation to these terms is more useful than previous descriptions of arms in domestic settings provided by scholars. For the glazing at Beaupré Hall and Athelhampton Hall, the term "genealogie" offers a more specific description of the intention to track ancestral descent than Howard's suggestion that they show "the owner [and] his family ties."<sup>153</sup> Equally, none of Wagner's and Newton's classifications of armorial glass are able to explain the representation of ancestral descent such as that which could be labelled as a "genealogie" at Beaupré and Athelhampton.<sup>154</sup>

The term, "alliaunce," more adequately suits the mixture of landed and marital ties represented at Cotehele and Athelhampton than Howard's description of how domestic arms could show the gentry lord's "chief local connections" or Emery's description of the Ockwells glass as showing the owner's "patrons, friends, and associates."<sup>155</sup> These sequences share parallels with the category of "Local Rolls" examined by Wagner and Newton.<sup>156</sup> However, this category of armorial roll does

---

<sup>152</sup> Ragen, "Semiotics," 13.

<sup>153</sup> Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House*, 42.

<sup>154</sup> Newton, *Schools of Glass Painting in the Midlands*, 136-46.

<sup>155</sup> Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House*, 42; GMHEW 3, 125.

<sup>156</sup> Newton, *Schools of Glass Painting in the Midlands*, 144.

not satisfactorily explain the ways in which bonds of locality might be tied to bonds of marriage between the families.

Whilst these broad definitions hold for the majority of case studies used in this thesis, some slight variation occurs in the characterisation of social relationships and the visual strategies used to convey them. To effectively account for these, the following chapters will refer back to the terms - “genealogie” and “alliaunce” - as established in this chapter when analysing the case studies of Ockwells Manor and Fawsley Hall, in order to accurately account for the social relationships shown in these glazing sequences.

## Chapter 2. Authorship and Gender in Domestic Glass

### 2.1. Introduction

The previous chapter introduced the social relationships through which gentry families chose to define themselves in their domestic glazing. This chapter continues to explore the intentions behind these schemes, by probing their visual qualities to infer their likely authors. Besides identifying particular men and women, the chapter also examines the familial and social roles in which they chose to represent themselves through armorial glass, focussing on how an author's gender might inflect their self-representation and motives. Since there is a lack of prior study into armorial glazing projects in domestic contexts, the chapter adopts a basic, empirical approach when establishing those responsible for initiating glazing projects and when analysing the representation of gendered roles.

As there are no textual sources available to illuminate personal intentions behind domestic glass, the chapter draws on plans outlined in wills for armorial series in churches. The degree of detail included in these wills enables us to extrapolate from them as a means of examining armorial glazing in domestic settings. Whilst acknowledging the limits of these sources, the analysis will use them to analyse authorship and gendered self-representation in three case studies: Athelhampton Hall, Fawsley Hall and Cotehele House.

The chapter uses three wills to examine these issues exploring male and female authors in turn. The first section examines male authors and self-representation. Using the will of John Langton (d.1466) of Farnley in West Yorkshire, the chapter will examine his request for an armorial sequence on his tomb. The analysis then returns to the will of John Pympe III (d.1496), introduced in Chapter 1, to analyse his interests in commissioning an ancestral series of armorial glass for St. Mary's, Nettlestead. Drawing on these two wills, we then turn to investigate the Martyn men responsible for glazing Athelhampton Hall and their represented gender roles.

The second section of the chapter focusses on female authors and their self-representation in domestic glass. The analysis turns to the will of Margaret Paston (d.1489), examining a lengthy description of a desired arrangement of arms for her tomb at Mautby in Norfolk. Drawing on this source, the section examines glazing at Fawsley Hall in relation to the authorship and depicted gender roles of two women, related to the estate's lord, Sir Edmund Knightley (d.1542): his wife, Ursula De Vere, and his mother, Jane Skenard. Finally, the chapter will conclude its discussion with

an examination of male and female self-representation in the glazing of Cotehele House in Cornwall and the ways its armorial glass represents the authorship and gender roles of Sir Peter Edgcumbe II, his wife, Joan Durnford, and his mother, Joan Tremayne.

This chapter's concern with male authorship and its intentions builds on previous work which has described the necessity for a gentry male to represent his family's historical relationship with their manor, when seeking to establish his authority as lord of his estate.<sup>157</sup> However, to fully understand the representation of male gender roles in domestic glass, it is necessary to explore other social expectations of elite masculinity during the medieval period, such as the ability to successfully manage the family patrimony.<sup>158</sup> The analysis must also address previous work on how aristocratic men might wish to express homosocial ties to other men as a means of reaffirming their membership to an elite social class.<sup>159</sup> To understand gentlewomen's involvement in domestic glazing, we must consider previous examinations of the spiritual support they offered to their natal relatives through their artistic commissions.<sup>160</sup> In addition, the chapter will discuss gentlewomen's motives in relation to previous discussions of their roles as widows when offering material support to their husbands in death.<sup>161</sup> The analysis will also consider the role played by women as patrons of propagandistic imagery intended to defend their property as well as their use of artistic projects intended to express their identities as mothers and protectors of their children.<sup>162</sup>

### **2.2.i. The Will of John Langton II (d.1467) and his Tomb at St. Peter's, Leeds**

The will of John Langton II, an esquire who lived at Farnley near Leeds in West Yorkshire, demonstrates the instrumental role that armorial marshalling could play when a gentry lord intended to fashion himself as heir to an old ancestral estate. Although details of John II's life are obscure, the career of his father, Sir John I, and his extensive property portfolio are well known. John II's father and grandfather had been prominent members of York's urban gentry in the later fourteenth

---

<sup>157</sup> James, "'To Knowe a Gentilman'," 122-44; Nigel Saul, *Death, Art and Memory in Medieval England: The Cobham Family and their Monuments 1300-1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), *passim*.

<sup>158</sup> Aird, "Frustrated Masculinity," 39-55.

<sup>159</sup> Phillips, "Masculinities," 22-42; M. J. Ailes, "The Medieval Male Couple and the Language of Homosociality," in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (Longman: London and New York, 1999), 214-37.

<sup>160</sup> Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion*, 84-118.

<sup>161</sup> Harris, *Fabric of Piety*, 28; Kurmann-Schwartz, "Gender and Medieval Art," 135.

<sup>162</sup> James, *The Feminine Dynamic*, 151-6; Sheingorn, "'The Wise Mother'," 69-80; Gee, *Women, Art and Patronage*, 49-54.

century, with Sir John I having been MP for Yorkshire in 1420 and Sheriff twice between 1424-26. After the death of his elder brother, John II inherited the family's estates, which included the manor of Farnley to which he relocated.<sup>163</sup> He seems to have maintained a connection to York, leaving money in his will to York Minster and the monastic orders of the city, as well as to the church of St. Peter's, Leeds where he asked to be buried.<sup>164</sup> His enduring connections to York and his ancestors were to be represented on his and his wife's tomb, through an elaborate armorial sequence.<sup>165</sup> John II outlines that he wished his executors to acquire

a stone of marbill to be laid upon us both(e) with a grete skochon of myn armes and of the armes of my said wife to be sett in the myd of the ston with all my doghtirs in armes with (th)air husbu[n]ds upon my right syde And with all(e) son and (th)air wives in armes upon my left side And with all(e) my ffadir graunsir and auncestues in small skochons at my hede under the scriptur towarde dep(ar)ted in lyke wise as ye sall(e) fynd (th)ame at yorke where myn auncestys is ther.<sup>166</sup>

The above quote firstly describes a means of armorially representing himself and his wife (through “a grete skochon”), secondly his daughters and their spouses through separate shields of arms, thirdly, his sons and their wives, and, finally, a group of arms representing his male ancestors. The material evidence of the tomb is now lost but the antiquarian Ralph Thoresby, who described it in the eighteenth century, stated it contained “vacancies for 12 escutcheons.”<sup>167</sup> Thoresby's account of the tomb suggests it was comprised of the marble slab that John II requested and was inlaid with pieces of brass showing a series of arms, following the design of many other tomb monuments during this period.

A primary function of John II's armorial display may have been to memorialise his relatives and seek prayers for their souls. Nigel Saul has suggested that commissioning tombs for one's ancestors could represent such an intention.<sup>168</sup> However, John likely also intended to stress his social status by

---

<sup>163</sup> This is described in a biography of his elder brother, also called John. C. Rawcliffe, “LANGTON, Sir John (c.1387-1459),” *History of Parliament*, Accessed 21st March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/langton-sir-john-1387-1459>.

<sup>164</sup> BIHR Probate Register 4, fol. 244v.

<sup>165</sup> In the following quotation, translations of words appear in rounded brackets.

<sup>166</sup> BIHR Probate Register 4, fol. 244v.

<sup>167</sup> Ralph Thoresby, *Ducatus Leodiensis: Or, the Topography of the Ancient and Populous Town and Parish of Leedes* (London: Maurice Atkins, 1715), 45.

<sup>168</sup> Saul, *English Church Monuments*, 129-30.

emphasising his descent from a line of Langton ancestors who had resided at York. As his will states, John II wished for his connection to them to be communicated through “departed” arms. A late fifteenth-century manuscript in the British Library reveals the appearance of a “departed” coat of arms. The manuscript, explored in greater detail in Chapter 3, outlines plans for a large window at the church of the Observant Friars at Greenwich, London. Whilst including descriptions of royal and religious figures which were to be included in the glazing scheme, the document also includes illustrations of each figure’s coat of arms and corresponding descriptions in armorial blazon. In many instances, the division of two coats of arms is described as “departed” where the illustration of a shield is divided along its *pale* line and the arms are divided equally across the two halves of the shield (Figure 3.18). From the late sixteenth century, the term was superseded by the word “impaled” to describe the presentation of two arms on a shield in this manner.<sup>169</sup> The use of this term at the end of John II’s description heavily implies he wished for all of the arms representing his ancestors to adopt this form of marshalling.

Through using *impaled* arms to display his ancestry, John II was using a common means of representing patrilineal ancestry on tomb brasses by gentry males. For example, the tomb brass of Sir John Harpedon (d.1438) at Westminster Abbey uses three instances of *impaled* Harpedon arms to allow the viewer to trace his male line, as seen on the two shields at the top of the brass, as well as on the shield in the bottom left-hand corner (Figure 2.1).<sup>170</sup> Other fifteenth-century examples which enable the viewer to track patrilineal descent through *impaled* shields include the brass of Sir Thomas Stahum (d.1470) and his wives at St. Matthew’s, Morley, Derbyshire (Figure 2.2) and the brass of Nicholas Kniverton (d.1500) and his wife at All Saints’, Muggington in the same county (Figure 2.3).

Although some parishioners of St. Peter’s, Leeds may have been aware of the Langtons’ origins at York, John II’s sequence could have duped an uninformed viewer into thinking his family had occupied their estates at Farnley for multiple generations. Indeed, his will provides no explicit instructions for the armorial display to indicate that his ancestors had previously resided at York. The repetition of this type of marshalling would have therefore created the seamless impression of the Langtons’ continuous occupation of their estates at Farnley, in a way which smoothed over the family’s relocation from York to their new home in the early fifteenth century. It would seem, by

---

<sup>169</sup> Anonymous, “impale, v.,” Oxford English Dictionary, Accessed 21st March 2019, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/92060?redirectedFrom=impale>.

<sup>170</sup> Saul, *Death, Art and Memory*, 217-19; Harpedon. DBA 4, 245. Arg a pd mullet Gu. N 342. “c.1312.”

adopting a common means of representing patrilineal descent on tomb brasses, John II intended to fashion his role as heir to an estate with which his ancestors held a strong and unbroken connection. John II's will therefore suggests the use of a series of *impaled* arms might be used to construct an impression of a gentry lord as heir to a lineage of men who had enjoyed an enduring connection with their manor.

## **2.2.ii. The Will of John Pympe III (d.1496) and Armorial Glazing at St. Mary's, Nettlestead**

Returning to the will of John Pympe III (d.1496) of Nettlestead in Kent, we are also able to observe the ways in which a gentry lord might choose to represent his family's antiquity through a commission of armorial glass to his local parish church (Figures VI.1 & VI.2). After describing the extant glazing in their church, we will return to an analysis of the plans for two glazing sequences described in John III's will.<sup>171</sup>

St. Mary's, Nettlestead, just a short distance from the Pympe's residence of Nettlestead Place, is a small church with a squat exterior appearance, made all the more apparent by the great size of its nave windows (Figure VI.1). The church is composed of three bays, a narrow chancel (Figure VI.2) and a twelfth-century tower to the west, all enclosing nine windows (see Figure VI.3 for a ground plan).<sup>172</sup> The nave of the church appears to have been built in the fifteenth century as outlined in Chapter 1. There are three windows on the north of the nave (nIII, nIV and nV), three along the south side (sIII, sIV and sV) along with two windows on either side of the chancel (nII and sII) and an east window (window I).

Post-medieval interventions in the Nettlestead glazing are evident in three of the windows. T.F Curtis restored the East window in 1909 and made the glass showing the saints in nIII in 1894 (Figures VI.4 & VI.5). The glazing in sII and sIII bears a nineteenth-century style and appears much later than the church's medieval windows (Figures VI.6 & VI.7). There are also a number of medieval windows which a survey by Historic England dates to the fifteenth century.<sup>173</sup> The first is a fragment representing the *adventus* of St. Thomas Becket entering Canterbury, now in window nV

<sup>171</sup> Although some of the glass' archaeology is set out here, for an extended discussion see Volume 1: Appendix VI. St. Mary's, Nettlestead.

<sup>172</sup> Livett, "Nettlestead Church," 251-282.

<sup>173</sup> Anonymous, "Church of St. Mary," Historic England, Accessed 28th March 2019, <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1060645>.

(Figure VI.8), although this does not appear to be in its original window.<sup>174</sup> Another shows SS. Stephen and Lawrence in the north chancel window, nII, including donor portraits that probably represent two of the church's rectors (Figure VI.9). The three main lights of nIV represent SS. Thomas, Bartholemew and Matthew yet appear to be heavily restored in parts (Figure VI.10).

Most of the church's armorial medieval glass is found in the nave. Each of the six nave windows is comprised of a three-light design, with cusped cinquefoil heads surmounted by a complex arrangement of tracery lights (for the following explanation please refer to Figure VI.11). Each cinquefoil-headed light is subdivided into two single-foiled tracery lights, totalling a row of six with the central two tracteries being taller than the others (hereafter referred to as A1-6). Above each pair of subdivided tracteries there is a diamond-shaped light (B1, B2 and B3). There are also four near quadrant-shaped lights of varying sizes following the curvature of the window's upper edge, two large (C1 and C2) and two small (D1 and D2). Finally, there are two quadrant-shaped lights at the top of each window (E1 and E2).

In windows nIII and nIV, tracery lights A1-A6 contain depictions of angels carrying shields containing the arms of local gentry families in Kent and Sussex (respectively Figures VI.12 & VI.13). There are indications on the south side, in windows sIII and sIV, that these arrangements of angels in A1-A6 were part of a much broader sequence in the nave: the single-foiled heads in lights A1-A6 of sIII and sIV contain crossed-wings of angels, identical to those appearing in A1-A6 of nIII and nIV. Furthermore, in C1 and C2 of windows nIII, nIV, nV, sV and sIV there are also coats of arms in shields representing the ancestry of the Stafford family, accompanied by the family's armorial badges in tracery lights C1, C2 and E1 of window sV.

It seems that the Pympe commissioned a great deal of glazing for the church during the later medieval period. When the antiquarian, John Thorpe, visited Nettlestead in the late eighteenth century, he recorded the Pympe coat of arms in the church's East window, no doubt intended to proclaim their status as lords of Nettlestead. John III's relatives also seem to have commissioned armorial glass for the church during the fifteenth century, which would have shaped his own plans for its glazing. Regnolde Pympe (d.1436), John III's uncle, was the likely author of the tracery glazing in lights A1-A6 of window nIII representing local gentry families, based on the demonstrable correlation between his career and those of the people represented therein (Figure

---

<sup>174</sup> T. G. Faussett, "On a Fragment of Glass in Nettlestead Church," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 6 (1866): 129-34.



VI.12).<sup>175</sup> In addition, John Pympe II, John III's father, probably planned and commissioned the tracery glazing in nIV, based on the number of shields that relate to the ancestry of his first wife Isabel Cheyne (Figure VI.13), which will be explored further below.<sup>176</sup> Furthermore, the design of the shield-bearing angels in these windows is broadly comparable to other mid fifteenth-century glass representing angels in south-east England.<sup>177</sup> The Pympe were also likely responsible for another series of fifteenth-century tracery lights in A1-A6 and C1 and C2 in window sV. These window lights also house angels holding shields, however these shields are filled with clear, unpainted glass (Figure VI.8).<sup>178</sup>

As well as the resident Pympe family, the church's glass suggests other socially elite families were interested in representing themselves in the church's glazing. The series of arms and badges representing the Earls of Stafford, from whom the Pympe rented Nettlestead Place, suggests they held a prerogative to appear in each arrangement of armorial tracery lights. Similarly, the extensive number of shields used to represent the local gentry in the tracteries of nIII and nIV suggest Regnolde and John Pympe II may have felt it necessary to represent those who frequented the church. Their choice to represent local families in the glazing follows other known instances in later medieval England where the interests of the wider parish community were considered when planning the decoration of churches.<sup>179</sup> It is in relation to these other interested parties that we are able to consider the motives behind John III's second donation of armorial glass to Nettlestead.

As outlined in Chapter 1, John III's will features descriptions of two associated armorial glazing projects: the first conveying his social connections to local families and the second suggesting his ancestral links to the Cheyne and St. Leger families.<sup>180</sup> John III's description of this second donation implies that he intended it to complement the pre-existing sequence of armorial glass installed in the tracteries of window nIV by his father, John II. This arrangement of arms in A1-A6 of window nIV represents the arms of families associated with the Cheynes to whom John II was

---

<sup>175</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix VI. St. Mary's, Nettlestead, especially "Window nIII, Lights A1-A6 (Arms of the Local Gentry)."

<sup>176</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix VI. St. Mary's, Nettlestead, especially "Window nIV, Lights A1-A6 (Arms of the Local Gentry)."

<sup>177</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix VI. St. Mary's, Nettlestead, especially "Stylistic Analysis."

<sup>178</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix VI. St. Mary's, Nettlestead, especially "Stylistic Analysis."

<sup>179</sup> Eamon Duffy, "The Parish, Piety, and Patronage in Late Medieval East Anglia: The Evidence of Rood Screens," in *The Parish in English Life, c.1400-1600*, eds. K. French, et al (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 150.

<sup>180</sup> See 1.3. An "Alliaunce" at St. Mary's, Nettlestead, Kent.

initially connected through his first marriage to Isobel, daughter of Richard Cheyne.<sup>181</sup> In A1, the tracery lights of nIV show the father of Richard Cheyne's wife, Robert Cralle, who was a local landowner in Kent. Following this, the arms of John Cheyne (d.1487) appear in A3, followed in A4 by the arms of Sir Robert Shottesbrooke, who was the father of John's wife, Eleanor. In addition, light A5 contains the arms of Thomas Town (d.1420), who had been a local landowner, MP for Kent in 1420 and married to John Cheyne I's sister, Joan. Besides this, there are other members of the gentry in these lights; one in A2 cannot be identified and another in A6 represents James Peckham, a local landowner (d.1471). As well as representing members of the local gentry more generally, there is a left-to-right progression in nIV, A1-A6, which reflects marital ties within the Cheyne ancestry.

John III's stipulation that his own donation of glass was to be placed "in such romes as may be thought most conuenient w(i)t(h)in the wyndowes of the saide church(e)" suggests he intended his own sequence of glass to be clearly intelligible.<sup>182</sup> Other uses of the term, "conuenient," during the period suggests it related principally to the aesthetic coherence of works of art and architecture.<sup>183</sup> It is possible, when writing his will, he would have preferred for the lights A1-A6 of sIV, those directly opposite his father's sequence in nIV, to house this contribution to the church's glazing. The vestiges of glass representing angels in these lights suggests they too originally contained armorial glass, since Regnolde's and John Pympe II's donations of armorial glass also contained angels holding coats of arms.

Despite John III's lengthy description in his will, it is unclear exactly how he wished the ties between the Pympe, Cheynes and St. Legers to be expressed through armorial glass. Given the dual intention of his father's glass placed in A1-A6 of window nIV, to commemorate the local gentry whilst also representing marriages within the Cheyne lineage, it seems likely John III

---

<sup>181</sup> For the following refer to Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 7, Cheyne Lineage and for references to the following people see Volume 1: Appendix VI. St. Mary's Nettlestead.

<sup>182</sup> TNA, PROB 11/11/124.

<sup>183</sup> For instance the term is used to describe windows which were to be constructed at St. Andrew's, Wingfield in Suffolk: "And þerynne to be made a clerestory wt vj conuenient wyndowes..." Quoted in John A. Goodall, "The Architecture of Ancestry at the Collegiate Church of St. Andrew's Wingfield, Suffolk," in *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, eds. R. Eales and S. Tyas (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2003), 164; The term is also used to describe the size of a stone desired for a tomb in the will of Edmund Chertsey (d.1474) "I will myn executors make to be leid a conuenient stone of marble with a remembrance of Imagery thereon." Quoted in W. H. St. John Hope, "The Architectural History of the Cathedral Church and Monastery of St. Andrew at Rochester," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 23 (1898): 296.

imagined a sequence showing the arms of gentry families to whom the Pympe, Cheynes and St. Legers could trace a common ancestor. It is unusual that John III's will does not include plans to accommodate the shields of the Earls of Stafford, however it is possible that arrangements to install these may have been made once John III's executors had decided which gentry families they would include in the glazing scheme.

As mentioned above, a principal motivation behind the representation of oneself and one's ancestors in churches was to solicit intercessory prayers from a local church congregation.<sup>184</sup> However, the social context of John III's will suggests he also intended to represent links to these families to lend a degree of antiquity to the Pympe by associating them with old Kentish families. The St. Legers had held their lands at Ulcombe since the eleventh century whilst the Cheynes had occupied Shurland in Eastchurch since the early fourteenth.<sup>185</sup> Thus, their arms would have likely been recognisable to the population of Kent during the medieval period.

As Chapter 1 argued, John III's first donation of glass appears to have been intended to emphasise the Pympe's renewed authority as Kentish landowners, given the recent return of their lands following Henry VII's accession to the English throne in 1485. John III's second donation of glass appears to have been motivated similarly by a wish to enhance their recently restored status as the lords of Nettlestead. It might appear surprising that John III did not request more of an overtly patrilineal sequence focused on charting the Pympe's historical association with Nettlestead; a strategy adopted, for example, by gentry lords in fifteenth-century Yorkshire.<sup>186</sup> It would seem, however, that in choosing to represent his ancestral ties to the St. Legers and Cheynes that John III was following the aforementioned tradition of representing other local gentry families in the church's glazing. It may have been that the highly visible nature of window lights made them more of a contested church fitting when deciding to represent oneself in an ecclesiastical space to which multiple other families may have held ties. Through his intention to represent his ties to the St. Legers and Cheynes, John III may have thus intended to lend antiquity and authority to his status as lord of Nettlestead, whilst also abiding by a tradition that required him to represent the interests of other groups in the church.

---

<sup>184</sup> Saul, *English Church Monuments*, 129-30; Saul, "The Gentry and the Parish," 252; Roffey, *The Medieval Chantry Chapel*, 104-5.

<sup>185</sup> Hasted, *The History: Volume 5*, 385-396; Edward Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 6* (Canterbury: W. Bristow, 1798), 245-58.

<sup>186</sup> James, "'To Knowe A Gentilman'," 137-8.

John III appears to have been able to plan this complementary glazing project based on the relationship the Pympe held with St. Mary's. Their long-standing ties with Nettlestead appear to have enabled him to assume a great degree of influence over the church's glazing. Indeed it appears during the fifteenth century that the family were able to reserve certain tracery lights for their use at a future date. John III describes the presence of "certayne blank skoggyngs" in the St. Thomas window. The second entry in MED for "blank" states "of a document: having blank spaces to be filled in by an agent," citing numerous descriptions of provisional spaces being left in charters for a subject's name to be added at a future date.<sup>187</sup> This sense of the word suggests Pympe understood these shields in the same way, but with coats of arms taking the place of written names. The tracery lights of window sV, which contain angels holding shields filled with white glass, may be similar to the "blank skoggyngs" described in Pympe's will. One might conclude that John III chose to leave this window open for their son and heir, Henry (d.1518) to use to install his own armorial glass. The still empty shields might be explained by Henry's early death at the age of twenty-three before he had a chance to plan a sequence for the window.

As the resident lords and advowson holders of Nettlestead, the Pympe may have come to an agreement with the Staffords and the local gentry to allow them to reserve parts of its glazing for future generations. They likely also required the permission of the church's clergy, yet given their possession of the church's advowson they were likely able to appoint priests who were obliging to the family's interests. Having examined the ways in which a gentry male might use armorial glass to strengthen his image as lord of his estates, we now turn to examine the representation of gentry lordship at Athelhampton.

### **2.2.iii. Male Authorship: The Armorial Glazing of Athelhampton Hall**

Drawing on these wills, we are able to identify the Martyns most likely responsible for glazing Athelhampton and examine the different gender roles in which they chose to represent themselves. As introduced in Chapter 1, the Martyn family constructed and glazed their hall during the fifteenth century.<sup>188</sup> Located in their oriel window, the Martyns' "genealogie" showed their patrilineal line from the late fourteenth century to the late sixteenth century. In particular, the sequence placed emphasis on their origins at Athelhampton and suggested their accumulation of a patrimony through

---

<sup>187</sup> Anonymous, "blaunk adj.," Middle English Dictionary, Accessed 21st March 2019, [https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED5130/track?counter=5&search\\_id=526796](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED5130/track?counter=5&search_id=526796).

<sup>188</sup> For a family tree see Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 2: Martyns of Athelhampton.

marriages to local heiresses.<sup>189</sup> This was communicated through using *impaled* coats of arms, with each shield in the series showing the Martyn arms on the *dexter* side and the arms of a female spouse on the *sinister* side (see Figures II.7-II.9).

It is possible to identify the probable author of the “genealogie” through comparing the glass’ stylistic qualities with the marriages it represents.<sup>190</sup> In all of the Martyn arms (*argent two bars gules*) a method of circular diapering is used on all of the white glass representing the *argent fields* (Figure II.14). However, the same circular pattern is only used to render the *fields* on the sinister sides of the shields in light 4b, which shows the arms of Elizabeth Pydel, wife of Thomas Martyn I, and light 4d, which shows the arms of Isabel Faringdon, wife of Sir William Martyn.<sup>191</sup> After the shield showing the marriage of Sir William, circular diapering is no longer used to render any of the female arms in the sequence. This stylistic evidence would suggest Sir William was responsible for installing all of these arms in lights 4a, 4b, 4c and 4d.

This first iteration of oriel glass seems to reflect Sir William’s establishment of himself as heir to Athelhampton and a line of Martyn men who had resided there since its acquisition by Sir Robert Martyn I (d.1375). The use of an *impaled* marshalling form for each coat of arms creates the impression of an uninterrupted transfer of the house from father to son and eventually to Sir William. This appears to have been a conceit intended to construct a coherent view of his family’s occupation of their manor, as a brief analysis of their family history reveals. Sir Robert I seems to have inherited Athelhampton through his first marriage to the heiress Agnes Loundres.<sup>192</sup> However, his male heir, Richard, was the product of his second marriage to Agnes Mountfort.<sup>193</sup> The repeated *impaled* arms therefore create a false impression of continuity between parents and their respective child and smooths over the problematic place of Agnes Mountfort. The armorial series thus conflates her identity with that of Agnes Loundres, enabling her to serve as both heiress and mother to Richard Martyn.

---

<sup>189</sup> On the meaning of “genealogie” see Chapter 1.

<sup>190</sup> For the following please refer to Volume 1: Appendix II. Athelhampton Hall, “Stylistic Analysis.”

<sup>191</sup> The arms on the *sinister* sides of the shields in 4a and 4c do not feature circular diapering and seem to be later restorations of the original medieval glass.

<sup>192</sup> H1, 471.

<sup>193</sup> This is revealed through a biography of Richard’s brother, William: Anonymous, “MARTIN, William,” History of Parliament, Accessed 19th March 2019, <http://www.histparl.ac.uk/volume/1386-1421/member/martin-william>.

If the oriel does indeed reflect Sir William's motives, then the use of *impaled* arms to some extent parallels John Langton II's arrangement of arms for his tomb. The adoption of a series of *impaled* shields was useful to both men in presenting a seamless picture of their ancestries. Whereas John II used such an arrangement to mask the displacement of his lineage from York to Leeds, Sir William seems to have utilised this type of display to omit a familial inconsistency and instead suggest continuity between the Martyn line and residence at Athelhampton. For a landowning man, creating the impression his family had continuously resided on their lands for several generations could be a crucial means of legitimising both his gentility and his lordship. Upon his arrival at his new manor at Thornhill in Yorkshire, Sir Thomas Saville adopted the crest of the estate's previous owners on his tomb in an attempt to lend antiquity to his lordship, as Alison James has demonstrated.<sup>194</sup> Nigel Saul has argued, in a similar context, how John Cobham retrospectively commissioned a tomb for his father in his local collegiate church at Cobham to consolidate his authority as his estate's lord.<sup>195</sup>

When representing his role as heir of Athelhampton, Sir William may have also intended to convey the great size of his family's patrimony. In 1483, Sir William inherited the nearby manor of Tingleton from his wife, Isabel Faringdon, following the death of her mother, Margaret. Sir William's father, Thomas Martyn I, had likely arranged the marriage with Margaret since her husband, Thomas Faringdon, had died earlier in 1444.<sup>196</sup> Thomas Faringdon's lack of a son would have made Isabel, as his legal heir, an attractive bride for a gentry family seeking to expand their land holdings, and Thomas Martyn I likely foresaw the advantages of the match for his patrimony. Through representing his marriage to Isabel, Sir William's oriel may have been intended to show the Martyns' acquisition of Tingleton. The representation of Richard Martyn's marriage in 4b would have also highlighted their receipt of other property in Athelhampton, received through Richard Martyn's marriage. In a parallel case, Alison James has argued, acquiring a collection of estates in the local county was a crucial means through which landowning men in fifteenth-century Yorkshire sought to authenticate their gentility.<sup>197</sup>

In representing the Martyns' possession of these properties, Sir William's "genealogie" to some extent mirrors John Pympe III's second donation of armorial glass to Nettlestead. As mentioned above, John III's armorial glazing was intended to buttress his status as lord of Nettlestead by representing his family's ancestral connections to other Kentish families. In doing so, John III

---

<sup>194</sup> James, "To Knowe A Gentilman'," 137-8.

<sup>195</sup> Saul, *Death, Art and Memory*, 90.

<sup>196</sup> Woodger, "FARINGDON, Thomas."

<sup>197</sup> James, "To Knowe A Gentilman'," 131.

sought to exert his antiquity as lord of his local estate while accommodating a tradition at St. Mary's for representing the local gentry in the church's windows. Like John III's armorial glazing, Sir William's "genealogie" also reflects his connections to local families. However, as a domestic glazing scheme, Sir William was not required to incorporate the interests of other families and would have been at greater liberty to represent ancestral connections that had directly benefited the Martyns. Indeed, whilst tracking ancestral descent, a principal function of Sir William's "genealogie" was to represent the Martyns' connections to families through whom they had acquired property.

Whilst the "genealogie" reflected some of the land inherited by the Martyns, the absence of text labels in the glass, such as those used at Beaupré Hall, would have created a degree of ambiguity about the extent of the Martyns' landholdings. For the contemporary viewer, it would have thus been impossible to tell exactly which marriages had brought property to the family without the clarification provided by additional text. Whilst there is a possibility that accompanying labels have since been lost, it is also possible that this was an intentional omission. Sir William's presentation of the arms in this way may have been intended to dupe a contemporary viewer into believing they had gained property through each marriage. Indeed, not every marriage had brought property to the family, as Thomas I appears to have inherited nothing through his marriage.<sup>198</sup> Nevertheless, the absence of text may have been intended to exaggerate an impression of Sir William's landed power.

With a large patrimony to manage, the "genealogie" may have also been intended to convey Sir William's ability to effectively manage his lands. All of the white glass used for the Martyn arms in the window is rendered with the same aforementioned circular diapering pattern, including the white glass used for the arms of Sir William's descendants in lights 4e-4h. This would suggest Sir William prospectively fitted lights 4e-4h in the oriel with the Martyn arms (Figure II.10) at the same time that he installed the glass in lights 4a-4d. The stylistic qualities of the four *sinister* arms, in 4e-4h, representing the sixteenth-century spouses of Martyn men, indicate they were filled-in in two further glazing campaigns.<sup>199</sup> At the time Sir William installed his campaign of armorial glazing he may have filled the *sinister* parts of the shields in 4e-4h with white glass as a means of reserving these parts of the window to accommodate the arms of future spouses.<sup>200</sup>

---

<sup>198</sup> H1, 471.

<sup>199</sup> For stylistic analysis of this glass and the reasoning behind the different campaigns in the oriel window see Volume 1: Appendix II. Athelhampton Hall, "Stylistic Analysis."

<sup>200</sup> This method was adopted for reserving lights at Nettlestead, as the following paragraph discusses.

If the preceding hypothesis is correct, Sir William's reservation of these parts of the window would suggest he was attempting to represent himself as a fatherly figure by enabling his male descendants to add the arms of their wives to the window. Sir William's reservation of certain parts of the oriel glass to some extent parallels John Pympe III's apparent reservation of the tracery lights of window nV at Nettlestead for the use of his heir, Henry Pympe. However, had Henry lived long enough to contribute to the church's glazing, he would have been constrained by a tradition of needing to include the arms of local gentry lords and the Stafford family in the church's windows. Whereas, unlike the Pympes, Sir William Martyn, as lord of Athelhampton, was able to reserve window lights solely for the representation of his future descendants.

At the time of the oriel's creation, the installation of white glass into these parts of the window would have demonstrated his expectation that future Martyn men would continue to dwell at Athelhampton over subsequent generations. Since Sir William would have anticipated the acquisition of Tingleton through his wife, he may have been keen to ensure that his heir, Christopher, did not decide to move to this estate and sever the connection between the Martyn lineage and Athelhampton. Although an aspiring gentry lord might wish to demonstrate his family's enduring occupation of a single estate, moving to a new manor granted the opportunity to reestablish oneself and potentially fabricate a new and even older lineage. Indeed, after inheriting the estate of Thornhill in Yorkshire, the Savilles attempted such a project in the fifteenth century with the establishment of a new manor there and family chantry chapel at their local church.<sup>201</sup> Sir William's embellishment of his patrimony therefore appears to have come with the risk that his heir might seek to establish himself independently from his father, especially since Tingleton could have appeared as an attractive prospect for Christopher. A valuation of Sir William's manors in his Inquisition Post Mortem states that the manor was less financially profitable than Athelhampton.<sup>202</sup> Nevertheless, a donation of farming equipment to Christopher suggests the manor was large enough to contain land capable of pasture.<sup>203</sup>

Sir William's intention to ensure Christopher remained at Athelhampton is also suggested through a discussion of donations to his heir in his will. As the document outlines, Sir William donates numerous pieces of furniture to his heir. However, it also states that Christopher would receive

---

<sup>201</sup> James, "'To Knowe a Gentilman'," 122-44.

<sup>202</sup> The "Manor of Athelhampton" was worth "20 l[ibras]" but the "Manor of Tyncleden" was worth "10 l[ibras]." IPM 1.3, 242.

<sup>203</sup> "It[em] lego eidem [Christ]ofero om[n]es bidentes meos nu[n]c pastur' sup[er] Athelh[a]mpston et Tynkeldene..." TNA 11/14/123.



nothing should he try to obstruct his second wife, Christina, in carrying out her duties as his executor.<sup>204</sup> It is possible, in appointing Christina as his executor, that Sir William wished for her to act as a proxy for him and ensure Christopher did not separate Athelhampton from its interior furnishings should he attempt to establish his own household on a different estate. Indeed, Sir William may have established such an arrangement to incentivise Christopher to remain at Athelhampton, where he would inherit a house along with its interior fittings and thus a manor appropriate for entertaining guests and presenting himself in the style befitting of a gentry lord. Given the measures taken by Sir William to ensure his household furnishings remained intact, we might interpret the initial series of half-filled shields in lights 4e-4h as an attempt to suggest he was able to control his patrimony and its use by his heir. Suggesting one's ability to control a sizeable patrimony in this way seems to have been a feature of elite manhood in the medieval period. Highlighting the problems that William the Conqueror experienced with his rebellious heir, William Aird has shown that a willingness to control one's son and their use of the family patrimony might be acknowledged as a laudable quality of aristocratic manhood during the medieval period.<sup>205</sup>

Whilst the Martyns used their domestic glass to create an impression of their connection to their manor and suggest the size of their patrimony, their "alliaunce," in neII, suggested their ties to other landholding families in the south of England. Determining the family members responsible for the planning and commissioning of this sequence is problematic due to its use of singular, *unmarshalled* coats of arms with no references to specific marriages that might aid in dating the glass. Nevertheless, the same circular diapering pattern that appears in the oriel window also appears on the arms of Faringdon (neIIa), Martyn (neIIb) and Pydel (neIIc) and is therefore likely representative of its manufacture by a fifteenth-century glazing studio.<sup>206</sup>

Further verification of their dating is provided by an analysis of historical information relating to these families in the later medieval period. The appearance of the arms of Mohun in neIIc, which appear to have been moved from the glass originally in swI, most likely represented the Mohuns of Dunster Castle in Somerset. The last lord of Dunster to use these arms would have been John Mohun (d.1376) yet a cadet branch of the family, which settled at Lanteglos near Fowey in

---

<sup>204</sup> "It[em] volo et ordino q[uod] si p[re]fat[us] [Christ]oferus filius meus impl[ac]itav[er]it vel p[er]turbav[er]it [Christ]ianam ux[orem] meam in aliqua curia vel aliquib[us] curijs post decessum meu[m] tunc volo q[uod] legacia mea p[re]d[i]c[t]a p[re]fato [Christ]ofero fact[a] pro nullo habeant[ur] Alioquin in suo robore p[er]manea[n]t et effect[u].” TNA PROB 11/14/123.

<sup>205</sup> Aird, "Frustrated Masculinity," 49.

<sup>206</sup> For further stylistic comparisons see Volume 1: Appendix II. Athelhampton Hall, "Stylistic Analysis."

Cornwall continued to use a variant of these arms into the early sixteenth century, suggesting the arms in this light might refer to them.<sup>207</sup>

As outlined above, Thomas Faringdon died in 1444 suggesting the glass may have been commissioned shortly before this date.<sup>208</sup> The inclusion of the arms of Pydel in this window suggests they had been intended to represent the Martyns' landed ties to this family who had lived close to Athelhampton. Richard Martyn's marriage to a daughter of Henry Pydel likely occurred in the early fifteenth century, given that his son, Thomas Martyn I, died in 1485. At his death, Thomas I's Inquisition Post Mortem stated Sir William was at least forty years of age, meaning that Thomas I had at least reached puberty c.1445. Based on this material and historical evidence, it appears probable that either Richard or Thomas I were responsible for commissioning the glazing representing an "alliaunce" in neII.

Each coat of arms is *unmarshalled* giving the impression that either Richard or Thomas I wished to suggest each man was of equal standing. The visual homogeneity of the arms in this window would suggest Richard or Thomas I wished to express homosocial bonds with one another as elite neighbours in the south and south-west of England. The visual uniformity of these arms mirrors other expressions of homosocial bonds amongst groups of gentry males. As Kim Phillips has shown, members of the gentry serving in the late medieval Commons established their own sumptuary legislation in a manner which enabled them to be collectively distinct from lower classes of men, by virtue of their attire.<sup>209</sup>

In addition, the distinctive inclusion of the pronouns, "I", "ME", "HE" and "WE", which surround the arms in lozenge quarries, would have suggested that this was a connection between individual men ("HE") who together formed a collective ("WE"). Searching through several catalogues of medieval stained glass quarries, I have been unable to find comparable instances containing pronouns from later medieval England.<sup>210</sup> Given this absence of comparable examples, it is possible

---

<sup>207</sup> Mohun. DBA 4, 225. From a maunch Erm a hand holding a fleur de lys. Mill Steph. Lanteglos near Fowey, Cornwall. "1508."

<sup>208</sup> Woodger, "FARINGDON, Thomas."

<sup>209</sup> Phillips, "Masculinities," 29-31.

<sup>210</sup> Augustus Wollaston Franks, *Ornamental Glazing Quarries: Collected and Arranged from Ancient Examples* (London: John Henry Parker, 1849). passim; Marks, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Northamptonshire*, xxix; Peter Newton, *The County of Oxford: A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass* (London: Oxford University Press, 1979), xxii; Penny Hebgin-Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Cheshire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), xlv; Brian Sprakes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of South Yorkshire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), xx; Penny Hebgin-

the Martyns commissioned these quarries as a means of amplifying the gendered connection they wished to express with these other landed men. This use of specific pronouns to evoke close masculine ties mirrors expressions of friendship between aristocratic men in earlier literary contexts. When examining the twelfth-century *Chanson de Roland*, M. J. Ailes has argued that Charlemagne's reference to his deceased companion as "Ami" would have been interpreted by its readers as an example of a homosocial connection, typical of the social bonds forged by elite men.<sup>211</sup> In neII, the use of these pronouns may therefore reflect the Martyns' attempts to further suggest their social exclusivity, through expressing their ties to their landed neighbours in a manner characteristic of aristocratic men during the later medieval period.

As this section has explored, Sir William Martyn's "genealogie" appears to have been intended to establish him as heir to Athelhampton and forge a historical connection between the Martyns and their estate, mirroring displays of ancestry in churches intended to forge a gentry lord's historical connection with his manor.<sup>212</sup> Sir William also chose to represent the size of his patrimony in his domestic glazing, possibly intending to inflate perceptions of its size through omitting textual descriptions that would have enabled viewers to isolate individual heiresses within the broader scheme. Whilst suggesting the great extent of his patrimony, the "genealogie" also represented Sir William himself as a prudent father able to control his large portfolio of estates. In doing so, Sir William's glass mirrors laudable qualities of elite masculinity during the medieval period, namely the expectation that elite men could control their childrens' use of the family patrimony.<sup>213</sup> Chronologically preceding this commission of glass, window neII also demonstrates either Richard or Thomas I's wish to express homosocial ties to landowners in the south of England. The representation of male bonds in this window parallels the ties that the parliamentary gentry exhibited through their choice of attire and, through the use of gendered pronouns in the window's quarries, the male bonds expressed by elite men in medieval epics.<sup>214</sup>

Having explored how Athelhampton's glazing reflects the intentions of Martyn men to represent their roles as heir, father and neighbor, we now turn to look in greater detail at the autonomy of women in planning domestic glazing and the roles in which they styled themselves.

---

Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Lancashire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), lii; Penny Hebgin-Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of the County of Lincolnshire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), xxii.

<sup>211</sup> Ailes, "The Medieval Male Couple," 218.

<sup>212</sup> James, "'To Knowe A Gentilman'," 137-8; Saul, *Death, Art and Memory*, 90.

<sup>213</sup> Aird, "Frustrated Masculinity," 45-6.

<sup>214</sup> Phillips, "Masculinities," 29-31; Ailes, "The Medieval Male Couple," 218.

### 2.3.i. The Will of Margaret Paston (d.1489) and her Tomb at Mautby

The will of Margaret Paston includes a lengthy explanation of the armorial sequence that would feature on her tomb, which was intended to demonstrate her status as heiress of her father's patrimony. Margaret was the daughter of John Mautby and Margaret Berney. John's male ancestors had occupied his lands at Mautby since the early fourteenth century, and were buried in their local church of St. Peter and St. Paul.<sup>215</sup> Some of her paternal ancestors may have participated in the French wars of the fourteenth century, as many of them had attained the rank of knight, such as Sir Robert Mautby who was recorded as lord of the estate in 1355. Her father had held numerous lands in Norfolk and Suffolk which, as his sole heiress, Margaret brought with her in her marriage to John Paston I (d.1466).<sup>216</sup> Although John I held numerous lands in Norfolk during his lifetime, in comparison to the Mautbys, his family had risen from humble origins as a group of farmers and agrarian workers.<sup>217</sup> It may have been because of the perceived lower status of her marital family that Margaret decided to be buried at Mautby along with her father and his paternal family.

In her will, written on 4th February 1483, Margaret describes her wish for her executors to

purveye a stoon of marble to be leyde alofte vpon my grave [...] and vpon that stoon I wulle have iiij schochens sett at the iiij corners, whereof I wulle that the fi rst schochen shalbe of my husbondes armes and myn departed, the iide of Mawtebys armes and Berneys of Redham departed, the iijde of Mawtebys armes and the Lord Loveyn departed, the iiiite of Mawtebys armes and Sir Roger Beauchamp departed. And in myddys of the seid stoon I wull have a scochen sett of Mawtebys armes allone.<sup>218</sup>

As the above quotation indicates, the tomb's design would feature an arrangement of five shields containing four *impaled* arms at each corner and one *unmarshalled* coat of arms in the centre. On one of the shields Margaret chose to represent herself in the conventional way as wife of her

---

<sup>215</sup> Francis Blomefield, *An Essay Towards A Topographical History of the County of Norfolk: Volume 11* (London: W Miller, 1810), 226-30.

<sup>216</sup> Blomefield, *An Essay Towards: Volume 11*, 226-30.

<sup>217</sup> Helen Castor, "Paston, Sir John (1442-1479)," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Accessed 21st March 2019,

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21512/version/0>; Colin Richmond, "Paston family," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 23rd March 2019, <https://www-oxforddnb-com.libproxy.york.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-52791?rskey=aT3oVI&result=1>.

<sup>218</sup> Davis, et al, eds. *Paston Letters*, 382-89.

husband John Paston II through the use of *impaled* arms, which would have seen the Paston arms placed on the *dexter* side and the Mautby arms placed on the *sinister*. The passage also indicated Margaret intended three shields to show her paternal ancestry; one of which represented her parents' marriage, whilst the remaining two shields were intended to show older marriages made by members of her father's paternal line ("Mawtebys armes and the Lord Loveyn departed... "Mawtebys armes and Sir Roger Beauchamp"). Other than through Margaret's will, it is not possible to trace women who married into the Mautby male line or to verify the family's descent from a "Lord Loveyn" or a "Sir Roger Beauchamp." I have been unable to find a possible match for the identity of "Lord Loveyn" but Margaret's reference to "Sir Roger Beauchamp" appears to mean Sir Richard Beauchamp (d.1439) the 13th Earl of Warwick. Sir Richard had married twice, firstly to Elizabeth Berekely, Countess of Warwick (d.1422), and secondly to Isabel Despenser (d.1439).<sup>219</sup> It would seem that, by including these invented marriages, Margaret sought to add further prestige to her ancestral line.

Despite her likely inclusion of fictitious marriages in the armorial display, Margaret's will demonstrates awareness of how to marshal arms within a sequence in order to communicate ancestral descent.<sup>220</sup> For instance, Margaret used an *impaled* coats of arms to indicate specific marriages within the Mautby line and to represent a continuous chain from her paternal line to her father and eventually to herself. Margaret's will therefore demonstrates her interest in representing her identity as an heiress, through association with her male line and her ability to marshal arms in order to represent her lineage.

### **2.3.ii. Female Authorship: The Armorial Glazing of Fawsley Hall**

The surviving glass commissioned by the Knightley family for their manor at Fawsley suggests the degree of influence elite women could have exerted over the glazing of their husband's domestic spaces. An analysis of the commissioning and later rearrangement of the family's armorial glass suggests the intentions of some Knightley women to define themselves in relation to their elite natal

---

<sup>219</sup> Christine Carpenter, "Beauchamp, Richard, thirteenth earl of Warwick," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 24th February 2019, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1838>.

<sup>220</sup> A secondary concern may have been to indicate the property that had descended through her, from the Mautby male line to her husband, John Paston II.

families, whilst also seeking to benefit the lord of Fawsley during a period of instability in his authority.

In 1416, the Knightleys moved from Staffordshire to Fawsley Hall in Northamptonshire, following the purchase of the estate by Richard Knightley I (Figure IV.1). The initial manor had been built by Simon de Fawsley at a short distance from St. Mary's, which became the Knightleys' local parish church and place of burial for the family's deceased.<sup>221</sup> During the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the Knightleys amassed great swathes of land through marriages to landed heiresses. Probably a short time before the death of his father, Sir Richard Knightley IV (d.1538) married Jane Skenard. Jane was heiress to a host of Northamptonshire estates, many of which she had inherited through her maternal grandmother, Margaret de St. John.<sup>222</sup>

Following the premature death of his elder brother in 1534, Sir Edmund, Sir Richard IV and Jane's second son, became their heir. Like his father, Sir Edmund made an advantageous marriage of his own, wedding Ursula De Vere (d.1559), co-heiress along with her brother, John de Vere, 14th Earl of Oxford (d.1526), to the De Vere family inheritance.<sup>223</sup> As a descendant of the De Vere line, Ursula's natal family ranked above many others in England.<sup>224</sup> In comparison to the Knightleys' relatively recent acquisition of Fawsley, her father's patrilineal line had held their family's seat at Castle Hedingham in Essex since the twelfth century.<sup>225</sup> They possessed a sizeable patrimony of their own that was comparable, if not superior in size, to that held by the Knightleys.<sup>226</sup> As coheiress to her father's patrimony Ursula would have brought a portion of this inheritance to the Knightleys. Although Sir Edmund possessed such a large number of estates during his lifetime, his inability to beget a son meant he was unable to bequeath the patrimony to an heir and, following his death, the Knightley lands passed instead to his younger brother, Sir Valentine.

---

<sup>221</sup> Heward and Taylor, *The Country Houses*, 211; George Baker, *History and Antiquities*, 381-82.

<sup>222</sup> Philip Riden and Charles Insley, *A History of the County of Northamptonshire: Volume 5, The Hundred of Cleley* (London: Victoria County History, 2002), 374-413.

<sup>223</sup> For a De Vere family tree see Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 4b: De Vere Lineage

<sup>224</sup> Carpenter, "England," 266.

<sup>225</sup> Philip Dixon and P. Marshall, "The Great Tower at Hedingham Castle: A Reassessment," *Fortress* 18 (2003): 23-42.

<sup>226</sup> Ragen C. Dearagon, "Vere, Aubrey de (d.1141)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Accessed 23rd February 2019,

<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-28203#odnb-9780198614128-e-28203>.

The Knightleys seem to have remodelled the hall at Fawsley some time during the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.<sup>227</sup> The structure consists of five bays lying on a south-east to north-west axis and has five, three-light windows running along its south-western side, hereafter referred to - from east to west - as swI, swII, swIII, swIV and swV (See Figure IV.2 for ground plan). The north-east side of the hall has three windows of the same design, neII, neIII and the oriel (nIV).<sup>228</sup> As we will examine further in Chapter 3, it is possible the hall's oriel window initially contained the Knightleys' "genealogie," showing the history of their family's connection with Fawsley and the properties they had amassed through marrying heiresses (see Figure IV.6 for a numbered diagram and Figure IV.27 for a hypothetical reconstruction). This sequence seems to have been later moved to windows swI-II of the hall and replaced with another series of glass showing the descent of the Skenard patrimony that could have initially been placed in the south-west windows of the hall (Figure IV.26).<sup>229</sup> The following analysis uses the prefix, II., when describing the position of this second sequence of glass in the oriel, to remind the reader of its later date in the chronology of Fawsley's glazing.<sup>230</sup>

An additional sequence of glass appearing to show the descent of the De Vere patrimony, and its receipt by Sir Edmund, was placed in windows swIII, swIV and swV (respectively Figures IV.23, IV.24 & IV.25). Based on a reading of the antiquarian evidence in relation to the surviving glass, it is possible to reconstruct the likely position of this sequence of glass.<sup>231</sup> The entire series seems to have been comprised of eighteen shields arranged over six rows of lights across the three windows and used *impaled* arms to show the descent of the De Vere patrimony. The sequence appears to have begun with the arms of an unidentifiable ancestor *impaling* the arms of William the Conqueror in II. swIII 2a and ended with a coat of arms representing Sir Edmund's marriage to Ursula in II.

---

<sup>227</sup> Heward and Taylor, *The County Houses*, 211.

<sup>228</sup> These three windows are the only ones on the north-east side contemporary with the hall; neI and neV are nineteenth-century additions.

<sup>229</sup> After being commissioned, the shields showing the Skenard ancestry were likely placed along the south west wall of the hall which was later occupied by the Knightley "genealogie" and the shields showing the De Vere ancestry. For more information on the chronology of the Knightley's glazing and its various arrangements in the hall see Volume 1: Appendix IV. Fawsley Hall, Northamptonshire.

<sup>230</sup> When referring to the shields showing the Knightley lineage both the earlier and later positions are stated, with each separated by a forward slash, i.e. I. Oriel 1a/ II. swII 1c.

<sup>231</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix IV. Fawsley Hall, Northamptonshire. See especially "Belcher's record of Window swV" and "swIII-swV (De Vere ancestry)."

swV 3c.<sup>232</sup> At the same time, a shield representing Sir Edmund and Ursula's marriage was also placed in tracery light A7 of the oriel window, which will be examined further in Chapter 4.<sup>233</sup>

The appearance at Fawsley of such an extensive sequence representing Ursula's ancestry suggests her involvement in its planning. As demonstrated, Margaret Paston, who emerged from a more humble background than Ursula, was able to describe a series of four shields showing her paternal descent. Like the tomb sequence, Ursula's ancestral narrative begins with the marriages of distant ancestors and ends with shields showing her own marriage. Since Margaret Paston could linguistically convey an ancestral series of arms, Ursula, who likely possessed a good knowledge of her ancestry and a more sophisticated command of blazon, would likely have been able to provide the necessary arms to a glazier and explain how they were supposed to be marshalled.

It is unusual in surviving art from the period for women to have commissioned such a public display of their ancestry. Elite women typically represented such ancestral lineages in private, illuminated books and other devotional manuscripts for the spiritual benefits they granted to their relatives. Kathryn Smith, for example, has shown how a fourteenth-century book of hours that belonged to Hawisia de Bois contained instances of her ancestors' arms to remind her to pray for them whilst reading specific passages of the text.<sup>234</sup> In contrast to this private depiction of ancestors for religious purposes, the De Vere sequence, located in the public setting of the hall, appears to place emphasis on Ursula's identity as heiress to her family patrimony.

Not only would the sequence of glass have been highly visible but the number of shields used in the sequence appears to have provided a comprehensive account of the De Vere ancestry. Indeed, some of the earlier shields such as that representing an unidentifiable ancestor *impaling* the arms of William the Conqueror in II. swIII 2a appear to have been invented as a means of lending further antiquity to her lineage. Such an extensive display of Ursula's descent from these relatives may have been intended as a defence of her rights to her inheritance. In 1526, Ursula's brother died leaving John de Vere (d.1540), 15th Earl of Oxford, a distant cousin as the only male heir of the Earldom. Given the De Vere inheritance had bypassed Ursula in favour of a distant relative, the glazing sequence may have been an attempt to memorialise her claim to her family's patrimony. As

---

<sup>232</sup> For a panel by panel description and archaeology behind this see Volume 1: Appendix IV. Fawsley Hall, specifically "Belcher's record of Window swIII", "Belcher's record of Window swIV," "Belcher's record of Window swV" and "swIII-swV (De Vere ancestry)."

<sup>233</sup> See 4.5. "Genealogie" and Stasis (Fawsley Hall).

<sup>234</sup> Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion*, 95-100.



Susan James has shown, women in late medieval England were highly attuned to the propagandistic functions of art for defending their rights to property they perceived as rightfully belonging to them. For instance, Margaret Fiennes commissioned two portraits representing herself as the legitimate custodian of her husband's patrimony, following his execution by Henry VIII and attempts to confiscate his estates.<sup>235</sup> In a similar manner, Ursula may have intended the sequence to suggest she held a stronger claim to her ancestral lands than that which her remote cousin and his descendants could claim.

Whilst seeking to legitimise her claim, Ursula's decision to boldly identify herself with the De vere line may have stemmed from her perception of them as being socially superior to her husband's family. As such, Ursula's wish to be associated with her natal family, rather than the Knightleys, parallels Margaret Paston's choice to be buried with her prestigious male line at Mautby rather than with her husband and his ancestors. One might argue that the sequence reflects Ursula's attempts at seizing authority within her husband's household through representing her descent from such an extensive chain of De Vere men. Katherine French has demonstrated, for instance, how women might acquire agency through adopting masculine forms of representation, citing Joan of Arc and her adoption of male attire as a means of acquiring authority on her military campaigns.<sup>236</sup>

However, given Sir William Martyn's ability to arrange a patrilineal narrative, one might equally argue that Sir Edmund had been responsible for planning and commissioning the sequence. Sir Edmund would have had good reason to emphasise his landed entitlements, given his probable need to strengthen his authority as lord of Fawsley during a period in which he failed to beget a male heir. Sir Edmund would have known that the Knightley patrimony was secure given that his younger brother, Sir Valentine, would have been poised to take up his position as lord of Fawsley. Nevertheless, a lack of male children during this period could cause great psychological damage to an elite male, given how - as Patricia Crawford has argued - men saw their heirs as continuing their identity after death.<sup>237</sup> It is possible Sir Edmund's inability to control his property inspired this representation of the De Vere lineage. Through commissioning this sequence, he may have thought it possible to recover his authority through suggesting the extent of the De Vere lands and his entitlement to them.

---

<sup>235</sup> James, *The Feminine Dynamic*, 151-61.

<sup>236</sup> French, "Genders and Material Culture," 203.

<sup>237</sup> Crawford, *Blood, Bodies and Families*, 115.

Despite Sir Edmund's need to recover his status, it appears most plausible that this sequence represents a mutually beneficial solution for both Ursula and her husband, allowing her to retain a degree of personal identification with the De Veres whilst also enabling him to recover a degree of his authority as lord, by suggesting his entitlement to the De Vere lands. Whilst Sir Edmund would have had good reason to emphasise his landed power, it seems unlikely he would have been able to exploit his spouse, given the social respect she is likely to have commanded as the descendant of a noble family. Instead, both parties may have worked together in the planning of the sequence.<sup>238</sup> This conclusion would have reflected the support women often showed for their husband's souls after death through commissioning their tombs.<sup>239</sup> In a similar sense, the De Vere lineage suggests Ursula was attuned to the needs of her heirless spouse during his lifetime.

Following a likely removal of the Knightley "genealogie" from the oriel window, the probable installation of the series showing the history of the Skenard inheritance into its main window lights suggests the input of Sir Edmund's mother, Jane Skenard. A hypothetical reconstruction of this sequence of lights would have seen the royal Tudor arms and royally-associated saints placed in lights II. Oriel 3a- II. Oriel 3d. The Skenard ancestry would then have begun in II. Oriel 3e with a coat of arms exhibiting the marriage of William de St. John's parents, a distant ancestor within the Skenard ancestry. The sequence would have then run along the third and second rows of the oriel ending in II. Oriel 2j with the arms of Jane Skenard herself.<sup>240</sup>

The conventions of armorial representation did not permit women to directly represent their connections to male relatives other than their fathers or husbands.<sup>241</sup> However, a burgeoning tradition of maternal imagery in later medieval Europe demonstrated that women were aware of their pastoral responsibilities as mothers. Later medieval Europe saw the development of an iconography that described women's roles as supporters of their children and families. Pamela Sheingorn argues that representations of St. Anne teaching the Virgin to read, often in manuscripts commissioned by the nobility and gentry, reflects patrons' awareness of their roles as educators of

---

<sup>238</sup> Rows 1 and 2 seem to have been left blank in window swV suggesting that the couple may have left room for male heirs to add their shields should Sir Edmund successfully acquire an heir. By implication, this would suggest Sir Edmund was willing to identify more with the De Vere patrimony than his own. The implications of this and the reconstruction of the Fawsley sequence in general might reward further study.

<sup>239</sup> Harris, *Fabric of Piety*, 28; Kurmann-Schwartz, "Gender and Medieval Art," 135.

<sup>240</sup> For a panel by panel description and archaeological reasoning behind this see Volume 1: Appendix IV. Fawsley Hall, specifically "Sir Edmund Knightley's arrangement" and "Oriel Window and neIII-neII."

<sup>241</sup> Brooke-Little, *Boutell's Heraldry*, 131.

their children.<sup>242</sup> Elite women were also likely attuned to the symbolic act of displaying shields and the protective connotations they might communicate. Loveday Lewes Gee has argued that a noblewoman's role as spiritual protectresses of her relatives is reflected in the thirteenth-century Lambeth Apocalypse, that possibly depicts its owner, Sancha De Quincy, holding the Shield of Faith intended to signify her wish to guard herself and her family from sin.<sup>243</sup>

Since socially elite women were clearly attuned to the power of visual culture to communicate their support for their families, it seems possible that Jane may have recommended to Sir Edmund the benefits of moving this ancestral series of glass to Fawsley's oriel window. Through moving the glass to this location, it could have served to further emphasise the extent of his landholdings and consolidate his authority as a gentry lord. The possibility that Jane wished to reappropriate this glass is supported by Gee's suggestion that women might have more frequently repurposed certain types of art such as devotional books rather than commissioning new ones for themselves.<sup>244</sup>

This section has examined how Ursula de Vere enjoyed a significant degree of autonomy at Fawsley Hall that enabled her to work with her husband to commission an armorial sequence proclaiming her identity as an heiress. The public nature of this sequence contrasts with more modest representations of ancestry by women in private devotional books.<sup>245</sup> Instead, Ursula's sequence appears to have performed a propagandistic function, defending her rights to her inheritance for the same reasons that women might commission portraiture in the early sixteenth century.<sup>246</sup> Through commissioning such a display, Ursula may have intended to retain her connection to the De Veres as a socially superior family to the Knightleys. However, the glazing project, which emphasised the extent of Ursula's inheritance, would have also benefited Sir Edmund as a means of consolidating his authority as lord of Fawsley, in a period which saw his repeated failings to beget a male heir. As a mutually beneficial project, Ursula's involvement mirrors the support women might offer to their husbands through commissioning artistic projects intended to benefit their souls in death.<sup>247</sup> In seeking to stabilise Sir Edmund's authority, as lord of Fawsley, Jane Skenard may have also advised her son to reuse her ancestral glazing sequence to exaggerate the extent of his lands in Northamptonshire, inherited from her natal family. The apparent

---

<sup>242</sup> Sheingorn, "'The Wise Mother'," 72-7.

<sup>243</sup> Gee, *Women, Art and Patronage*, 48-9.

<sup>244</sup> Gee, *Women, Art and Patronage*, 54.

<sup>245</sup> Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion*, 95-100.

<sup>246</sup> James, *The Feminine Dynamic*, 151-61.

<sup>247</sup> Harris, *Fabric of Piety*, 28; Kurmann-Schwartz, "Gender and Medieval Art," 135.

movement of the Skenard ancestry to the hall's oriel could therefore reflect indirect support for her son's interests, reflecting women's use of visual culture, during this period, to represent their material responsibilities.<sup>248</sup>

#### **2.4. Case Study: Exploring Male and Female Authorship in the Armorial Glazing of Cotehele House**

We have thus far explored how a gentry lord might have utilised armorial glass to consolidate his power during a period in which he failed to beget a male heir. However, an examination of the glazing of Cotehele House permits an insight into how gentry lords might have commissioned domestic glazing to tackle other social factors which threatened their family's relationship with their manor.

As outlined in Chapter 1, during the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the Edgcumbes married into local landowning families to enhance their social connections with them. In the same period they also used marriage as a means of expanding their landholdings in their local area. Sir Peter Edgcumbe II's decision to wed Joan Durnford in 1493 may reflect his attempts to expand his family's patrimony by deliberately marrying a woman whose father lacked a male heir.<sup>249</sup> Through this marriage, Sir Peter II gained the estates of Rame and West Stonehouse. According to J. J. Goring, the acquisition of these estates made Sir Peter II "an unrivalled landowner in the neighbourhood of Plymouth."<sup>250</sup> Following his death, Sir Peter II's son, Sir Richard II, moved from Cotehele to occupy the former Durnford estate at West Stonehouse where he erected a grand new manor, later named 'Mount Edgcumbe.'<sup>251</sup>

The hall's glazing appears to have been carried out in three campaigns, which can be distinguished from one another by the stylistic peculiarities of the charges in the Edgcumbe and Durnford arms. A series of arms showing the patrilineal line of the Edgcumbe family is placed in the north windows, nII and nI (respectively Figures III.4 & III.5) and forms the main part of the first glazing campaign

---

<sup>248</sup> Sheingorn, "'The Wise Mother'," 72-7; Gee, *Women, Art and Patronage*, 48-9.

<sup>249</sup> GMHEW 3, 526.

<sup>250</sup> J.J. Goring, "EDGECOMBE, Sir Peter (1468/69-1539)," History of Parliament Online, Accessed 3rd January 2019, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/edgecombe-sir-peter-146869-1539>.

<sup>251</sup> J. J. Goring, "EDGECOMBE, Richard (c.1499-1562)," History of Parliament Online, Accessed 3rd January 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/edgecombe-richard-1499-1562>.

in the hall.<sup>252</sup> The three shields in nIa, nIb and nIIa show the marriages in the Edgcumbe male line from Peter Edgcumbe I to Sir Peter Edgcumbe II. Like those seen at Beaupré and Athelhampton, the Edgcumbe lineage is communicated through *impaled* arms. The most recent marriage shown in this sequence of glass is that of Sir Peter II to Joan Durnford, suggesting Sir Peter II was responsible for its planning.

Although the surviving glass does not depict the entire history of his family's occupation at Cotehele, the initial sequence may have done so. The previously discussed representations of patrilineal descent chart a family's history since their occupation of a manor, such as those seen at Athelhampton and Beaupré. These comparisons would suggest some of the Edgcumbes' glass - showing the earlier stages of the patrilineal line - is now lost. This sequence may have been initially housed in the bay window, comprised of two rows of four lights, located in the south-west side of the hall (Figure III.9).<sup>253</sup> If the shields had been housed here, then Sir Peter II may have imagined an arrangement of shields across both rows of the window's lights (Figure III.10). The sequence might have started in the second row of lights, with 2a exhibiting the marriage of William Edgcumbe I (d.1380) to Hilaria de Cotehele, 2b containing the marriage of William II to his wife, 2c housing the extant shield (now in nIIa) showing the marriage of Peter I to Elizabeth Holland, 2d holding the shield (now in nIIb) representing the marriage of Sir Richard I to Joan Tremayne and, 1a, the first light in the second row containing the marriage of Sir Peter II to Joan Durnford (now in sIa). Since the glazing likely tracked the Edgcumbe line to its arrival at Cotehele, and the surviving glass represents the heiress Joan Durnford, it seems fitting to categorise this series as a "genealogie."

The use of these *impaled* arms suggests Sir Peter II intended his "genealogie" to present his familial role as heir to Cotehele. Sir Peter II's series of arms appears to represent a genuine, continuous link between his lineage and his manor, since his family's arrival at Cotehele, thus contrasting with the partially altered history presented by the Martyns' "genealogie" at Athelhampton. The Edgcumbe "genealogie" also appears to have been intended to suggest the size of Sir Peter II's patrimony through representing his marriage to Joan Durnford and thus his receipt of her ancestral lands. However, not every marriage represented in the sequence reflects an actual transfer of property to the Edgcumbes. The marriage of Peter I, represented in nIIa, may not have brought property to the

---

<sup>252</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix III. Cotehele House, "Stylistic Analysis."

<sup>253</sup> This would appear likely, given the identical profile of this window's hood mouldings with the other windows in the hall and the south-west position of other male ancestries in glazing schemes at Athelhampton Hall and Fawsley Hall.

family as the natal family of his wife, Elizabeth Holland, continued to occupy their ancestral seat in Denton, Lancashire well into the seventeenth century.<sup>254</sup> Similarly, Sir Richard I's marriage, depicted in nIIb, does not seem to have resulted in the Edgcumbe's acquisition of property as the Tremayne's family seat at Collacombe was inherited by its heir, Thomas Tremayne, and later his own descendants.<sup>255</sup> And yet, like the Athelhampton glass, the absence of text labels would have suggested to a contemporary viewer the possibility that each marriage in the "genealogie" brought property to the Edgcumbes.

Alongside his self-representation as heir, Sir Peter II may have intended to exert his role as a father by including space in the bay window for his descendants to include armorial glass representing their own marriages. If this was the originally intended location of the sequence, as seems likely, then this reconstruction would have left room for three later male descendants of the Edgcumbe family to add shields. Like Sir William Martyn at Athelhampton Hall, Sir Peter II may have initially intended to construct his identity as lord by suggesting his ability to manage his patrimony and its use by his heir. However, following the acquisition of West Stonehouse through the Durnford inheritance, it appears Sir Peter II was unable to temper his son's ambitions to exert his independence as a landed lord. Sir Richard II's decision to move to West Stonehouse suggests that, later in Sir Peter II's life, the lord of Cotehele may have come into conflict with his heir through the latter's apparent willingness to sever the family's connection with their ancestral seat. As such, Sir Peter II may have thought it problematic to have a glazing sequence that focussed on the continuity of the Edgcumbe lineage at Cotehele. Richard Edgcumbe II may have made his intentions known to his father during the latter's lifetime, at which point Sir Peter II may have moved the "genealogie" to its current position along the north wall to reduce the spatial prominence this sequence would have retained in the bay window.

Whilst Cotehele's glazing highlighted the Edgcumbes' connection to their manor and the size of their patrimony, it also suggests Sir Peter II was interested in defining himself in relation to other local landowners. As examined in Chapter 1, a series of shields showing an "alliaunce" along the south wall of Cotehele House emphasises the connections between the Edgcumbes and other landed families in the region (Figures III.6-III.8). The shields, which refer to the marriages of Sir Peter II's sisters, were possibly commissioned by him to strengthen his bonds with men of a similarly

---

<sup>254</sup> William Farrer and J. Brownbill, *A History of the County of Lancaster: Volume 4* (London: Victoria County History, 1911), 311-22.

<sup>255</sup> John Lambrick Vivian, ed., *The Visitations of the County of Devon: Comprising the Herald's Visitations of 1531, 1564 & 1620* (Exeter: H. S. Eland, 1895), 730.

perceived rank. Their stylistic qualities suggest they were installed in two glazing campaigns, following the commissioning of the Edgcumbe "genealogie."<sup>256</sup> The earliest of these two campaigns was comprised of one shield, showing the marriage of William St. Maur to Margaret Edgcumbe, now in sIIb.<sup>257</sup> This campaign of glazing was shortly followed by another, consisting of the three other shields showing the marriages of his remaining sisters to Sir William Trevanion (in sIa), Sir Wymond Raleigh (in sIb) and Margaret's second marriage to Sir William Courtenay (in sIIIa). Since the shields comprising the Edgcumbe "alliaunce" represented Sir Peter II's sisters, it seems plausible that he was responsible for their planning.

Being able to suggest attachment to local lords appears to have been a central means for gentry lords to construct their elite masculinity. However, it is possible Sir Peter II's decision to install a glazing scheme that highlighted these connections acted as a means of distracting from the disjuncture that Richard II's move to West Stonehouse would eventually cause. The use of two glazing campaigns to highlight these connections might suggest Sir Edmund's decision to create such a sequence occurred during a period of heightened tensions in his relationship with his heir. It is worth speculating whether the two sequences might evoke different stages in the decline of Sir Peter II's control over his son. He may have commissioned the second glazing sequence at Cotehele, comprising the shield showing Margaret Edgcumbe's first marriage, as a contingency should he fail to control the actions of his son. The shield would have still functioned to show his connections to a local landed lord, during a period that his lineage's attachment to Cotehele remained secure. However, towards the end of his life Sir Peter II may have realised he would not succeed in persuading his son to remain at Cotehele, thus prompting him to commission the shields in the third sequence, which could have provided further account of the support given to him by other landed men following a major lapse in his authority as lord of his manor.

An examination of the other shields commissioned at the same time as the Edgcumbe "genealogie," suggests the involvement of Sir Peter II's wife, Joan Durnford, in its planning stages. The shield in nIa shows Joan Durnford in her role as Sir Peter II's wife. Next to the shield displaying their marriage is another shield, in nIb, showing a marriage from the Durnford patrilineal line.<sup>258</sup> In addition to this shield, another, now in light sIIIb, shows another marriage from the Durnford

---

<sup>256</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix III. Cotehele House, "Stylistic Analysis."

<sup>257</sup> It is possible this or the following campaign of glazing included a now lost shield showing the marriage of Sir Peter II's sister Joan to her husband, Fulk Prideaux, who are not represented in the surviving armorial glass.

<sup>258</sup> It is possible that the arms represented the marriage of James Durnford and Joan (née Cole) yet the absence of any comparable arms of Cole in DBA make this impossible to verify.

ancestry. The inclusion of shields in the hall representing Joan's patrilineal line suggests she may have been responsible for suggesting their inclusion in Sir Peter II's sequence. She may herself, like Margaret Paston, have possessed some understanding of how to describe coats of arms and the ways in which they conveyed social relationships. As such, she may have been able to inform her husband of some of the blazons that were to be included in the scheme.

It is possible the windows along the north side of the hall were initially intended to house a larger sequence of glass showing the Durnford ancestry, before the Edgcumbe lineage was relocated from the bay window to the hall's north windows. Aside from generally promoting the memory of her ancestors, it is unlikely Joan sought to gain any social advantage through displaying the Durnford ancestry. As a landowning family in Cornwall, the Durnfords do not seem to have been a family of particular antiquity not do they appear to have held more land than the Edgcumbes.<sup>259</sup>

Instead, the commissioning of these Durnford shields may indicate Joan's intention to bolster her husband's authority during a period in which the relationship between the Edgcumbe lineage and Cotehele came under threat. In order to buttress his authority, Joan may have thought it expedient for her husband to include these shields within his glazing sequence as they emphasised the extent of his landholdings, by showing the roots of the inherited properties of West Stonehouse and Rame within the Durnford ancestry.

In addition to uxorial involvement in the glazing, another shield in sIIa suggests the involvement of Sir Peter II's mother, Joan Tremayne, in embellishing her son's "genealogie." The arms exhibit the marriage of Sir Peter II's maternal grandfather Thomas Tremayne to his wife Elizabeth Carew. It is unusual that the shield is included in the sequence, given that the Edgcumbes do not appear to have inherited any property from the Tremaynes. Nevertheless, it is possible the shield was intended to represent the transmission of property from the Tremaynes' landholdings to the Edgcumbes as a means of inflating viewers' impression of Sir Peter II's land portfolio. Like Sir Peter II's wife, Joan may have been able to convey the benefits of using this shield as part of the initial glazing plan for the hall, suggesting to him the benefits it could impart should he lose control of his heir.

---

<sup>259</sup> Daniel Lysons and Samuel Lysons, *Magna Britannia: Volume 3, Cornwall* (London: T Cadell and W Davies, London, 1814), 274-80.



## 2.5. Conclusion

The evidence presented in this chapter suggests both gentry lords and gentlewomen acted as authors and participated in the planning and commissioning of domestic glazing sequences. Using the wills of John Langton II and John Pympe III, we are able to infer how gentry men might have used such sequences to model themselves in different familial roles to enable them to fulfil expectations of socially-distinguished lords. Through their respective commissioning of a “genealogie,” Sir William Martyn and Sir Peter Edgcumbe II demonstrate an eagerness to assert their role as heirs to a line of men who had consistently occupied their respective estates. To some extent, these sequences mirror gentry displays of ancestry in local parish church settings that were concerned with the fabrication of ancestry to consolidate individual power.<sup>260</sup> However, it seems that in domestic settings gentry lords also sought to emphasise the extent of their patrimonies through such displays. It also appears that, through representing oneself as a father figure and suggesting one’s ability to manage such a large patrimony, a landed man could appear as a credible gentry lord, mirroring laudable qualities attributed to elite fatherhood in the medieval period.<sup>261</sup>

The evidence from Athelhampton also suggests gentry lords might seek to express their identities through representing themselves as a neighbor within a community of other male landowners, using *unmarshalled* arms, and gendered pronouns, to express homosocial bonds with men they perceived to be of a similar social class. As explored above, these expressions of gendered ties mirror the forms of representation adopted as a means of securing elite masculine status in other contexts.<sup>262</sup>

Drawing on the will of Margaret Paston, it seems likely that Ursula de Vere possessed enough knowledge of armorial blazon to be able to participate in the planning of her own ancestral glazing sequence. It is likely that women of a higher social status, like Ursula De Vere, were capable of independently planning sequences and marshalling the arms they contained. However for gentlewomen whose social status was similar to that of her husband, such as Joan Durnford, a gentry lord may have needed to supervise the planning of armorial sequences which involved his wife’s ancestry yet he may have trusted them to independently correspond with glaziers on his behalf.

---

<sup>260</sup> James, “‘To Knowe a Gentilman’,” 122-44; Saul, *Death Art and Memory*, 90.

<sup>261</sup> Aird, “Frustrated Masculinity,” 45-6.

<sup>262</sup> Phillips, “Masculinities,” 29-31; Ailes, “The Medieval Male Couple,” 214-8.

In contributing to an extensive glazing commission, the De Vere sequence contrasts starkly with the more modestly-sized armorial series commissioned in women's books of hours during the later medieval period.<sup>263</sup> The social esteem of some women's natal families may have attracted them to the idea of commissioning an ancestral sequence, in order to retain a public association with them. In Ursula's case, the De Vere sequence may have also been intended as a propagandistic defence of her entitlement to the De Vere patrimony, in a similar manner to elite women's use of artistic projects for these purposes during the later medieval period.<sup>264</sup>

Both Ursula de Vere and Joan Durnford appear to have been permitted degrees of autonomy because of deficiencies in the control their respective husbands exerted over their manors. Due to a lack of continuity between lineage and manor, either through the death of an heir or his movement of the family's ancestral seat, it appears Sir Edmund Knightley and Sir Peter Edgcumbe II felt a need to draw on their uxorial inheritances to bolster their authority as gentry lords. Through supporting their husbands, women's activities thus mirror how they supported their husbands through commissioning tombs and windows to solicit prayers for their souls.<sup>265</sup>

Some women may have also operated in their capacity as mothers to intervene in a glazing programme. This occurred through suggesting additions or rearrangements to a "genealogie," documenting the number of estates a woman had passed on to her son. Joan Tremayne may have prompted her son to commission shields from her ancestry as additional elements to the Edgcumbe "genealogie," to support his weakened authority as lord of Cotehele. In a similar manner, Jane Skenard repurposed a preexisting sequence of glass to achieve the same ends for Sir Edmund Knightley. These instances suggest women continued to care for their sons even after they had assumed their role as lord of their estates and mirror the ways in which women showed support for their families in other contexts during this period.<sup>266</sup>

Based on this cross comparison of case studies, it would seem the lord enjoyed the greatest autonomy out of all members of the gentry household when seeking to glaze his domestic hall. During this period it seems a gentlewoman performed a supportive role in enabling her husband or son to represent her ancestry for his own benefit. In what seems to have been rare circumstances, such as that seen at Fawsley, the evidence suggests socially distinguished heiresses may have been

---

<sup>263</sup> Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion*, 95-100.

<sup>264</sup> James, *The Feminine Dynamic*, 151-61.

<sup>265</sup> Harris, *Fabric of Piety*, 28; Kurmann-Schwartz, "Gender and Medieval Art," 135.

<sup>266</sup> Sheingorn, "'The Wise Mother'," 75-6; Gee, *Women, Art and Patronage*, 54.

able to contribute more than usual to a glazing scheme, which allowed to retain an association with their natal family and support their husband's status as lord of his estate.<sup>267</sup>

---

<sup>267</sup> Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 28.

## Chapter 3. Fashioning Gentry Lordship in Armorial Glass

### 3.1. Introduction

The preceding chapter argued that gentry lords likely exerted a considerable degree of influence over domestic glazing commissions to fashion their identities in relation to a number of masculine roles. Building on this discussion, this chapter continues to explore gentry lords' intentions when making choices regarding the design and manufacture of their domestic glass. Drawing on a variety of textual and visual evidence to aid our analysis, the discussion will examine case studies of glazing at Athelhampton Hall, Ockwells Manor, Beaupré Hall and Fawsley Hall.

The first section of the chapter explores the gentry lords' use of different shield types to frame coats of arms in their armorial glass. The shield formed part of the armorial “achievement,” a typical ensemble of imagery used for displaying coats of arms in many contexts and usually composed of a “crest,” “shield of arms,” “supporters” and “mottoes” (Figure 3.1).<sup>268</sup> Whilst all of these components could have communicated elite social status, the shield appears to have been the component most frequently adapted in domestic glass to represent different aspects of gentry lordship. To examine the fashioning of gentry lordship through the use of different shield types, the chapter examines the domestic accounts of the Suffolk-based landowner, Thomas Lucas (d.1523), which provide detailed descriptions of the armorial glazing commissioned for his estate at Little Saxham. We will then use this evidence to examine the use of specific shield types in the armorial glass commissioned by Sir William Martyn at Athelhampton Hall and the meaning they were intended to convey. To complement this section, we will briefly explore the impact of using certain shield types on the overall cost of armorial glazing projects.

From these larger decorative elements, we narrow our focus to the types of marshalling used in the coats of arms themselves. Chapter 2 has already examined the advantages of using *impaled* shields for the gentry lord, enabling him to show, or construct, an atavistic connection with his manor. However, under certain circumstances, more complex forms of marshalling were also useful for constructing a gentry male's status as lord of his manor. In this section, the analysis uses a preliminary sketch for a church window containing a set of armorial donor portraits by the Warwickshire-based esquire Thomas Froxmere (d.1498), reflecting his interests in representing himself through using intricately marshalled coats of arms. Drawing on this evidence, we will then

---

<sup>268</sup> Brooke-Little, ed. *Boutell's Heraldry*, 13-4.

examine the glazing commissioned by the Noreys family for their manor at Ockwells in Berkshire, where extant armorial glass includes similar arrangements of complex arms. This section also examines the impact of preparing for complex glazing commissions on the overall cost of a project. To examine this feature, we will probe a set of plans from what appears to have been a royal commission, under Henry VII, for a large-scale window containing numerous coats of arms at the Franciscan church in the palace of Greenwich.<sup>269</sup> The plans, outlined in BL MS Egerton 2341, give an impression of the extent of preparation required for commissions of armorial glass.

The third section of the chapter explores the gentry lord's intervention into the techniques used during the manufacturing process of armorial glass as a means of creating certain points of emphasis in an armorial series. To examine this issue, we will explore the glazing and contract of the Beauchamp Chapel at St. Mary's, Warwick, the commemorative chantry chapel to Richard Beauchamp (d.1439), 13th Earl of Warwick. Drawing on the contract, this section will explore the specifications outlined by the Earl's elite executors for the use of certain techniques during the manufacture of the chapel's glazing. The chapter will then use the evidence from the Beauchamp Chapel to examine the techniques in the glazing commissioned by the Beauprés of Beaupré Hall. The section will close by examining the impact of specific manufacturing methods on the overall cost of their glazing.

The final section explores a case study of the Knightleys' first glazing sequence at Fawsley Hall, analysing the armorial glass in relation to its use of specific shield types, marshalling forms and glazing techniques. After examining the glass in relation to these themes, the analysis reflects on how these visual features appear to represent the extent of the family's financial investment in their glazing.

In examining the use of shields in armorial glass, the analysis builds on previous studies of the martial image cultivated by socially elite lords in their domestic architecture. In particular, the chapter draws on Ruth Karras' concept of "prowess."<sup>270</sup> According to Karras, engaging in armed combat, especially on the battlefield, was a principal means by which a man might display

---

<sup>269</sup> Nicholas Rogers states the patron was "Henry VII or, perhaps, Elizabeth of York or Lady Margaret." Nicholas Rogers, "A Pattern for Princes: The Royal Window at the Greenwich Greyfriars," in *Saints and Cults in Medieval England: Proceedings of the 2015 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. S. Powell (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2017), 327.

<sup>270</sup> Karras, *From Boys to Men*, 25.

"prowess," or "expertise in the use of violence," and thus qualify his elite masculinity.<sup>271</sup> To examine how such ideas might manifest in domestic contexts, the chapter uses Alison James' analysis of militaristic architecture as a means of fashioning gentry masculinity in fifteenth-century Yorkshire.<sup>272</sup> Building on the work of Karras and James, this chapter will examine how gentry lords used different types of shields in their armorial glass to construct images of their "prowess" as lords of their estates. Following on from the previous chapter, the discussion conducted here returns to examine representations of gentry heirship in armorial glass, drawing on W. M. Aird's discussion of elite masculinity in the twelfth century and the significance of patrimony to a lord's conception of his own autonomy as head of his household.<sup>273</sup>

The chapter's examination of the cost of armorial glazing builds on the work of scholars who have identified that deliberate displays of wealth might be a crucial aspect in authenticating elite identity in acts of "conspicuous consumption."<sup>274</sup> Typically, commissions of stained glass were priced per square foot of glass.<sup>275</sup> However, Richard Marks has suggested that the use of certain techniques in stained glass manufacture likely also affected the final price of a product.<sup>276</sup> Drawing on the concept of "conspicuous consumption," the chapter will explore the extent to which particular features of the design and manufacture of armorial glazing reflected gentry lords' wish to exhibit their financial resources as a means of qualifying their elite status.

### **3.2. Examining Shield Types, “Prowess” and Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Athelhampton Hall**

To understand how a gentry lord might use different shield types to fashion his identity, we must firstly consider the development of armorial display in English domestic contexts during the later medieval period. Between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, many landed lords chose to represent their distinguished social status on their residences by decorating them with martial features, such as crenellations and turrets, that referred to their occupations as soldiers.<sup>277</sup> Although

---

<sup>271</sup> Karras, *From Boys to Men*, 21-4.

<sup>272</sup> James, “‘*To Knowe a Gentilman*’,” 181-4.

<sup>273</sup> Aird, "Frustrated Masculinity," 44-8.

<sup>274</sup> Phillips, "Masculinities," 25-8; Emery, "Late Medieval Houses," 144; Marks, "An Age of Consumption," 20-3.

<sup>275</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 48.

<sup>276</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 97.

<sup>277</sup> Charles Coulson, *Castles in Medieval Society: Fortresses in England, France and Ireland in the Central Middle Ages* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 99-101; John A. A. Goodall,

this type of militaristic display communicated elite status, it also appears to have represented the lord's preparedness to fight as a means of protecting his estate and its occupants from attack.<sup>278</sup> In representing their willingness to defend their estates through force, one might conclude these men wished to suggest their "prowess," and thus their fulfillment of a key principal of elite manhood.<sup>279</sup>

It might be said the shield types used to frame the armorial displays on elite residences were also intended to reflect their owners' "prowess" as the martial defenders of their estates. This may have been especially true for noble families whose superior social status was partly derived from their continued military service to the Crown during the medieval period.<sup>280</sup> The particular shield types adopted for their displays were derived from triangular shields used from the thirteenth century onwards by foot soldiers and cavalry in Europe as seen in a surviving example from Thuringia in Germany (Figure 3.2).<sup>281</sup>

A surviving armorial display commissioned by a noble lord appears on the front of Hylton Castle in Sunderland (Figure 3.3), constructed in the late fourteenth century by Sir William Hylton (d.1435), of the Hylton Barony. Showing his ties to local landed lords, each coat of arms is framed in this particular kind of shield.<sup>282</sup> In addition to the nobility, landed men who had acquired military experience, in the fourteenth century French wars, also commissioned these displays for their houses. Sir Edward Dalyngrigge (d.1394) used this type of shield to frame the coats of arms on his fourteenth-century gatehouse at Bodiam Castle in Sussex (Figure 3.4) suggesting his wish to be perceived as its protector.<sup>283</sup>

During the fifteenth century, various ranks of elite men began to represent themselves in public and private settings through another shield type designed principally for use in mounted combat. During the later fourteenth century, the shields used by cavalry soldiers were adapted with an indentation in their upper-right hand corners for them to support a spear during a mounted charge. At the same time, this shield was introduced into the tournament to enable participants to support a lance when

---

"The Architecture of War," in *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, eds. R. Marks and P. Williamson (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 188.

<sup>278</sup> Coulson, *Castles in Medieval Society*, 100-1.

<sup>279</sup> Karras, *From Boys to Men*, 25.

<sup>280</sup> Carpenter, "England," 266.

<sup>281</sup> Kelly DeVries and Robert Douglas Smith, *Medieval Military Technology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 89-90.

<sup>282</sup> Beric Morley, *Hylton Castle: Tyne and Wear* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1979), 4.

<sup>283</sup> Coulson, *Castles in Medieval Society*, 101.

jousting (Figure 3.5). This type of shield appeared in a range of different artistic contexts and could also vary considerably in shape, although many adopted an oblong profile, often with outward-pointing upper and lower edges.<sup>284</sup> The shield type appears on the end of Henry VII's tomb, suggesting the King may have specified its inclusion in the monument's design (Figure 3.6). The Beauchamp family, one of the senior families in the later medieval nobility, may have requested its use to represent their ancestor, Richard Beauchamp, 13<sup>th</sup> Earl of Warwick, who is shown holding this type of shield in the fifteenth-century history of their dynasty known as the *Rous Roll* (Figure 3.7). Lesser landowning men also used these shields to represent themselves in their domestic settings, as seen on John Buxton's late fifteenth-century painted cloth known as *The Buxton Achievement* (Figure 3.8).<sup>285</sup> They were also used by high-ranking city elites, such as the fifteenth-century mayor of London, Richard Whittington, in the Ordinances made for one of his almshouses (Figure 3.9).

In fashioning himself as a gentry lord, a landowner might draw on different shield types to fashion specific relationships with his lands. An analysis of Thomas Lucas' building accounts permits insight into a landowner's use of a specific shield type when fashioning his identity. Thomas' surviving account books detail expenditures on his manor at Little Saxham Hall in Suffolk for the years 1505-14, including information on several purchases of armorial glass. The accounts are written out in BL MS 7097, ff.174-200, but were also partially transcribed by the antiquarian John Gage in the nineteenth century.<sup>286</sup> Thomas had strong court connections, being secretary to Jasper Tudor, Earl of Pembroke and Duke of Bedford, and also played important roles at Henry VII's Court, acting as financial and legal advisor to the King in his role as Solicitor-General.

Despite the hall's destruction in 1773, the accounts provide a useful tool for analysing some of the visual qualities of Lucas' glazing, as we are able to relate their descriptions of armorial glass to one of the aforementioned shield types.<sup>287</sup> The account books record payments to three different glaziers for armorial glass with accompanying decoration. In chronological order, the first payment in 1506 was to Robert Beston of Bury St. Edmunds "for ev(er)y skochon' of armes garnyshed w[i](t)[h]

---

<sup>284</sup> DeVries and Smith, *Medieval Military Technology*, 89-90.

<sup>285</sup> Susan Foister, "The Buxton Achievement," in *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, eds. R. Marks and P. Williamson (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 291-2.

<sup>286</sup> BL MS Additional 7097, ff.174-200; HAS, 140-51. From my reading of the British Library manuscript, Gage transcribed all of the references to armorial glass.

<sup>287</sup> John Rainer, *Little Saxham Hall, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk: Report on Geophysical Survey, September 2014* (Suffolk Archaeological Field Group, Unpublished Report Series, 2014), 4.



helmetts, targetts, & scriptures.”<sup>288</sup> In 1507, Thomas paid William Duxford of London “for ev(er)y scochon’ of armes w[i](t)[h] helmetts, targetts, & scriptures.”<sup>289</sup> In the same year, Thomas paid John, glazier of Colchester, “for ev(er)y skocheon’ of armes, helmes, & targets.”<sup>290</sup>

The use of “helmetts” and “scriptures” may have referred to the inclusion of helmets and mottoes in the overall design of his windows, such as those surviving in the glass at Ockwells Manor (Figure I.5). However, the appearance of “targets” is less obvious and requires further exploration. A “target” is described in Lydgate’s fifteenth-century poem, *Hood of Green*. When describing the appearance of a female character carrying a shield, the poem states “her cote armure is duskyd reed, with a boordure as blak as sabyl, a pavys or a terget for a sperys heed, wyde as a chirche that hath a gabyl...”<sup>291</sup> The poem suggests “target” might be understood as the name of a particular shield type used to steady a spear. However, Thomas’ accounts suggest a “target” was an additional feature introduced by a glazier into the design of an armorial window.<sup>292</sup> Based on its use in Lydgate’s poem, it would seem that a “target” referred to the adaptation of a shield containing a coat of arms to suggest its intended use alongside a spear. As the headings in the *Middle English Dictionary* demonstrate, a “spere” could refer to either “a thrusting weapon” or “a spear prepared for jousting,” suggesting “targets” might be used in either warfare or a tournament.<sup>293</sup>

Fifteenth-century visual evidence illustrating the different functions of shields reveal the appearance of such “targets.” Representations of battle indicate that contemporary shields, which might be used alongside a spear, included indentations to support the weapon. A representation of the Battle of Agincourt in the fifteenth-century *Chronicle of St. Albans* depicts a cavalryman with a closed bascinet carrying an indented shield, although in this particular depiction he does not use it to support his weapon (Figure 3.10). Shields modified with indents appear in representations of jousting from the same period. For instance, shield and lance are used in tandem in a representation of two jousting knights in *Sir Thomas Holme’s Book*, made before 1448, where one contender strikes at his opponent with his lance inserted through the indent in his shield (Figure 3.11). It

---

<sup>288</sup> HAS, 142.

<sup>289</sup> HAS, 143.

<sup>290</sup> HAS, 143.

<sup>291</sup> James Halliwell, ed. *A Selection from the Minor Poems of Dan John Lydgate* (London: C. Richards, 1840), 199-205.

<sup>292</sup> This is suggested by the phrasing of Lucas’ accounts, “for ev(er)y skocheon’... w[i](t)[h] ... targets...” HAS, 142.

<sup>293</sup> Anonymous, “spear, n.,” *Middle English Dictionary*, Accessed 19th March 2019, [https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED42136/track?counter=1&search\\_id=2780924](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED42136/track?counter=1&search_id=2780924).

would therefore seem that the inclusion of “target” in Thomas’ accounts referred to his glaziers’ adaptation of shields with indents, reflecting the broader use of this type of shield in artistic commissions of social elites during this period.<sup>294</sup> Given Thomas’ adaptation of armorial glass in this manner, we must now turn to examine his career to determine potential associations with warfare or tourneying.

It would appear unlikely that Thomas intended to suggest a career as a soldier through using these shields to frame his armorial glass. D. F. Coros’ biography of Thomas’ son only mentions his father’s involvement with jurisprudence and does not cite his participation in military campaigns.<sup>295</sup> In a recent study of the prominent men at Henry VII’s court, Steven Gunn solely describes Thomas in terms of his aptitude for the legal profession and does not include him in his discussion of men who possessed military renown at the Tudor Court.<sup>296</sup> Although it would appear unlikely Thomas participated in armed warfare, it is possible he may have been better placed to participate in jousts. In order to gauge his associations with the tournament, we must review its origins and development in medieval England.

The tournament initially emerged as a court entertainment in France but was adopted in England after Richard I licensed them in 1194. These events were frequently organised by kings to celebrate royal births, marriages or military triumphs. The main event might consist of a *melée* where participants engaged in combat on foot.<sup>297</sup> Whilst the *melée* continued into the fifteenth century in the Low Countries, the last English tournament to host this kind of event occurred at Dunstable in 1342. After this point, the centerpiece of the English tournament became the joust.<sup>298</sup> Although less popular during the early fifteenth century, jousts experienced a revival in the later half of the century and particularly following the accession of the Yorkist dynasty.<sup>299</sup> In this type of contest, mounted competitors rode at each other with lances from opposite ends of jousting lists attempting

---

<sup>294</sup> DeVries and Smith, *Medieval Military Technology*, 89-90.

<sup>295</sup> D.F. Coros. “LUCAS, John (by 1512-56),” *History of Parliament*, Accessed 27th March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/lucas-john-1512-56>.

<sup>296</sup> Steven Gunn, *Henry VII’s New Men and the Making of Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 14., 88-112.

<sup>297</sup> Richard Barber and Juliet Barker, *Tournaments: Jousts, Chivalry and Pageants in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 29-37.

<sup>298</sup> Mario Damen, “Tournament Culture in the Low Countries and England,” in *Contact and Exchange in Later Medieval Europe: Essays in Honour of Malcolm Vale*, eds. H. Skoda, et al (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), 247-66.

<sup>299</sup> Barber and Barker, *Tournaments*, 223; Sidney Anglo, “Anglo-Burgundian Feats of Arms: Smithfield, June 1467,” *Guildhall Miscellany* 2 (1965): 271–83; Alan Young, *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments* (London: George Philip, 1987), 14-23.

to strike their opponent, with scores being tallied based on the number of lances a contender was able to break on his opponent.<sup>300</sup> Earlier formulations, termed jousting *à outrance*, saw teams of knights compete against one another, in the simulation of border conflicts during military campaigns.<sup>301</sup> However, during the fifteenth century, participants frequently joust by themselves against a single opponent. As such, Barker and Barber argue that these events served as a means for knights to gain individual honour and reputation.<sup>302</sup> Karras also proposes that the joust presented an opportunity, other than the battlefield, for knights to display their “prowess.”<sup>303</sup>

Whilst one might assume that jousting was the typical preserve of the nobility and the King, it appears emerging landowners were able to participate in the tournament, given that the Norfolk landowner Sir John Paston II (d.1479) jousted at Eltham in 1467 at a tournament organised by Edward IV.<sup>304</sup> I can find no evidence that Thomas Lucas participated in tournaments, yet he may have possessed the necessary skills and financial resources to authenticate an image of his ability to joust. Scholars agree that socially elite men were trained in arms from a young age. Paul B. Newman, for instance, argues that noble boys were coached in horse-riding from a young age and also trained in how to use a lance from horseback and strike at practice dummies called *quintains*.<sup>305</sup> Even if Thomas did not train in these skills he likely possessed, at the very least, a basic knowledge of armed combat. Nicholas Orme argues that aristocratic boys tended to be coached from puberty in weapons handling, where they would learn how to correctly use shield, sword and bow.<sup>306</sup> Thomas may have not only possessed the skills which enabled him to be perceived as a jouster but also some of its accoutrements. Due to his success as a court lawyer, Thomas may have been able to afford the expensive equipment needed for the tournament, such as armour and a reliable horse.<sup>307</sup>

Although Thomas may have never entered the jousting lists, the use of these particular shield types in Little Saxham’s armorial glass may indicate his wish to be perceived as a man capable of engaging in a violent sport and thus able to exhibit “prowess.” In order to further understand the

---

<sup>300</sup> Emma Levitt, “Scoring Masculinity: The English Tournament and the Jousting Cheques of the Early Sixteenth Century,” *Postgraduate Perspectives on the Past* 1.1 (2014): 53.

<sup>301</sup> Barber and Barker, *Tournaments*, 125.

<sup>302</sup> Barber and Barker, *Tournaments*, 110-2.

<sup>303</sup> Karras, *From Boys to Men*, 48.

<sup>304</sup> Karras, *From Boys to Men*, 21.

<sup>305</sup> Paul B. Newman, *Growing Up in the Middle Ages* (Jefferson: MacFarland & Company, Inc., 2007), 232.

<sup>306</sup> Nicholas Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066-1530* (London and New York: Methuen, 1984), 187-8.

<sup>307</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: The Fourteenth-Century Political Community* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 17-18

function of this shield type and in the fashioning of gentry lordship, we must turn to examine the Martyns' surviving glazing at Athelhampton.

In Sir William Martyn's "genealogie", the arms of each Martyn man is framed in a shield adapted with a "target" (Figure II.14). It is unlikely that the adaptation of the shields in this way was intended to suggest the Martyns' careers as soldiers, as I have been unable to find any reference of their participation in armed warfare during the fifteenth century. Rather than warfare, the Martyns appear to have pursued careers in sheepfarming and the administration of county law. Thomas I, for instance, was justice of the peace for Dorset on five occasions between 1472-5.<sup>308</sup> Sir William similarly had been justice for the county on numerous instances during the period 1482-1503.<sup>309</sup>

Despite the Martyns' lack of military experience, Sir William seems to have possessed some knowledge of weaponry and arms training, since he was chosen in 1488 to survey the number of capable archers in the service of Dorset landowners.<sup>310</sup> The Martyns' tombs would also suggest they wished to be perceived as men capable of engaging in armed combat. Located in St. Mary's, Puddletown, close to Athelhampton, two alabaster tombs represent Thomas I and Sir William in suits of armour, although scholars disagree about which tomb represents which man (Figures II.18 & II.19).<sup>311</sup> Although he lacked direct experience of war, this evidence suggests Sir William's intention to be perceived as a man with martial skill. Given the combative associations of indented shields, it would therefore seem Sir William, like Thomas Lucas, intended for his armorial glass to suggest his proficiency in the tiltyard.

In choosing to represent himself in such a manner, Sir William appears to have followed a precedent for commissioning armorial glass at Athelhampton that fashioned its lord as an accomplished joust. The arms which comprise the "alliaunce," installed in neII, also include these indents for supporting a lance (Figure II.5). The windows appear to show either Richard or Thomas Martyn I's wish to construct the chivalric links they shared to other families within their local community.<sup>312</sup> Like the Martyns, the Mohuns may have been able to maintain an impression of their ability to joust, even if they lacked real life experience of the tournament. As a much older landed

---

<sup>308</sup> Cal PR 1, 612-3.

<sup>309</sup> Cal PR 1, 612-3; Cal PR 2, 559; Cal PR 3, 485; Cal PR 4, 637.

<sup>310</sup> Cal PR 1, 78.

<sup>311</sup> Brian Gittos and Moira Gittos, *The Monuments of the Athelhampton Chapel Puddletown* (Puddletown: Puddletown PCC, 2014), 10-16.

<sup>312</sup> See 1.6. Case Study: Examining "Genealogie" and "Alliaunce" at Athelhampton Hall, Dorset.

family, the Mohuns may have trained each generation in the martial skills necessary for a joust, given that their ancestors may have participated in such events. John de Mohun, 1st Baron Mohun (d.1330) had participated in the Siege of Caerlaverock with Edward I and may have also jousted on the same occasion, given that military victories were often celebrated through tournaments.<sup>313</sup> However, it seems that some of these individuals would have been unable to participate in tournaments or even to fabricate an impression of themselves as men capable of jousting. The Pydels appear to have owned only a small portion of land close to Athelhampton and it is doubtful that the family earned enough to afford the costly equipment necessary for jousting.<sup>314</sup> Additionally, Thomas Faringdon (d.1444) was reported in 1427 as being “too sick and aged” to carry out his role as coroner for the county, suggesting he would have been unfit to participate in physical sport of any kind.<sup>315</sup> Despite the inability of Faringdon and Pydel to participate in jousts, the “alliaunce” suggests the Martyns’ wished to be perceived as part of a group of men who were collectively able to display “prowess” through their deeds in the tiltyard. Either Richard or Thomas I’s wish for their ties to be perceived in this way draws on the earlier function of tournaments as an occasion for social bonding between elite men. Barber and Barker have suggested that jousts in the fourteenth century acted as a means for men to express “camaraderie” with one another when jousting as part of a team.<sup>316</sup> Through suggesting their prior experience jousting together as part of a local group of landed men, the Martyns may have intended to suggest the strength of the homosocial ties they shared with these neighbours.

Whilst the “alliaunce” draws on the tournament to suggest lateral bonds with other elite men, Sir William’s “genealogie” presents the Martyns' continued relationship with the tournament over several generations. The sequence gives the impression that the skills of a joust, had been passed down from father to son since Sir Robert Martyn I’s arrival at Athelhampton in the fourteenth century. To uncover Sir William’s intentions we are able to draw a helpful contrast with the Edgcumbes' glazing at Cotehele.

Sir Peter Edgcumbe II’s “genealogie” at Cotehele is not adapted with indentations for lances and instead adopts the shape of earlier shields used on elite residences to evoke the lord’s role as the

---

<sup>313</sup> Another coat of arms used by the Mohuns during this period is recorded in the Roll of Caerlaverock. Thomas Wright, *The Roll of Arms of the Princes, Barons, and Knights who attended King Edward I to the Siege of Caerlaverock in 1300* (London: John Camden Hotten, 1864), 8; Barber and Barker, *Tournaments*, 35.

<sup>314</sup> H1, 471.

<sup>315</sup> Woodger, “FARINGDON, Thomas.”

<sup>316</sup> Barber and Barker, *Tournaments*, 110-2.

protector of his estates. Whilst also being involved in Cornwall's local government, the Edgcumbes had been heavily involved in the military campaigns of the Tudors that enabled their rise to the English throne. Sir Richard Edgcumbe I (d.1489) had first-hand experience of combat, having fought for Henry VII at Bosworth in 1485.<sup>317</sup> Sir Peter II also saw military action in the Battle of the Spurs in 1513.<sup>318</sup> Although the two Edgcumbe men were experienced soldiers, I can find no record that Sir Peter II's grandfather, Peter I (represented in nIIa), participated in specific military campaigns. Although his grandfather may not have seen military action, Sir Peter II may have considered the more recent members of the family to have possessed enough martial experience for him to convincingly construct an impression of the Edgcumbes' identity as a dynasty of soldiers. In doing so, Sir Peter II seems to have intended to fashion his family's historical connection with Cotehele as its militarised protectors and suggest their "prowess" through representing their willingness to fight in defence of the estate and its occupants. In contrast to the Edgcumbes' "genealogie," Sir William's sequence suggests a more aggressive impression of his lordship and his relationship with Athelhampton. Unlike the military-trained Edgcumbes, whose glazing suggested their readiness to defend Cotehele, the Martyns lacked any real experience of war that would have enabled them to convincingly forge such a connection with their manor.

However, it appears a lack of exposure to warfare may not have deterred some landed families from representing themselves as capable soldiers in their domestic glass. The Beauprés, although lacking military experience, chose to frame their "genealogie" in shields without indents, suggesting their collective identity as the martially-trained defenders of their estate (Figures V.3 & V.4). The Beauprés' glass thus reflects some fifteenth-century gentry lords in Yorkshire who, although lacking martial training, nevertheless styled themselves as war veterans through their domestic architecture. Alison James has highlighted how Sir Richard Conyers built a fortified tower house at his estate in South Cowton in Yorkshire to fashion himself as a lord capable of defending his estate and its populace.<sup>319</sup> Instead of fabricating an impression of the Martyns' military careers in the same way as the Beauprés, Sir William's decision to represent of his family's proficiency in the tiltyard may have been intended as a more credible means of suggesting their "prowess."

Karras argues that displays of violence were one means through which men were able to exert dominance over other men, women and social inferiors.<sup>320</sup> A domestic series which suggested Sir

---

<sup>317</sup> Kirby, "Edgcumbe [Edgecombe], Sir Richard, (c. 1443–1489)."

<sup>318</sup> Kirby, "Edgcumbe, Sir Peter (1477–1539)."

<sup>319</sup> James, "To Knowe a Gentilman", 182-4.

<sup>320</sup> Karras, *From Boys to Men*, 21.

William's capacity for aggression may have been intended to ensure the obedience of the other occupants of his family and household. Alison James has shown how, for the Yorkshire gentry, aggression might be deemed necessary as a means of upholding a man's honor when it was challenged, particularly by those he perceived to be of a lesser status.<sup>321</sup> In lacking the military experience that would have enabled him to convincingly appear in the guise of an elite, protective lord, it seems Sir William sought instead to emphasise his capacity for violence as a means of reinforcing his authority as lord of Athelhampton.<sup>322</sup>

Thomas Lucas' accounts reveal that numerous local glaziers from Bury St. Edmunds, Colchester and London were all able to adapt the shields used in armorial windows with indents. The number of glaziers in nearby urban centres able to fulfill Lucas' requirements suggests Sir William may have also had a choice of glaziers to whom he could turn to commission his "genealogie," most plausibly in nearby towns and cities such as Poole or Salisbury.

Glaziers may have possessed designs for different shield shapes in pattern books that they might have then adapted with an indentation if their patron so desired. These designs would then have been rendered on either a paper cartoon or a white-washed table that would have guided the glazier in cutting the correct dimensions of coloured glass for the coat of arms contained within the shield.<sup>323</sup> A surviving late sixteenth-century cartoon for a shield of the coat of arms of the City of Gouda shows how an armorial cartoon might include the shield shape a glazier was to use, whilst a series of lines drawn in the space demarcated for the coat of arms suggest they were used to calculate the proportions of the individual *charges* used (compare Figures 3.12 & 3.13).

Whilst Sir William may have been able to choose from a number of local glaziers, his wish for them to accommodate indents into the designs of shields in the windows may have required him to pay a high price due to the obstacles this feature likely presented when cutting the pieces of glass needed to represent a coat of arms. In order to represent the intrusive shapes of the indents on Sir William's shields, his glazier would therefore have been required to make specific cuts into the glass used to represent the *charges* in each coat of arms (Figure II.14). As seen in Sir William Martyn's oriel shields at Athelhampton Hall, the glazier has rendered the jousting notch by making a concave cut into one side of the upper *bar gules* in the Martyn arms. The task of cutting this awkward line in a

---

<sup>321</sup> James, "To Knowe a Gentilman'," 262.

<sup>322</sup> For further development of this point see 4.5. Case Study: Exploring Sightlines and Audiences at Athelhampton Hall.

<sup>323</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 31-6; Anna Santolaria Tura, *Glazing on White-Washed Tables* (Girona: Institut Catala de Recerca en Patrimoni Cultural, 2014), 111.

sheet of glass for each coat of arms in the oriel may have placed increased demands on the glasscutting skills and time of Sir William's glazier. The Beauprés' glaziers may have been presented with fewer obstacles to rendering the coats of arms contained in their armorial glass, given the comparably simpler design of the shields used to frame their armorial glass. Sir William's choice to include jousting indents may have resulted in him paying an additional sum to accommodate the degree of labour needed to adapt his armorial glazing with this particular feature. To compensate for this lack of military experience, Sir William may have therefore paid a premium for armorial glass that enabled him to make a convincing display of his "prowess" as lord of Athelhampton. Judging by the Beauprés' glass, Sir William may have had the option of fabricating a militaristic identity for himself through commissioning a simpler, and perhaps cheaper, set of armorial windows. However, these shields suggest he was willing to spend money to give a more plausible impression of his "prowess." The additional money likely spent on this commission of glass therefore reflects a "conspicuous consumption" of glass. Through such a commission, Sir William may have sought to demonstrate his wealth and thus gentility as a means of further compensating for his lack of the traditional attributes of a military lord.

This section has examined how Sir William Martyn drew on an elite visual tradition of using an indented shield type to suggest his ability to joust as a means of displaying his "expertise in the use of violence," otherwise known as his "prowess."<sup>324</sup> His use of these shields to represent this aspect of his elite masculinity contrasts with an older, thirteenth-century shield type, adopted in the fourteenth century on elite residences to signify its owner as a soldier and protector of his estate. It seems that gentry families who possessed some military experience, such as the Edgcumbes, chose to fabricate a connection with their manor as a dynasty of soldiers offering protection to their estate and its residents. However, it is clear that other families who possessed no military experience, such as the Beauprés or Conyers, were willing to entirely fabricate this identity for themselves.<sup>325</sup> As a means of staging a more convincing display of his "prowess," Sir William Martyn's "genealogie" suggests a hereditary tradition of training children how to joust at Athelhampton and thus implies each Martyn lord's ability to display aggression in the tiltyard. In representing this quality, Sir William Martyn appears to have wished for the display to reinforce his authority over other members of his household. The inclusion of jousting indents in his shields may also reflect the high price Sir William paid for his glazing due to the skill and time required to incorporate such shields into an armorial window. Indeed, through commissioning bespoke glazing, Sir William may have

---

<sup>324</sup> Karras, *From Boys to Men*, 25.

<sup>325</sup> James, "'To Knowe a Gentilman'," 262.



intended to show his vast resources and exhibit “consumption” to further buttress his status as Athelhampton’s lord.

### 3.3. Examining Marshalling and Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Ockwells Manor

Although a gentry lord lacking military experience might adopt indented shields to convey ideas of his “prowess,” he might also use different forms of armorial marshalling in his domestic glazing to remedy other issues threatening his authority.<sup>326</sup> As seen in Chapter 2, *impaled* arms enabled a gentry lord to construct ideas of continuity between his lineage and his manor. Yet, when this connection became unstable, he might instead seek to stress other types of relationships to his lands through using more complex forms of marshalling.

A preliminary drawing outlining plans for two donor portraits in a church’s window permits insight into how gentry lords could use intricate arrangements of arms to represent their authority (Figure 3.14). Preparatory sketches were used frequently in stained glass commissions to communicate the essential design of a window to a glazier. The patron themselves was usually responsible for providing the sketch, although their executors might also be involved in this process if their project was a testamentary bequest.<sup>327</sup> Following a glazier’s receipt of the sketch, they might hire a draughtsman to render a scaled version of the design to enable the accurate cutting and leading of glass to the proportions of the intended window light.<sup>328</sup>

The drawing seems to have been made by the window’s patron, Thomas Froxmere (d.1498). Since the early fifteenth century, Thomas’ family had resided at the manor of Crowle in Worcestershire.<sup>329</sup> After marrying Margaret Fillongley, William Froxmere, Thomas’ father, moved the family seat to Old Fillongley, the ancestral estate he inherited from his wife.<sup>330</sup> Thomas

---

<sup>326</sup> To assist in understanding the remainder of the chapter the reader is encouraged to refer frequently to Volume 2: Armorial Glossary.

<sup>327</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 23-4. Richard Marks, “Wills and Windows: Documentary Evidence for the Commissioning of Stained Glass Windows in Late Medieval England,” in *Studies in the Art and Imagery of the Middle Ages*, ed. R. Marks (London: Pindar Press, 2013), 200-15.

<sup>328</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 25.

<sup>329</sup> Anonymous, *A History of the County of Worcester: Volume 3* (London: Victoria County History, 1913), 329-34.

<sup>330</sup> The following Victoria County History publication refers to the family as “Felongleye”, yet the the modernised version of the spelling is used from here onwards in the thesis text. Anonymous, *A History of the County of Warwick: Volume 4* (London: Victoria County History, 1913), 69-75.

inherited both of these paternal and maternal estates and continued to reside at Old Fillongley as its lord. His donor portraits appear to have been intended for the parish church of St. Mary and All Saints in Fillongley which was the closest church to the manor.<sup>331</sup> Pasted into the back of a collection of seventeenth-century church notes in the British Library, the drawing shows Froxmere positioned on the left of the drawing with his wife Catherine Cornwallis on the right.<sup>332</sup> In the drawing, both figures adopt kneeling postures typical of many “donor portraits” during this period, designed to solicit intercessory prayers from parishioners.<sup>333</sup> The portraits of Thomas and his wife are drawn above sketches of their respective armorial badges and surrounded by a series of notes providing more detail to the glazier about the window’s intended design. The drawing was clearly intended to be received by either a glazier or perhaps their draughtsman, given that written instructions on the page suggest the recipient was able to influence the next stage of the manufacturing process for a window. For instance, the beginning of one of the inscriptions highlights Froxmere’s position in the window, stating, “let me stond in the [m]edyll pane...” whilst another begins with the instruction, “put myne armys in her mantell.”<sup>334</sup>

Both Thomas and his wife are drawn wearing clothing displaying their coats of arms. Whilst the Cornwallis arms appear *unmarshalled* on Catherine’s kirtle, the marshalling form used for Froxmere’s is more complex, being *quartered* on his surcoat, showing a combination of the Froxmere and Fillongley arms.<sup>335</sup> Aside from sixteenth-century examples recorded in DBA, the drawing shows the earliest recorded instance of the Froxmere arms as well as the earliest known example of the Fillongley arms. It is therefore possible that the drawing not only represents one of the first occurrences of both arms but Froxmere’s invention of them to represent his dual lordship over the estates at Crowle and Old Fillongley. As Adrian Ailes argues, men might use *quartered* arms in this way to show their inheritance of lordships from their parents.<sup>336</sup>

---

<sup>331</sup> Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, 655.

<sup>332</sup> BL MS Lansdowne 874, f.191; John Goodall, "Two Medieval Drawings," *The Antiquaries Journal* 58.1 (1978): 159-162.

<sup>333</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 13.

<sup>334</sup> BL MS Lansdowne 874, f.191.

<sup>335</sup> There is no direct equivalent for the Froxsmere arms in DBA. A near match is given at Froxmere. DBA 4, 240. Griffin segr betw 3 crosslets fitchy. Mill Steph Swyre, Dorset. “1505.”; Feningley. DBA 3, 431. Arg a fess betw 6 aspen leaves Gu. CRK 30. “c1510.”; DBA only lists “Feningley,” as the owner for these arms, yet the similarity of this and the maiden name of Thomas’ mother suggests the arms most likely came from her natal family.

<sup>336</sup> Ailes, “Heraldic Marshalling,” 20.

The use of quartered arms on donor portraits was a common means of self-representation by the gentry in fifteenth-century glazing, such as in the portrait of John Denston at Holy Trinity, Long Melford in Suffolk (Figure 3.15). It would appear Thomas made a conscious decision to concoct a *quartered* marshalling form to represent his lordship over both of his properties given that a simpler option was available to him. Thomas could have chosen to use one, *unmarshalled* coat of arms representing the Froxmeres' possession of Old Fillongley as its lord.<sup>337</sup> For instance, Robert Crane's use of an *unmarshalled* coat of arms on his donor portrait at Long Melford appears to represent his lordship over a single ancestral estate (Figure 3.16).

The degree of specificity included in the drawing suggests it was intended as a lifetime commission planned by Thomas himself. His will, likewise, does not contain any donations of stained glass windows, suggesting the window was not commissioned as a testamentary bequest.<sup>338</sup> Although donations of stained glass such as this were partially motivated by acts of generosity, Thomas' window equally appears to have been an attempt to exert his social status in the church.<sup>339</sup> As Pamela Graves has argued, one function of a lord's architectural contributions to his local church was to exert his presence as its most senior patron, especially during periods of absence from the building or the local estate.<sup>340</sup> Although close to his manor, Thomas might have only intermittently attended mass at St. Mary and All Saints and thus required a window to represent his authority as lord of the local estate. Through including this *quartered* coat of arms in his window, Thomas may have therefore intended to reinforce his authority as the local lord whilst absent from the church by emphasising the landed basis for his power derived from his ownership of the estates at Crowle and Old Fillongley.

Thomas Froxmere's drawing provides an insight into the motives behind the use of a similar marshalling form in the armorial glazing at Ockwells Manor. The Noreys came into possession of Ockwells (Figure I.1) in 1268 when it was granted to Richard Noreys, cook to Eleanor of Provence, consort of Henry III. In 1422, Sir Henry Noreys of Speke near Liverpool, bequeathed the manor to his son, Sir William Noreys. Following Sir William's death, the manor passed to his heir John Noreys. John subsequently filled highly important administrative roles, such as that of Sheriff of Berkshire under Henry V and Esquire to the Body of Henry VI during his infancy.<sup>341</sup> He enjoyed

---

<sup>337</sup> Ragen, "Semiotics," 13.

<sup>338</sup> TNA PROB 11/11/438.

<sup>339</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 5.

<sup>340</sup> Graves, "Social Space," 311-2.

<sup>341</sup> GMHEW 3, 124-30.

close proximity to Henry VI and subsequently Edward IV, being Master of the Royal Wardrobe under both Lancastrian and Yorkist Kings.

In addition to his professional life, John made advantageous marriages to heiresses, firstly to Alice Merbrooke, which brought him partial ownership of the manor of Yattendon near Reading and, secondly, to Eleanor Clitherow. Through his marriage to Eleanor, Noreys obtained the manor of Goldstanton in Kent as well as other property which appears to have been granted to her father from the forfeited lands of the Lollard leader, Sir John Oldcastle.<sup>342</sup> John does not seem to have received any property through his marriage to his third wife, Margaret Chedworth.<sup>343</sup>

After eventually purchasing full ownership of Yattendon from Edward Langford in 1441-2, John appears to have moved to this estate, thus leaving a manor which had been previously occupied by his father and possibly also his grandfather.<sup>344</sup> The replacement of the medieval manor of Yattendon in the eighteenth century prevents us from examining any particular features of this estate that Ockwells lacked, yet it is clear from his obtaining of a license to crenellate his new manor in 1448 that he wished to initiate building works there.<sup>345</sup> It is possible he may have sought the opportunity to fashion an ancient connection to Yattendon by attaching the Noreys' lineage to the Merbrookes or Yattendon's former owners, the Coterons. John also suggests his wish for his heir, Sir William, to continue to inhabit Yattendon following his death, through his donation of all of the interior furnishings of the manor to him.<sup>346</sup> Despite John's relocation to Yattendon, it is likely he was responsible for commissioning the extant glazing at Ockwells. Due to the house being in private ownership, I have been unable to gain access in order to allow for an assessment of its stylistic features, sequencing or authorship. Despite this, Richard Marks, who has been able to gain access and examine the glass first-hand, suggests it was commissioned by John Noreys.<sup>347</sup>

---

<sup>342</sup> Edward Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 9* (Canterbury: W. Bristow, 1800), 191-224; L. S. Woodger, "CLITHEROE, Richard I (d.1420)," *History of Parliament Online*, Accessed 30th March 2019, <http://www.histparl.ac.uk/volume/1386-1421/member/clitheroe-richard-i-1420>.

<sup>343</sup> For a Noreys family tree see Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 1: Noreys of Ockwells.

<sup>344</sup> William Page and P. H. Ditchfield, *A History of the County of Berkshire: Volume 4* (London: Victoria County History, 1924), 125-30.

<sup>345</sup> GMHEW 3, 124.

<sup>346</sup> "Sir William Norreys my son and heir, all my stuff of houshold being in my manoir of Yatenden and bilogyng to ev(er)y house of office w(i)t(h)in my said manoir, as halle, p(ar)lour, chambres, Botery, ketchyn, bakehouse, and all other to ye same manoir p(er)teynyng." Charles Kerry, *The History and Antiquities of the Hundred of Bray, in the County of Berkshire* (London: Savill and Edwards, 1861), 116-20.

<sup>347</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 97.

The hall contains four windows, three facing north-east and one facing south-west (Figure I.3). The windows show John's court connections, in neI (Figure I.4), and his links to religious institutions in swI (Figure I.7).<sup>348</sup> However, the hall's glazing most prominently displays his links to other local lords and his first two marriages in windows neII (Figure I.5) and neIII (Figure I.6). He may have conceived this series of arms in a similar manner to the examples of an "alliaunce," as defined in Chapter 1.<sup>349</sup> Like the glazing at Cotehele and Athelhampton, many of these arms are those of local landowners who held lands in close proximity to him. For instance, Edward Langford, whose arms appear in neIIIb, held lands in close proximity to Ockwells Manor at Bradfield in Berkshire.<sup>350</sup> Sir John Nanfan, whose arms appear in neIIe, also owned the manor of Birtsmorton in nearby Worcestershire.<sup>351</sup> Slightly further afield, John Wenlock, whose arms appear in neIIb, appears to have resided at the manor of Greathampstead Someries near Luton in Bedfordshire.<sup>352</sup> Similarly to Athelhampton, the shields mostly use *unmarshalled* arms to represent individual men and their patrilineal lines. Like Sir Peter Edgcumbe II's glazing at Cotehele, it is possible John commissioned this sequence showing his connections to landowners to strengthen his authority as lord of the manor and compensate for the break between his lineage and his family home caused by his relocation to Yattendon.

Although he may have deemed this an effective strategy for consolidating lordship over Ockwells, John also decided to stress the size of his patrimony. He drew attention to this through representing his first two marriages in shields which reflect some of the meanings of the term, "genealogie."<sup>353</sup> The shields representing Noreys' marriages use complex marshalling forms to suggest his inheritance of property from each of his first two wives. In neIIa his marriage to his second wife, Eleanor Clitherow, is represented through the Noreys arms *impaled* on the shield's *dexter* side and the Clitherow arms appearing as *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement* on the *sinister*

---

<sup>348</sup> For a full description of the people represented in these windows see Volume 1: Appendix I. Ockwells Manor, "Antiquarian Evidence and Identification of Arms."

<sup>349</sup> See 1.3. An "Alliaunce" at St. Mary's, Nettlestead, Kent.

<sup>350</sup> L. S. Woodger, "LANGFORD, Sir William (c.1366-1411)," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 19th March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/langford-sirwilliam-1366-1411>.

<sup>351</sup> William Page and J. W. Willis-Bund, *A History of the County of Worcester: Volume 4* (London: Victoria County History, 1924), 29-33.

<sup>352</sup> William Page, *A History of the County of Bedford: Volume 2* (London: Victoria County History 1908), 348-75.

<sup>353</sup> See 1.2. The Newburghs' "Genealogie" at East Lulworth, Dorset.

side.<sup>354</sup> The Clitherow arms are comprised of the quartered arms of Clitherow and Oldcastle, both of which had been used to represent their various lordships since the fourteenth century.<sup>355</sup>

In neIIIa, the same marshalling arrangement is used to represent his first marriage to Alice Merbrooke. The appearance of the Merbrooke arms at Ockwells is the first recorded instance in the medieval period. This could suggest Noreys invented these arms to enable him to show his inheritance of property from his first wife. In addition, there are no parallels in DBA for the other coat of arms which *quarters* those intended to represent the Merbrooke family. I have been unable to trace the patrilineal line of the Merbrookes to determine which family or property this coat of arms could represent. However, it is likely the coat of arms was intended to represent a property contained in the broader Merbrooke patrimony that John inherited. Through inventing these arms and using complex marshalling to present his landed entitlements, John's glazing reflects Thomas Froxmere's intentions behind his window at Old Fillongley. Like Thomas' donor portrait, the shields representing John's marriages were likely intended to represent his landed power and thus consolidate his authority in a space from which he would have been absent for long periods of time.

In seeking to represent the size of his patrimony, John's glazing reflects Sir William Martyn's "genealogie." At Athelhampton, Sir William's glazing suggested not only the size of his inherited patrimony but also - through a series of prospectively glazed lights in the manor's oriel - his ability to control it.<sup>356</sup> Since John had decided to move the family's seat to Yattendon, it seems he was unable to display his control over his lands in the same way and instead sought to stress the great size of his patrimony as a means of reclaiming authority over Ockwells as its absent lord.

Scholars have already noted the large amounts of money John likely spent on commissioning the glass, citing the techniques used in its manufacture. Richard Marks has singled out the use of inserted pieces in the Ockwells glass as an example of expensive glazing due to the great skill required for its manufacture.<sup>357</sup> John Goodall has even suggested the windows were produced by as highly a skilled workshop as that belonging to John Prudde, glazier to Henry VI.<sup>358</sup> It also seems

---

<sup>354</sup> See Volume 2: Armorial Glossary.

<sup>355</sup> See Volume 1: Appendix 1. Ockwells Manor, "Window neII."

<sup>356</sup> See 2.2.iii. Male Authorship: A Case Study of Athelhampton Hall, Dorset.

<sup>357</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 97.

<sup>358</sup> There is a typing error in Goodall's attribution. He says "Noreys Prudde" when he means "John Prudde." John Goodall, "Ockwells Manor, Berkshire: An Insight into the Splendours of Grand Living in 15th-century England," *Country Life*, Accessed 30th March 2019, <https://www.countrylife.co.uk/architecture/ockwells-manor-berkshire-an-insight-into->

likely that the planning stages behind such a sequence involved significant cost to John Noreys. John's use of complex marshalling to represent the extent of his landholdings likely required him to pay additional sums for the making of preparatory documents to assist in communicating their intricate compositions to his glazier.

The additional cost John likely paid when preparing the Ockwells windows becomes apparent when one examines the detailed visual instructions that might have been produced to inform other commissions which included complex arrangements of arms. A set of two rolls in the British Library, comprising BL MS Egerton 2341, permit an insight into the additional money John likely invested during the process of planning such windows. These rolls outline plans for the East window glass of the Franciscan church of the Observant Friars located within the grounds of Henry VIII's palace at Greenwich.<sup>359</sup> It is unclear whether the glass described in the rolls was ever installed in the window. The amount of detail included in these plans suggests significant headway was made with its preparations. However, many of the illustrations and written notes in the document were left unfinished, which could indicate that the project may have been abandoned.

The window consisted of five lights and a series of tracery lights and contained a variety of figures such as saints, historical figures and members of the royal family. Each member of the royal family appeared at the bottom of each light, above their coat of arms and above each of these figures were three saints. Due to a lack of any archaeological details about the window's appearance, Rogers' reconstruction assists in visualizing its composition, but remains speculative (Figure 3.17).<sup>360</sup>

The rolls consist of discrete entries for each figure that was to be included in the window, dictating how they were to appear in the finished work. Each entry includes textual instructions on how to represent a specific figure, an illustration of their coat of arms in a triangular shield and a corresponding description of their arms in blazon (Figure 3.18). The recipient of the design appears to have been either a glazier or someone in close correspondence with such an artisan. For instance, the instructions appear to address someone who is presumed to possess the skills to render visual representations of the desired subjects: the entry for St. Edward the Confessor begins "make hym in the abbytt of a ryall peasible kyng wyth a berde of the age of iii<sup>xx</sup> yere..."<sup>361</sup>

---

[thesplendours-of-grand-living-in-15th-century-england-175132](#); On John Prudde see, Marks, *Stained Glass*, 96.

<sup>359</sup> Rogers, "A Pattern for Princes," 318.

<sup>360</sup> Rogers, "A Pattern for Princes," 319.

<sup>361</sup> Rogers, "A Pattern for Princes," 331.

The illustrations of each coat of arms are coloured with paint thus visually indicating to the recipient which colours of glass were necessary. In comparison to Froxmere's drawing, a significant amount of visual detail is included to instruct the recipient in the necessary colours in the eventual making of the armorial glass. However, the rolls do not provide enough visual detail to permit a glazier to begin cutting and leading glass according to the actual size of a predetermined window space. Surviving examples of proportioned drawings, which were likely made from an initial sketch, demonstrate the amount of detail that could be required for a glazier to use a document as an authoritative reference point during the manufacturing process. This is clearly visible in the scaled drawing prepared for the East Window of Cardinal Wolsey's Chapel at York Place now in the Scottish National Gallery in Edinburgh (Figure 3.19).<sup>362</sup>

The rolls do not, however, convey a finalised design to a glazier in the same way as the Edinburgh drawing. Due to the small scale of the drawing, at 42 x 30.5 cms, it seems likely to assume that a similar drawing produced for the Greenwich project would have been too small to accurately depict the *tinctures* and *charges* of coats of arms that were to be included in the window. Therefore, it seems one function of these rolls was to act as a supplementary reference for a glazier, enabling them to observe the necessary details of the coats of arms when cutting and arranging the appropriate pieces of coloured glass for coats of arms on their whitewashed tables or cartoons. It is possible that a similar document is described in a 1443 inventory taken of John Prudde's workshop at the royal palace of Shene which described "25 shields painted on paper with various arms of the King for patterns for the use of glaziers working there."<sup>363</sup>

The paintings of coats of arms on the rolls appear crude when compared with the highly refined illustrations which feature in the output of the Flemish illuminators of the so-called "Ghent-Bruges school" that produced numerous books of hours for the English market during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.<sup>364</sup> The lower calibre of, or the reduced period of time allocated to, the artists responsible for producing the illustrations in the Egerton rolls is apparent when comparing the scant details used to represent the petals of the *fleur-de-lis* and *lions passant* in the arms of Henry VII with the highly detailed version of the same arms appearing in a Book of Hours the King presented to his daughter Margaret (Figures 3.20 & 3.21). Based on this assessment, it seems most

---

<sup>362</sup> Hilary Wayment, "Twenty-Four Vidimuses for Cardinal Wolsey," *Master Drawings* 23/24, no.4 (1985): 506.

<sup>363</sup> L. F. Salzman, "Medieval Glazing Accounts," *Journal of the British Society of Master Glass Painters* 3.1 (April, 1929): 27.

<sup>364</sup> Janet Backhouse, "Hours Inscribed by Henry VII to his Daughter Margaret," *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, eds. R. Marks and P. Williamson (London: V&A Publications, 2003), 184.



likely that those involved in planning the sequence hired a limner to paint the illustrations of the shield to give an accurate impression of their appearance, rather than one which was intended to be aesthetically pleasing.

The arms of Elizabeth of York, consort to Henry VII, are comprised of the arms of Henry VII on the *dexter* and the arms of her father Edward IV on the *sinister* (Figure 3.22). Although only half-illustrated in the Egerton Rolls, they also appear in a poetry book, BL MS Royal 16 FII, formerly within Henry VII's library (Figure 3.23). Elizabeth's arms was therefore comprised of the marshalling form, *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement impaling a quartered coat of arms within an impalement*. The same marshalling form is also used for the arms of the King's daughter, Margaret Tudor. The inclusion of these complex arrangements of arms in the glazing sequence suggests they may have necessitated the making of the rolls in order to clearly inform a glazier of the arms that were to be included in the Greenwich window. Indeed, the use of two other marshalling forms in the sequence, although less complex, may have equally required the Greenwich glazier to see their designs in detail through the added clarity of the roll format.<sup>365</sup>

The marshalling form used for Elizabeth of York's coat of arms is the same used to represent the ancestry of John Noreys' wives in the two shields in lights neIIa and neIIIa. Besides the use of this marshalling form, John's glass also used *unmarshalled* arms, *quartered* arms, *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement impaling a quartered coat of arms within an impalement* and *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement impaling a quarterly coat of arms of six within an impalement* (Figure I. 10). Due to the complexity of the marshalling forms used in John's glazing sequence it seems likely that he was required to commission the making of a document similar to the Egerton rolls to accurately inform his glazier of their *tinctures* and *charges*.

It is likely John hired an illuminator to make the illustrations on this type of document. This seems as though it would have been necessary as a monochrome, handmade sketch, such as that made by Thomas Froxmere, would have been potentially misleading for John's glaziers who would have required more accomplished, coloured detail of each coat of arms. It is possible he employed the services of a limner in the making of these illustrations. Book limners held a distinct presence in London from the early fifteenth century with the formation of the Guild of Stationers in the city in

---

<sup>365</sup> The roll also included *unmarshalled* arms and *impaled* arms.

1403.<sup>366</sup> John's service to the Crown would have required him to spend time in London where he may have been able to hire the services of such an artist to produce illustrations of his arms for his glazing project.

This section has examined how John Noreys used complex marshalling as a means of representing the extent of his land holdings and consolidate his family's power on an estate from which they would have been largely absent. Due to the intricacy of his armorial glass, it is likely John paid for the preparation of coloured illustrations of the shields to act as a convenient reference to his glaziers. It is possible John embarked on this commission knowing it would require this additional cost. If so, he may have intended for the glazing to convey his economic resources and thus serve to further legitimise his status as a gentry lord. Such an overt demonstration of his financial resources could have further served to stabilise his lordship in a manor with which his lineage no longer shared a strong connection.

### **3.4. Examining Glass Cutting, Abrasion and Emphasis in the Armorial Glazing of Beaupré Hall**

For an absent gentry lord, stressing the extent of one's patrimony might have been seen as an effective strategy for maintaining authority over a peripheral manor. However, the necessity for the gentry lord to be able to show the inheritance of the family patrimony from his ancestors could be equally important when the future prospects of his own dynasty appeared uncertain. In order to emphasise this quality, the gentry lord might make interventions into the techniques used during the later manufacturing stages of his armorial glass.

Until the sixteenth century there were three common methods that glaziers could use to place certain colours next to one another in a window's design. The first two methods involved the use of glass and lead. Firstly, glaziers could use the traditional means of cutting pieces of glass from a larger sheet, joining them with lead comes and closing nails before soldering them together.<sup>367</sup> This is apparent from a fifteenth-century example of the arms of De Burgh (*or a cross gules*) from Great Malvern Priory in Worcestershire (Figure 3.24). In this example, the glaziers would have originally made the *cross gules* by cutting it out of a single piece of ruby glass and then leading it to four

---

<sup>366</sup> Martha Driver and Micahel Orr, "Decorating and Illustrating the Page," in *The Production of Books in England, 1350-1500*, eds. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 105.

<sup>367</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 36.

pieces of yellow-stained glass for the *or field*. Secondly, glaziers could adopt the technically difficult solution of inserting pieces into the middle of others, whereby one would drill or cut a hole in sheet glass, insert the desired piece and then affix with lead.<sup>368</sup> This technique required great skill due to the likelihood of the glass breaking.<sup>369</sup> Its use may have also increased the price of a commission due to the incumbent time a glazier would require to make such a product.<sup>370</sup> Examples of such insertions are apparent in the rendering of the *leopards' heads* in a fifteenth-century example of the arms of De La Pole (*azure a fess between three leopards' heads or*) from the Church of St. Mary the Virgin in Ewelme, Oxfordshire (Figure 3.25).

A third solution for combining colours was to abrade off the surface colour of a flashed piece of glass where a piece of white glass was given a thin layer of colour along its surface and then removed with acid, or etched away with a sharp implement, to reveal the white colour beneath.<sup>371</sup> This could be done with ruby glass thus enabling the glazier to render the colours white and red (armorially, *argent* and *gules*) on a single piece of glass, as seen in the sixteenth-century armorial panel representing the Swiss canton of Nidwalden, now in Sułkowski castle in Poland (Figure 3.26). In this example, the ruby surface of the glass is scratched away in order to render the key on the flag. Abraded areas of glass could be further coloured with silver stain to combine the colours yellow and red on the same piece of glass. This can be seen in an early sixteenth-century example of one of the quarterings from the English royal arms (*gules three lions passant or*), appearing at St Mary's Church, Worplesdon, where the ruby surface of the glass is abraded to outline the *lions passant* which are then coloured with silver stain to create the tincture *or* (Figure 3.27). The colours blue and yellow could be combined through abrading flashed blue glass and then applying silver stain as seen with the arms of Combemartin (*gules a lion rampant vairy or and azure*), from the Fawsley series (Figure IV.33).<sup>372</sup>

---

<sup>368</sup> Megan Stacey, "Artistic and Technical Dexterity: An Investigation of Medieval Jewel Techniques in Stained Glass," in *Stained Glass: Art at the Surface: Creation, Recognition, Conservation: Transactions of the 10th Forum for the Conservation and Technology of Stained Glass, Cambridge, 3th-5th September, 2017*, eds. S. Brown et al (Burwood: ISCCSG, 2017), 43-59.

<sup>369</sup> Megan Stacey, "'A Veritable Tour de Force of Mechanical and Artistic Dexterity': An Investigation into the Medieval Techniques of Inserting 'Jewels' in Stained Glass" (MA Diss., University of York, 2015), 36-7.

<sup>370</sup> Stacey, "'A Veritable'," 116.

<sup>371</sup> Sarah Brown and David O' Connor, *Medieval Craftsmen: Glass-Painters* (London: British Museum Press, 1991) 51.

<sup>372</sup> See section 3.5. Case Study: Fawsley Hall, Northamptonshire.

The contract and extant glazing of the Beauchamp Chapel in Warwick (Figure 3.28) suggests elite men may have influenced the use of certain techniques in stained glass commissions to create emphasis in the design of a glazing sequence. As Richard Marks has argued, the Beauchamp Chapel, constructed between 1439-45, was intended to commemorate Richard Beauchamp, 13th Earl of Warwick, and serve as a means of soliciting prayers for his soul whilst also evoking his Lancastrian allegiances.<sup>373</sup> The contract for the Chapel's glazing was drawn up by his executors: Thomas Huggefurd, esquire, Nicholas Rodye (d.1458), gentleman, and a priest, William Brakeswell. Whilst no details are available about Huggefurd's career, Rodye appears to have held a number of important roles during his career in service to the Earl and in county administration. Besides being the Earl's Steward, he fulfilled numerous roles in local government as escheator for Warwick and MP for the county on nine occasions. Rodye had also acted as an escheator for Warwickshire and Leicestershire.<sup>374</sup> As a man with close personal ties to the Earl, Rodye was likely heavily involved in the arrangements behind the glazing contract and in identifying an appropriately talented glazier. For this commission, they chose John Prudde, personal glazier to Henry VI. Rodye and the other executors were responsible for transferring an initial design to Prudde through "patterns in papur."<sup>375</sup>

The Chapel's contract is explicit about the high quality of cut and leaded glass Prudde was expected to produce. The document states he was to "make perfectly to fine glass, anneal it, and finely and strongly set it in lead, and solder it as well as any glass that is in England."<sup>376</sup> Prudde employed both glass cutting and glass insertions throughout the Beauchamp Chapel's glazing, with both techniques being apparent in a panel representing the Virgin (Figure 3.29). In this example, the use of the conventional method of cutting and leading glass is used for representing the background of the panel, where pieces of yellow-stained glass representing rays of sunlight are joined to alternating pieces of blue glass representing the sky. In this panel there are also pieces of yellow-stained glass inserted into the blue glass to represent stars. Prudde's studio also used abrasion to render the Beauchamp arms on his portrait in the Chapel's East Window (Figure 3.30). To render the blazon *gules between six crosslets or a fess or*, the glaziers soldered two pieces of ruby glass to a rectangular-shaped piece of yellow stained glass. For the smaller *crosslets*, the glaziers abraded parts of the ruby glass before colouring these exposed parts with yellow stain. Whilst Prudde may

---

<sup>373</sup> Marks, "Entumbid," 163-9.

<sup>374</sup> L.S. Woodger, "RODY, Nicholas (d.1458)," *History of Parliament*, Accessed 22nd March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/rody-nicholas-1458>.

<sup>375</sup> Alec Myers, ed., *English Historical Documents. 1327-1485. Volume 4* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 1161.

<sup>376</sup> *Ibid.*

have used this technique to produce the colours of red and yellow alongside one another in the Beauchamp arms, they are combined in other parts of the glazing through cutting and leading. For instance, the canopy designs in the East Window, formerly positioned above the figures of saints, use small pieces of yellow-stained glass inserted into larger pieces of ruby glass to represent stars (Figure 3.31).

Due to cut and leaded glass being employed throughout the Chapel's glazing, the Earl's executors were clearly aware of its usefulness for creating visual emphasis in important parts of the design. Given such an explicit reference in the glazing contract to high-quality, robust cut and leaded glass, it is surprising to find the use of abrasion for the making of the Beauchamp arms on the Earl's portrait. Indeed, one might expect to find the Earl's coat of arms made using only cut and leaded glass in order to give it a bold prominence in the Chapel's scheme.

The most logical conclusion, it would seem, is that the rendering of all the *crosslets* on the Earl's coat of arms would have been too awkward and difficult a shape for the glaziers to cut and lead into the space provided by the ruby glass used for the *field* of the Beauchamp arms. Though Prudde was able to render the *fess or* through cutting a band of yellow stained glass and leading them to pieces of ruby glass, the *crosslets* appear to have presented him with too much of a challenge, even for one of the most expert glaziers in fifteenth-century England. The awkward shape and size of these *crosslets* appears to have meant they were impossible to render through traditional methods. The explicit reference in the contract to cutting and leading and its use throughout the surviving glass clearly indicates the executors' preference for it as a means of creating emphasis in the Chapel's glazing programme.

A similar interest in retaining cut and leaded glass, where possible, is suggested by the Beaupré family's glazing. The Beaupré family inhabited their manor near Outwell in Cambridgeshire until the death of Edmund Beaupré (d.1567) who, lacking a male heir, bequeathed the house to his daughter Dorothy. Sir Robert Bell, Dorothy's husband, then inherited Beaupré Hall and bequeathed the manor to his descendants. As explored in Chapter 1, the Beauprés' "genealogie" was intended to signify the family's occupancy of their estate whilst also suggesting their accumulation of a patrimony over the later medieval period.<sup>377</sup> Since the most recent shield in the series is that of Edmund Beaupré, it would appear he was the most likely person responsible for its planning and

---

<sup>377</sup> For a family tree see Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 5: Beauprés of Beaupré Hall.

commissioning. In order to examine Edmund's possible intervention into the techniques used by his glaziers, we must briefly return to look at the use of marshalling in the Beaupré "genealogie."

In window I at Beaupré Hall, the shield of John FitzGilbert appears to have been placed in its first light and contained an unmarshalled version of the Beaupré arms (*argent on a bend azure three crosslets or*).<sup>378</sup> The second and third lights appear to have traced the descent of the manor of Beaupré before its transmission to John FitzGilbert's son, Richard, who, upon marrying Catherine Mundeford, inherited Beaupré Hall from the St. Omer family and adopted the surname Beaupré. It is at this point that the Beaupré arms change in the sequence: the fourth light of the window, representing Richard's marriage, shows them as a new, *quartered* arrangement of the Beaupré and St. Omer arms signifying Richard's inheritance from his father but also his entitlement to Beaupré through his mother. The Dudley Roll, made c.1553, shows a parallel case when illustrating the ancestry of the Beauchamp family (Figure 3.33). In this example, the arms of Beauchamp and Mauduit are each *impaled* to show the marriage of William Beauchamp III (d.1296) and Isabel Mauduit. Both arms are then quartered on the dexter side of the following shield representing their son and heir, William Beauchamp IV (d.1298). Before the shield representing Edmund Beaupré, all of the surviving instances of Beaupré arms show the adoption of the new *quartered* form following Richard's marriage. However, in the shield representing Edmund Beaupré, the already *quartered* arrangement of Beaupré arms are *quartered* again with the arms of Fodingaye, showing his entitlements to lands in Suffolk inherited through his mother's line.

All of the instances of the Beaupré arms, prior to Edmund Beaupré's shield, are made from the conventional method of cut and leaded glass. The shield, originally in window IId (Figure V.4), which shows the marriage of Nicholas Beaupré III and Margaret Fodingaye, contains a number of different sizes of cut glass.<sup>379</sup> Now appearing as part of the Beaupré coat of arms (Figures V.16), the arms of St. Omer (*azure a fess between six crosslets flory or*), are made by cutting and leading together four pieces of blue glass representing the *azure field* along with two pieces of yellow-stained glass to represent two groups of three joined-up *crosslets or* and a strip of yellow-stained glass for the *fess or* (Figure V.17). To render the St. Omer arms, Edmund's glaziers were required to cut and lead small pieces of glass to render its individual charges. For instance, the upper group of *crosslets flory* measure approximately 3 cms in width. In addition, the three pieces of cut yellow-

---

<sup>378</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the Beaupré Hall glass' archaeology see Volume 1: Appendix V. Beaupré Hall.

<sup>379</sup> The size of the overall shield is 37.2 x 30.2 cms with a lead of 0.6 cms in width being used to secure its edges.

stained glass used to represent the *crosslets flory or* in the Beaupré arms (*argent on a bend azure three crosslets flory or*) have a diameter of between 3.6 - 4.5 cm.<sup>380</sup>

The following shield in the sequence, from IIe (Figure V.4), displays the arms of Edmund Beaupré (d.1567) and includes the Beaupré arms as part of an even more complex arrangement of arms. In this shield they appear as a *quartered coat of arms within a quartering* which required Edmund's glaziers to adopt abrasion as a means of accurately rendering them (compare Figures V.18 & V.19). Given the reduced scale at which the glaziers were required to reproduce these arms, it would appear that it was impossible to do so with cut and leaded glass and instead they were forced to use flashed blue, abrasion and yellow stain to achieve the desired result. In contrast to the six pieces of glass used to represent the St. Omer arms in IIId, the glaziers' adoption of abrasion on this shield enabled them to render them with only three pieces of glass: two pieces of flashed blue glass, with the *crosslets* being abraded and coloured with yellow stain attached to one strip of yellow-stained glass for the *fess or*. Instead of the nine pieces of glass used to render the Beaupré arms in IIId, abrasion enabled the glazier to render them with only three pieces of glass. The shift in technique to abrasion when rendering the Beaupré arms at a smaller scale suggests Edmund had preferred his glaziers to retain cut and leaded glass as much as possible in the rendering of the Beaupré arms throughout the sequence. It would seem, however, that Edmund's glaziers adopted abrasion as the most convenient solution for rendering the Beaupré arms on this shield given the reduced scale at which they appeared.

When viewing a reconstruction of Window II, it seems the repeated use of cut and leaded glass to render the coat of arms would have drawn the viewer's attention to them in each window light (Figure V.4). The repetition of the Beaupré arms in cut and leaded glass stresses the continued transfer of Beaupré Hall and its broader patrimony via each male heir until the shield representing Edmund. The materials used place emphasis on Edmund's receipt of his patrimony from his ancestors, suggesting he was responsible for requesting that his glazier retain this technique as much as possible within his glazing programme. In this way, Edmund's apparent stipulation regarding the techniques used in his glazing parallels Nicholas Rodye and his plausible wish to retain cut and leaded glass to create emphasis in the glazing throughout the glazing of the Beauchamp Chapel.

---

<sup>380</sup> These are secured to the bend with leads which have a thickness of 0.25 cms.

An elite male's acquisition of the family patrimony from his predecessors could be a principal means through which he might seek to proclaim his autonomy as the head of his own household. William Aird has shown how Robert Curthose, son of William the Conqueror, sought for a long period to obtain his patrimonial lands in order to establish his independence from his father and thus his own authority as a lord.<sup>381</sup> Due to the emasculation caused by his lack of a male heir, Edmund may have intended to counterbalance the weakening of his status through stressing his inheritance of the family patrimony.<sup>382</sup>

In stressing his inheritance of the family patrimony, Edmund's glass is similar to the glazing at Athelhampton Hall and Cotehele House, which stresses Sir William Martyn and Sir Peter Edgcumbe II's identities as heirs of their respective patrimonies. However, in contrast to Edmund, these lords possessed an heir to whom they were able to convey their property and thus continue to nurture their family's relationship with their estate.<sup>383</sup> Since Edmund lacked a son, he appears to have resorted to emphasising his status as heir as a means of reclaiming a degree of authority as lord of Beaupré. Whilst the future prospects of his dynasty appeared bleak, the emphasis placed on his receipt of the Beaupré inheritance would have at least enabled him to exert his individual autonomy as the landed lord of his estate.

In comparison to the Beauchamp Chapel, where pieces of inserted glass measure as small as 2 cms in diameter, the Beauprés' glass seems to reflect the relatively modest ability of their glaziers to cut and lead glass at small dimensions (Figure 3.32). At 3 cms in diameter, the small-scale cutting and leading used to make the *crosslets or* in the St. Omer arms might have been considered impressive but by no means unparalleled in late medieval elite commissions of armorial glass. There were, for instance, numerous examples of inserted pieces of glass measuring 3 cms, and, even then, such insertions fall into the largest of the categories Megan Stacey has established for insertion sizes in late medieval England (those measuring over 3 cms in diameter).<sup>384</sup> The Beauprés' glazing might therefore be said to represent the work of a modestly skilled glazing studio. It is possible they aimed for their glaziers to produce imitations of inserted glass, which, when seen from a distance, may have appeared similar to more expensive examples of contemporary glass which contained insertions.

---

<sup>381</sup> Aird, "Frustrated Masculinity," 44-8.

<sup>382</sup> Rosenthal, *Patriarchy*, 43.

<sup>383</sup> As argued in Chapter 2, it seems initially that Sir Peter Edgcumbe II's glazing was intended to demonstrate his ability to pass on his estate to his heir, Sir Richard II, before the latter's move to Mount Edgcumbe caused the former to rearrange the armorial glass in his hall.

<sup>384</sup> Stacey, "*A Veritable*," footnote 1, 196.



The Beauprés' lack of interest in exhibiting an overt degree of “conspicuous consumption” in commissioning expensive glazing might appear surprising given the bleak prospects for their male line in the sixteenth century. However, it would seem Edmund Beaupré may have deemed his ability to demonstrate a distinctly old connection with his manor to have been a sufficient means of securing his status as a gentry lord. Given the Beauprés' acquisition of the manor around 1313, they were able to claim this distinctly old connection to their estate, especially when compared with the other four case studies examined in this thesis.<sup>385</sup> For instance, the next oldest estate was that of the Edgcumbes who had occupied their manor since 1353.<sup>386</sup> Despite his lack of a male heir, Edmund may have deemed his ability to showcase a strong connection between his lineage and manor as a sufficient means of legitimising his lordship. Indeed, the Beauprés' distinctive connection with their manor may have also enabled Edmund to retain a degree of authority despite the dubious claims to his ancestors' militaristic career.<sup>387</sup>

The evidence presented here suggests Edmund Beaupré stated conscious technical preferences in the commissioning of his armorial glass to emphasise his inheritance of the family patrimony and therefore his personal autonomy as lord of his estate. In doing so, Edmund may have sought to compensate for a weakening in his authority brought about through his inability to beget a male heir. Edmund's wish to represent his ownership of his father's property thus reflects earlier and likely pervading concerns of elite masculinity during the medieval period.<sup>388</sup>

Edmund appears to have been satisfied with exerting a modest degree of “conspicuous consumption.” His ownership of numerous properties that provided him a revenue would suggest he possessed the economic means to procure expensive windows. However, it may have been the case that he was satisfied with commissioning glaziers who were able to cut and lead glass at a relatively small scale, without needing to commission glaziers who may have been able to cut and lead glass at an even smaller scale. When compared with sizes of cut and leaded glass in other, contemporary examples, the Beauprés' glaziers appear seemingly unremarkable. Due to Edmund's ability to demonstrate an ancient connection with his manor, he does not seem to have felt the need to vouch for his status through commissioning distinctly sumptuous armorial glass.

---

<sup>385</sup> Blomefield, *An Essay Towards: Volume 7*, 454-78.

<sup>386</sup> GMHEW 3, 525.

<sup>387</sup> See 3.2. Examining Shield Types, “Prowess” and Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Athelhampton Hall.

<sup>388</sup> Aird, “Frustrated Masculinity,” 43-4.

### 3.5. Case Study: Constructions of Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Fawsley Hall

So far the chapter has examined how the shield types, marshalling and techniques used in the designing of a gentry lord's armorial glass could work towards remedying the issues that threatened the integrity of his relationship with his manor. As we have seen, in certain contexts, men might also commission noticeably expensive armorial glass to convey the extent of their financial resources and thus seek to further validate their gentry lordship. An examination of the first campaign of armorial glass commissioned by the Knightleys for their manor at Fawsley enables us to further determine the ways in which a gentry lord might employ these strategies when faced with significant instability in his male line and the succession of his manor.

As Chapter 2 argued, the hall's second sequence of armorial glass appears to have been commissioned and planned by Sir Edmund Knightley together with his wife, Ursula de Vere, and shows the history of the De Vere family and extent of its patrimony. However, the first sequence of glass commissioned at Fawsley described the Knightley ancestry. Following the initial construction of the oriel window, it is likely this series was placed within its main lights. This seems probable given that the Martyns' "genealogie" was positioned in their oriel at Athelhampton, and antiquarian evidence from other locations suggests oriel windows were intended for displaying lengthy expositions of male ancestry. For instance, William Dugdale's drawings of armorial glass from houses in Warwickshire where the glass or the building itself has been destroyed indicate this was likely true in other houses. Dugdale's drawings of glass at Compton Murdack show glass in the "bay window" apparently presenting the patrilineal descent of the resident Verney family (Figure 3.34).<sup>389</sup> In addition, Dugdale also drew a great number of armorial glass panels in the "canton window" at Chesterton, showing the descent of William Peyto, the house's owner (Figure 3.35). The sheer number of arms demonstrates they occupied a window with many lights, similar to the oriels at Athelhampton and Fawsley.<sup>390</sup> Thus, it seems likely that oriel windows might often have been considered to be appropriate settings to display a "genealogie" due to their sheer number of lights. The following analysis uses the prefix, I., when describing the lights in the oriel window to remind the reader of their place within the hall's broader glazing chronology, for example, I. Oriel 1a.

---

<sup>389</sup> William Dugdale, *The Antiquities of Warwickshire Volume 1* (London: J. Osborn and T. Longman, 1730), 564.

<sup>390</sup> Dugdale, *The Antiquities*, 474.

Before its movement to windows swI-swII (Figures IV.21 & IV.22), the original arrangement of this series might have seen the glass occupy the two rows of main lights in the oriel window, including a single light in the first row (Figure IV.27).<sup>391</sup> The first four lights, 3a-3d, would have been taken up by shields displaying the Knightleys' allegiance to the Tudor Court and would have begun in I. Oriel 3e with a coat of arms representing William de Knightley (d. c. 1394). The sequence would have continued along the third and second rows of lights before finishing in the first row (I. Oriel 1a) with the coat of arms depicting the marriage of Richard Knightley III and Eleanor Throckmorton. One of the tracery lights, A4, appears to have contained a shield showing the marriage of Sir Richard IV to Jane Skenard.<sup>392</sup> This hypothetical reconstruction of the oriel's glazing would have represented Sir Richard IV as the chronologically most recent Knightley. It therefore seems probable that he was responsible for planning and commissioning the sequence of glass.

This first sequence of glass was commissioned alongside another series showing the history and extent of the Skenard inheritance. It appears these shields were placed elsewhere in the hall, most plausibly along the hall's south-west wall. As described in Chapter 2, it seems that these shields showing the Skenard properties could have later replaced the shields depicting the Knightley ancestry in the oriel. Given the antiquity of some of the Northamptonshire families included in the sequence, it is likely Jane Skenard provided some of the blazons for the arms in her ancestral sequence during the planning stages of the window.

Unlike the histories of the other families examined in this thesis, the Knightleys' glass begins to show their patrilineal descent from the mid to late fourteenth century, a time *before* their arrival at Fawsley in 1416.<sup>393</sup> As a family that moved from Leicestershire to Northamptonshire, one might be tempted to conclude that the Knightleys wished to maintain a degree of individuality amongst the Northamptonshire gentry by displaying their roots in their native county. This would, however, appear unusual given Sir Richard IV's interests in the local gentry community demonstrated by marrying Jane Skenard, a local heiress, and marrying his firstborn son, Sir Richard V with Susan Spenser, the daughter of a local gentry family. Indeed, when one compares the extent of Sir Richard IV's series with the other aforementioned case studies of the thesis, one might conclude that the

---

<sup>391</sup> For a discussion of the archaeological assessment behind this sequence, see Volume 1, Appendix IV. Fawsley Hall, "Sir Richard Knightley IV's arrangement."

<sup>392</sup> See 4.5. Stasis and the "Genealogie" at Fawsley Hall.

<sup>393</sup> Heward and Taylor, *The Country Houses*, 211.

lord of Fawsley actually wished to suggest that the Knightley family originated at Fawsley, with the marriage of William de Knightley (d. c.1394) to Dorothy Golofer at some time in the mid fourteenth century. Like the other examples in the thesis, Sir Richard IV's series would have also suggested the accumulation of property through marriages in the patrilineal line. This is represented through the use of complex marshalling forms, explored further below. The sequence's emphasis on the Knightleys' history at Fawsley and their accumulation of property through inheritance would suggest we might usefully classify this sequence as a "genealogie."

The shields comprising Sir Richard IV's "genealogie" featured indentations in their upper-*dexter* corners (Figure IV. 32). Unlike the Edgcumbes, I can find no evidence for the Knightleys' participation in military campaigns during this period. It would instead seem that the sequence was intended to represent the Knightleys' proficiency in jousting. Sir Richard IV's tomb (Figure IV.28) represents him in a suit of armour, further suggesting his wish to be perceived as a man with proficiency in the tiltyard. It seems that Sir Richard IV, unlike Edmund Beaupré, did not opt to fabricate a militaristic identity for himself through his ancestral sequence but instead chose what he may have deemed as a more credible means of representing his "prowess" and thus his authority over the occupants of his manor.

The range of complex marshalling forms used in Sir Richard IV's "genealogie" suggests his preoccupation with showcasing the great number of estates his patrimony contained. The now lost coat of arms depicting Sir Richard IV and Jane's marriage from tracery light A4 of the oriel (Figures IV.7 & IV.27), represented the great number of properties Sir Richard IV had accrued through use of the marshalling form *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement impaling a quarterly coat of arms of eight within an impalement*. The *dexter* side of this shield includes the arms of Knightley, Golofer, Burgh and Cowley suggesting Sir Richard IV's inheritance of four patrimonial estates from the Knightleys' male line. This formulation of arms also appears on his tomb in St. Mary's, Fawsley (Figure IV.29). The estates brought to the Knightley patrimony through Jane's inheritance are suggested through the eight arms included on the *dexter* side of the shield. The *dexter* side thus contained the arms of Skenard, Harwedon, St. John, Bagot, Lions, Combemartin and two others which cannot be identified. In some instances, it seems Sir Richard IV and Jane may have invented arms for some of their ancestors in order to enable them to increase the number of inherited properties they were able to represent on their shield. For instance, there are no recorded instances of the Combemartin arms in usage during the medieval period before their appearance in this sequence of glass.

One reason for wishing to represent the great size of his patrimony may have been as a means of distracting visitors to the hall from instability in the succession of the Knightley patrimony during the 1530s. The premature death of Sir Richard IV's heir, Sir Richard V, in 1534 would likely have caused great psychological and emotional upset to the lord of Fawsley. Of the five other male children born to Sir Richard IV, his second son and eventual heir, Sir Edmund, had likely already reached maturity, meaning the lord of Fawsley was safe in the knowledge that the Knightley patrimony would pass to one of his sons. Having written his will before the death of his heir, Sir Richard IV includes a number of clauses relating to the transferal of his estates at Fawsley, Charwelton and Snotescombe firstly to his wife, followed by his son Sir Richard V, upon his reaching maturity, followed by his remaining sons, Sir Edmund and Sir Valentine.<sup>394</sup> Sir Richard IV may have grown anxious that the death of his heir could suggested he had lost control over his patrimony. Instead of seeking to present a seamless transition of his estate through using *impaled* arms, he appears to have chosen to emphasise the number of lands within his patrimony. It is possible that in doing so he intended to reclaim some of his status by highlighting his ability to control a large portfolio of estates, despite the injury caused to his lineage.

Like Edmund Beaupré, Sir Richard Knightley IV may have specified wishes for his glazier to render certain coats of arms in cut and leaded glass at small scales despite alternative methods being available. Within the sequence, the arms of Golofer (*azure a buck's head or*) are used to represent property inherited from Dorothy Golofer, wife of William de Knightley (d. c. 1394). The Golofer arms are consistently rendered with cut and leaded glass despite being scaled down in coats of arms with complex marshalling forms (for what follows see Figure IV.34). For instance, larger versions of these arms survive such as in the shield representing the marriage of Sir John Knightley to Elizabeth Burgh, in I. Oriel 2b, where the buck's head measures 15.2 cms from the tip of its antler to the bottom of its snout and 15.5 cms from the edge of one ear to the edge of its other ear. The smallest iteration is in the shield originally from light I. Oriel 2g, representing the marriage of Richard Knightley II (d.1442) to Elizabeth Purefoy. This shield contains the Golofer arms in another *quartered* coat of arms within an impalement and the glass for the buck's head measures 8.7 cms from the top of its antlers to its snout and 4.8 cms from the outer edge of its antler to that of its other antler. A piece of blue glass measuring 3.3 cms in height and 1.6 cms in width has been cut and inserted into the buck's head as a means of representing the *azure field* showing through the gap in its antlers. This piece of cut and leaded glass further serves to emphasise the presence of the Golofer arms within the shield.

---

<sup>394</sup> TNA PROB 11/25/292.

It is clear that other, more convenient solutions were open to the Knightleys' glaziers when faced with the task of combining the tinctures *or* on *azure* in a coat of arms. As at Beaupré Hall, the Knightleys' glaziers adopted flashed blue glass, abrasion and yellow stain, which allowed them to reproduce coats of arms at extremely small dimensions, following the scaling down of arms in shields that adopted complex forms of marshalling. A transition from using cut and leaded glass to using abrasion at smaller scales is apparent when comparing examples of the Combemartin arms (*gules a lion rampant vairy or and azure*) within the sequence (Figure IV.35). In its largest iteration, the Combemartin arms appear in an *impaled* shield (II. Oriel 1g) where each segment of the *vairy* pattern was individually cut out of yellow-stained glass and blue glass, at sizes roughly measuring 1.8 x 2.5 cms before being leaded together. However, by using abrasion, the Knightleys' glaziers were able to represent the Combemartin arms at much smaller scales. For instance, the shield representing Margery Harwedon (II. Oriel 2g) contains the Combemartin arms as part of the marshalling form, *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement*. In this shield the Knightleys' glaziers used abrasion along with only a single piece of glass, measuring 1.6 x 2.25 cms, to render the *lion rampant vairy or and azure*. Furthermore, the Combemartin *lion rampant* is rendered at a size of 1.2 x 2.35 cms in an even more complex marshalling form in the shield showing the marriage of William Harwedon and Margaret St. John (II. Oriel 2e). Therefore the family's glaziers appear to have used abrasion and yellow-stain on flashed blue glass as a more convenient solution when required to represent the tinctures *or* and *azure* alongside one another.

The retention of cut and leaded glass appears to have been intended to emphasise the descent of property within the family's patrimony to Sir Richard IV. Although the shield representing Sir Richard IV from oriel A4 is now lost, it is likely that the example of the Golofer arms contained therein was also made with cut and leaded glass.<sup>395</sup> Sir Richard IV may have thus intended for contemporary viewers of the window to track the descent of the Golofer lands through the Knightley ancestry in the oriel window before being able to spot its place in Sir Richard IV's coat of arms in A4.

Like the extensive use of cut and leaded glass at Beaupré, it is possible the lord of Fawsley intended to highlight his own inheritance of the family patrimony. Given the premature death of his firstborn son, Sir Richard IV may have sought to compensate for the failure of his plans for Fawsley's

---

<sup>395</sup> In A4, the Golofer arms are represented as part of the marshalling form, *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement*. The shield from I. Oriel 2a, which used the same marshalling form to represent Sir John Knightley, also included the Goloder arms in cut and leaded glass.

inheritance by emphasizing his possession of the family patrimony. Indeed, in placing such an emphasis on his receipt of patrimonial lands, Sir Richard may have intended to conceal the death of his firstborn son, Sir Richard V, through suggesting that he himself was the most recent heir of Fawsley.

Whilst Sir Richard IV made these design choices to consolidate specific aspects of his authority as lord of Fawsley, the degree of labour and skill involved in manufacturing these windows would have also been intended to recommend his aristocratic status through the large amounts of money he likely spent on the project. The introduction of the jousting indent in Sir Richard IV's shields would have required an increased degree of labour for his glazier, and likely a higher price than shields without such features. For instance, due to the intrusive shape of the indent, the adaptation of the shield showing the arms of Margaret de St. John with the indent required the glazier to cut numerous, small pieces of glass (Figure IV.32) to represent the *canton ermine* in the St. John coat of arms (*gules two bars argent a canton ermine*).

The complexity of marshalling in Sir Richard IV's glazing sequence would have likely required him to provide coloured illustrations to his glazier as a means of visually informing them of how the arms on each shield should have been arranged. Sir Richard IV's glazing used a combined total of thirteen different types of marshalling to represent the individuals included in the Knightley and Skenard lineages. From the known glass that constituted the Knightley "genealogie," Sir Richard IV used five types of marshalling to represent ancestral descent. There are relatively simple examples earlier on in the sequence, such as *unmarshalled*, *impaled* and *quartered arms* (Figure IV.36). Yet, there are also complex arrangements of arms used to represent more recent ancestors' accumulation of properties. These shields are marshalled as *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement impaling a quartered coat of arms within an impalement* and *a quartered coat of arms within an impalement impaling a quarterly coat of arms of eight within an impalement* (Figure IV.36).

The Skenard lineage contains shields that use even more complex marshalling to represent individual ancestors and the gradual accumulation of property by Jane's ancestors. In some instances, individuals are represented in relation to their identity as heirs or heiresses and their arms are marshalled through combining multiple *quarterings* in either *a quarterly coat of arms of eight* or *a quarterly coat of arms of twelve* (Figure IV.37). The series also contains arms of Skenard ancestors who married heirs or heiresses. This was conveyed with an *impaled* coat of arms *impaling* arms which contained numerous *quarterings*. These examples were marshalled as *an impaled coat of arms impaling a quartered coat of arms within an impalement*, *an impaled coat of arms impaling*

*a quarterly coat of arms of six within an impalement and an impaled coat of arms impaling a quarterly coat of arms of eight within an impalement* (Figure IV.37). This type of marshalling becomes even more complex in the shield representing the marriage of Margaret de St. John's heir, William, to the heiress Margaret Vaux (II. Oriel 2f). In this shield, each *impalement* contains numerous quarterings resulting in the arrangement, *a quarterly coat of arms of eight within an impalement impaling a quartered coat of arms* (Figure IV.38). At its most complex, the sequence represents heiresses whose mothers were themselves heiresses by combining *quartered arms* with coats of arms which are themselves already *quartered*. The shield of Maud Lions (II. Oriel 2c) thus uses the marshalling form *a quartered coat of arms with a quartered coat of arms within a quartering* (Figure IV.38). Another distinctive solution to depicting heiresses of this kind is represented through the arms of Jane Skenard before her marriage to Sir Richard IV (II. Oriel 2j). In this shield, Jane is represented through *a quartered coat of arms with quarterings spread across two quarterings* (Figure IV.38).

Considering the degree of complexity involved in Sir Richard IV's glazing, he is likely to have paid additional costs in the preparation of documents intended to inform his glaziers of the necessary designs. It is possible Sir Richard IV may, like John Noreys, have employed limners to assist with the illustrations. He may have employed London-based artists, given that he likely spent time in Westminster when fulfilling his duties as a justice for Northamptonshire. Whilst we cannot account for any lost glass at Ockwells, based on the known extent of Sir Richard IV's sequence at Fawsley, it seems very likely he was intending to spend more money on his glazing than John Noreys, given the comparably more intricate plans he would have been required to commission ahead of their submission to his glaziers.

Sir Richard IV may have also intended to convey his status through spending large sums of money on glaziers who were able to accommodate his technical specification for the glass' manufacture. The Knightleys' glaziers appear to have been expert craftsmen given the extremely small scale at which they could cut and lead glass, especially inserted glass. As examined above, the glaziers employed by the Beauprés were able to cut and lead glass down to a length of 3cms, as demonstrated through one of the groups of *crosslets flory* in the Beaupré arms. In contrast, the piece of glass representing the *azure field* between the antlers of the stag on the arms of *Golofer* (from I. Oriel 2g) measures just 1.6 cms in width (Figures IV.27 & IV.34). Moreover, this piece of glass is part of a double insertion, with the stag's head itself being inserted into another piece of blue glass representing the *azure field* of the *Golofer* arms.



### 3.6. Conclusion

This chapter has examined how the design of domestic glazing reflects the different kinds of relationships the gentry lord wished to construct with his manor. Sir William Martyn's and Sir Richard Knightley IV's use of indented shields suggests they intended to present their physical skills as jousting to authenticate their "prowess" and fulfill a key requirement of late medieval aristocratic masculinity.<sup>396</sup> The Knightley and Martyn shields contrast with the "genealogie" commissioned by Sir Peter Edgcumbe II, whose use of an older type of shield suggested his wish to fashion his family's identity as trained soldiers, ready and willing to defend Cotehele and its occupants. In certain cases, however, it seems gentry lords were willing to fabricate a militaristic identity for themselves, when lacking any experience of war. The Beauprés' glazing, which used the same type of shield as the Edgcumbes, presents the family as a dynasty of warriors, mirroring examples of late medieval gentry lords in Yorkshire who similarly adopted militaristic displays on their houses to construct their identities as gentry lords.<sup>397</sup> However, in contrast, the Martyns' and Knightleys' shields suggest they intended to convey a more convincing impression of their capacity for violence, and thus enabling them to reinforce their authority over others in their household.

As well as exhibiting potential for physical aggression, a lord might wish to represent his authority by marshalling several coats of arms together in complex arrangements to represent the great extent of his land holdings. Gentry lords such as Sir Richard Knightley IV and John Noreys appear to have used such arrangements of arms in their glazing to compensate for a weakened connection between their lineage and their ancestral manor. Sir Richard IV's highly complex arrangements of arms appear to have been partially made up of arms intended to represent ancestral properties and may have been motivated by a wish to consolidate his power as lord of Fawsley, following the death of his heir. Similarly, John Noreys included intricate arrangements of arms intended to represent the extent of the lands inherited from his wives. Such a display was surely motivated by John's wish to manifest his authority in a space from which he and his heirs would be absent following their move to another manor.

A gentry lord might also wish to buttress his authority following a disjuncture between his lineage and manor by specifying that his glazier to retain cut and leaded glass in certain parts of his "genealogie." In doing so it appears he sought to stress his inheritance of the family patrimony and

---

<sup>396</sup> Karras, *From Boys to Men*, 25.

<sup>397</sup> James, "'To Knowe a Gentilman'," 182-4.

thus his autonomy as head of his household. Sir Richard IV's glazing seems to have conveyed this message as a means of consolidating his domestic rule following the death of his first born son. Likewise, Edmund Beaupré's glazing presented him as heir to the Beaupré estate to consolidate his authority during a period in which he failed to beget a son. By representing themselves in such a manner, both lords reflect a broader pattern during this period of aristocratic men seeking to obtain their patrimonies to exert their own independence as heads of their respective households.<sup>398</sup>

Whilst these aesthetic choices were intended to remedy specific deficiencies in the gentry lord's status, the large sums of money he likely paid to integrate them in his glazing project also buttressed his status as an elite lord through demonstrating his "conspicuous consumption." Such acts of extravagant spending may have further acted as a means of remedying the aforementioned problems that could occur. The adaptation of shields with indents likely required glaziers to engage in additional labour when accommodating the intrusive notch in the act of glass cutting. Their inclusion may have therefore increased the price of an armorial glazing commission. The additional cost the Martyns and Knightleys likely incurred through including this feature would have reflected their intention to spend large sums of money to appear as authentic gentry lords.

Likewise, the inclusion of complex marshalling arrangements probably required the gentry lord to pay additional sums of money to a limner to prepare documents outlining the precise arrangements of arms which were to be included in the sequence. It is likely the Noreys and Knightleys thought the financial investment involved in preparing a commission of this kind would have been apparent to their contemporaries. John Noreys and Sir Richard Knightley IV thus likely engaged in such commissions with the intention of representing their elite status, and in the process seeking to further recover from the weakening of their family's connection to their estate. The Beauprés and the Knightleys hiring of highly skilled glaziers capable of cutting and leading glass at small scales appears to have been an indication of their willingness to make overtly lavish expenditures. Whilst the Beauprés may have hired glaziers of modest technical abilities, the Knightleys are likely to have spent great sums of money on hiring adept, most likely specialist, glaziers. These displays of financial investment, particularly by the Knightleys, appear to have been intended to communicate their socially elite rank and partially resolve the loss of status incurred through instability in their male lines.

---

<sup>398</sup> Aird, "Frustrated Masculinity," 43-4.

## Chapter 4. The Audiences of Domestic Glazing

### 4.1. Introduction

Having examined the ways in which landed men commissioned domestic glass to fashion aspects of their gentry lordship, we now turn to explore the intended audiences of these armorial displays to further understand the motivations behind these sequences. To determine the audiences gentry lords expected to view their glass, the chapter analyses the positions of the “genealogie” or “alliaunce” within the hall in relation to the routes people may have taken through these spaces or specific locations in which they might have remained static. To examine the intended audiences behind gentry domestic glass, we will explore the topography of armorial glazing at Ockwells Manor, Fawsley Hall and Athelhampton Hall.

The first section assesses the intended audiences of John Noreys' “alliaunce” in the hall windows at Ockwells and will consider their intended audiences in a space that may have acted as a thoroughfare for different groups of people entering the house from its porch. Besides using the surviving glass, this section draws on recent research by Duncan Berryman into the administration of Wiltshire estates to determine the likely audiences of Ockwells' glass.<sup>399</sup> The second section of the chapter turns to consider another audience for John Noreys' glazing by examining the hall as a space through which people intended to pass when leaving the house. The third section of the chapter examines Sir Richard Knightley IV's placement of the Knightley “genealogie” at Fawsley in relation to the movement of certain groups through the hall after entering the manor. The fourth section considers the position of the “genealogie” at Fawsley opposite the fireplace, examining specifically the latter as a place where certain people may have remained stationary within the hall. The final section of the chapter examines the placement of the “alliaunce” and “genealogie” at Athelhampton to infer their intended audiences.

### 4.2. Entering the Hall and the “Alliaunce” at Ockwells Manor

The hall at Ockwells Manor is positioned between a corridor to the south-west, which adjoins the manor's entrance porch, and a room to the hall's north-west. A possible route through the hall is from its entrance in its south-east corner to the door in its north-west corner (for the following see Figure 4.1). Taking this route, one would have seen John's arms and those of other landowning men

---

<sup>399</sup> Duncan Berryman, “Two Wiltshire Manors and their Manorial Buildings,” *The Wiltshire Archaeology & Natural History Magazine*, 109 (2016): 121.

in neIII and neII (Arrows 1 & 2). Finally, when coming into view of windows neI (Arrow 3), the visitor would see John's allegiance to Henry VI, whom he served in an official capacity, along with the arms of numerous other elite men, some of whom belonged to the nobility such as Henry Beauchamp, 14th Earl of Warwick who is represented in light neIa.

The emphasis placed on John's landed associates in the glazing sequence could suggest it was made with the intention of impressing them when visiting Ockwells. Although John occupied Yattendon as his principal manor from 1442 onwards, it is likely he prepared Ockwells for entertaining guests should the need arise when residing there. Chris Woolgar has suggested that the hall of the manor served as a thoroughfare through which household servants would lead guests to dine with the lord.<sup>400</sup> Mark Girouard has argued that in the late medieval house, gentry and noble lords held their meals in a "great chamber" which was usually attached to the hall.<sup>401</sup> Although Anthony Emery identifies the room to the north-west of Ockwells' hall as a "parlour," due to its attachment to the hall, it is possible this space served the function of a "great chamber" as a space in which John and his guests could dine together.<sup>402</sup>

Some of the shields in his windows represented men, such as Sir Richard Nanfan (neIIe) and Edward Langford (neIIIb), who held lands in adjacent counties to Berkshire and could have plausibly visited John Noreys at Ockwells. Whilst walking through the hall, either Sir Richard or Edward would have seen himself represented alongside John and other men who each derived their status through possessing land. Through placing this sequence in the hall, John may have intended to ensure his peers were reminded of their equal social status to him before meeting the lord of Ockwells in the "great chamber." The similarity between John and his landed associates would have been reinforced through the placement of the royal and noble arms in neI. Upon seeing these arms before entering the "great chamber," John may have intended for the window to remind these men of their collective deference to this upper level of masculine society.

Whilst seeking to cement his status within a network of landed lords, the arrangement of the hall's windows may have also been intended for an audience who used the house on a daily basis. Although John did not occupy Ockwells as his principal residence, it is likely he maintained the manor as a source of income, through rearing sheep on its lands. Following a period of decline

---

<sup>400</sup> Woolgar, *The Great Household*, 25.

<sup>401</sup> Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, 51-2.

<sup>402</sup> GMHEW 3, 128.

during the Black Death, the economy of sheepfarming stabilised during the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and enabled elite landowners to generate immense wealth through the sale of fleeces.<sup>403</sup> Anthony Emery has located a medieval barn at Ockwells suggesting John's use of this estate for agricultural business.<sup>404</sup> In addition, John included in his will a donation of money “unto my Shepherds and meniall s(er)v[a]nts attending my husbandrie,” which may have included members of his household attending his sheep at Ockwells.<sup>405</sup>

Large flocks of sheep normally required maintenance by members of a lord's household. Duncan Berryman's research into Longbridge Deverill and Monkton Deverill, two Wiltshire manors owned by the chamberlain of Glastonbury Abbey, has revealed how a lord might employ a bailiff and reeve to oversee the commercial activities of his estates. Whilst bailiffs usually managed all of the lord's estates, reeves were employed to audit the agricultural accounts for individual manors.<sup>406</sup> Taking into account Berryman's case studies, it would seem likely that John also employed a bailiff to handle the running of all his estates and a reeve to manage the accounts at Ockwells.

The produce of a lord's estate was typically managed from the hall which functioned as the heart of the estate's economy, sometimes referred to as the “manorial court.”<sup>407</sup> As a place to store the manor's records, John's reeve probably used the hall on a frequent basis for recording and checking the manor's accounts.<sup>408</sup> It is possible that the records of the manor were stowed in the slightly extruded section that Anthony Emery refers to as the “bay” below windows neI and swI. This seems like a plausible location for John's reeve to have consulted documents away from the main body of the hall and the potential hazard of fire in the hearth.<sup>409</sup> The reeve may have therefore entered the hall on its south-east side and moved towards the “bay” on the north-east side of the hall. When moving through the space of the hall, John's reeve would have thus seen his lord's membership to a

---

<sup>403</sup> David Stone, “The Productivity and Management of Sheep in Later Medieval England,” *The Agricultural History Review* 51.1 (2003): 1-3; Eileen Power, *The Wool Trade in English Medieval History: Being the Ford Lectures* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941), 58-67.

<sup>404</sup> GMHEW 3, 126.

<sup>405</sup> Charles Kerry, *The History and Antiquities of the Hundred of Bray, in the County of Berkshire* (London: Savill and Edwards, 1861), 119.

<sup>406</sup> Berryman, “Two Wiltshire Manors,” 121.

<sup>407</sup> John Baker, *The Legal Profession and the Common Law* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1986), 164; Lloyd Bonfield, “What did English Villagers Mean by ‘Customary Law?’” in *Medieval Society and the Manor Court*, eds. Z. Razi and R. Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 105.

<sup>408</sup> Berryman, “Two Wiltshire Manors,” 121.

<sup>409</sup> GMHEW 3, 126.

group of landowning men (Figure 4.2, Arrow 1 & 2). Although women could indeed occupy roles in a lord's household staff, Peter Fleming and Chris Woolgar have argued, based on broad samples of evidence, that household servants in fifteenth-century elite families tended to be male.<sup>410</sup> In addition, Peter Fleming has demonstrated that servants in elite households might often be of a relatively high status and hold their own land and property.<sup>411</sup> Given that servants might bear similarities to their employers, it is possible John sought to reinforce his authority over his reeve through suggesting the power he derived through his ties to other landed men. In doing so, John may have sought to remind his reeve of his subservient position in the masculine hierarchy of his household and thus the necessity for his reeve to effectively perform his duties in service to his lord.

In addition to reminding John's male servants of their place within his household, it seems likely the glazing was intended to address a certain group of visitors to Ockwells. Later medieval accounts from the manor of Longbridge Deverill reveal interested clients might visit the hall of a manor in person to purchase fleeces. The surviving roll records two instances of customers travelling to the manor to buy its products in the mid fifteenth century: the first is a John Lane of Glastonbury in 1453 and the second is a John Sheoler of Wells in 1455.<sup>412</sup> The precise occupation of these two men is unclear yet some of the men purchasing wool from the same manor in the fourteenth century were wool merchants and dyers from other nearby towns such as Winchester and Salisbury, suggesting Longbridge Deverill may have continued to attract a similar clientele during the fifteenth century.<sup>413</sup> Although deriving from the records of a monastic estate, such instances of clients visiting a manor in person might reflect one of the ways in which John sold his produce.

It is possible John attracted a clientele of merchants from local towns in Berkshire. The county's wool was highly important in the burgeoning manufacturing industries of Reading and Newbury, which grew in size between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>414</sup> Ockwells may have been ideally placed for merchants to acquire wool given its location close to Maidenhead. The town's bridge over the River Thames, which was maintained by a guild from the mid-fifteenth century

---

<sup>410</sup> Peter Fleming, "Household Servants of the Yorkist and Early Tudor Gentry," in *Early Tudor England: Proceedings of the 1987 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. D. Williams (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1989), 25; Woolgar, *The Great Household*, 34.

<sup>411</sup> Fleming, "Household Servants," 28.

<sup>412</sup> Referenced in D.L. Farmer, "Two Wiltshire Manors and their Markets," *The Agricultural History Review* 37.1 (1989): 10.

<sup>413</sup> Farmer, "Two Wiltshire Manors," 10.

<sup>414</sup> Margaret Yates, *Town and Countryside in Western Berkshire, c.1327-c.1600: Social and Economic Change* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 28.

onwards, may have acted as a transport hub for the surrounding area and drawn custom to Ockwells.<sup>415</sup>

It is plausible that a visiting merchant may have accompanied John's reeve through the hall to discuss a sale and record it in the manor's accounts, where they would have seen John's membership to a group of elite landowning men in neII and neIII (Figure 4.2, Arrows 1 & 2). Some of the men represented in these windows possessed estates capable of producing agricultural goods of their own. Sir John Wenlock's manor of Greathampstead Someries is recorded in the mid-sixteenth century as possessing a farm and could suggest Sir John had engaged in sheepfarming on this estate.<sup>416</sup> Sir Richard Nanfan's estate of Birtsmorton in Worcestershire (represented in neIIe) is recorded as having a mill in the fourteenth century, suggesting his family continued to engage in agricultural business there during the fifteenth century.<sup>417</sup> In these windows, the presence of arms belonging to men who likely profited from agriculture themselves may have been intended to suggest they endorsed John in his capacity as a sheepfarmer and, by extension, his produce. Merchants may have been familiar with the coats of arms of lords within their local area, given that during the fifteenth century they began to adopt their own coats of arms, as Caroline Barron has shown in relation to the mercantile classes of late medieval London.<sup>418</sup> John may have therefore intended these windows to act as a means of recommending his wares to potential clients intending for them to display the endorsements of his peers and increase the likelihood of a sale.

It would appear John Noreys' "alliaunce" was simultaneously concerned with reaffirming his social status to his landed peer group as their equal, whilst also seeking to exert his authority over his reeve. In addition, the glazing appears to have been intended to recommend John's produce to potential merchant clients who may have travelled to Ockwells to purchase agricultural wares.

### 4.3. Exiting the Hall and the "Alliaunce" at Ockwells Manor

Another possible route through the hall is from the door in its north-west corner to the door in its south-east corner, close to the porch where one would have been able to exit the manor. Along this

---

<sup>415</sup> William Page and P. H. Ditchfield, *A History of the County of Berkshire: Volume 3* (London: Victoria County History, 1923), 93-107.

<sup>416</sup> Page, *The Victoria History of the County of Bedford: Volume 2*, 358.

<sup>417</sup> Page and Willis-Bund, *A History of the County of Worcester: Volume 4*, 29-33.

<sup>418</sup> Caroline Barron, "Chivalry, Pageantry and Merchant Culture," in *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*, eds. M. Keen and P. Coss (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), 231-2.

path, the viewer would have been confronted by the arms of John and his landed associates in windows neII and neIII (Figure 4.3, Arrows 1 & 2). As the potential heirs to the Noreys patrimony, the “alliaunce” may have been aimed at John’s four sons, and especially his heir, Sir William, to familiarise themselves with the arms of their father's peers.

The distribution of some of the arms in neII and neIII suggest they may have been arranged in such a way as to seize the viewer’s line of sight and encourage quick identification, whilst moving through this space. For instance, both neII and neIII contain *unmarshalled* coats of arms, which would have enabled the viewer to fleetingly recognise a single coat of arms when passing through. In addition, many of the arms appear to have been distributed across neII and neIII to match the tinctures of each iteration of the Noreys arms, allowing for a more seamless mode of visual consumption when seeing them from left-to-right.

Although unique amongst the thesis’ case studies, this aspect of Ockwells’ glass merits closer analysis. In light neIIa, the tinctures in both the Noreys arms (*argent a chevron between three crows’ heads sable*) and the Clitherow arms provide the apparatus for describing some of those occurring later on such as the *argent field* and *sable chevron* in the arms of Wenlock (*argent a chevron sable between three saracens’ heads wreathed argent*) positioned directly next to it in neIIb. The tinctures used in the arms of John's first wife, Alice Merbrooke (*bendy or and azure a bordure gules*), in neIIIa, might have been thought to assist in helping the onlooker in describing the combination of *azure* and *or* in the arms of Langford (*paly argent and gules on a chief azure a lion passant or*) in neIIIb.<sup>419</sup>

Karen Elizabeth Gross has described how the late medieval armorial treatise, *The Boke of St. Albans*, reveals the existence of an oral culture in which young would-be gentlemen were encouraged to learn the different parts of armorial blazon and memorise to whom certain arms belonged.<sup>420</sup> Gross also draws on the fourteenth-century testimony given by Sir Robert Laton in the Court of Chivalry dispute between the Scrope and Grosvenor families, who disputed the right to bear the arms *azure a bend or*. Laton’s account, which is given as a means of verifying the ancestral right of the Scrope family to bear the arms, includes a description of an educational exercise conducted by his father. Laton recounts how, whilst attending jousting tournaments, his father

---

<sup>419</sup> This type of aesthetic cohesion occurs only at Ockwells and is not represented in the glass of any other case study, however, its study in other contexts if present would merit further study.

<sup>420</sup> Gross, “Hunting,” 200.



recited to him numerous coats of arms belonging to everyone, from kings to gentlemen, before making him write them down and memorise them.<sup>421</sup>

It is highly probable that young men aspiring to gentility were tested on their knowledge of coats of arms on a regular basis. Indeed, even household members of considerably lower status to the lords' children were encouraged to retain visual knowledge relating to gentle pursuits. For instance, *The Master of the Game Book*, translated from the original French version by Edward 2nd Duke of York between 1406-13 recommended that young male servants learn the colours and names of the lord's hounds so as to effectively assist whilst attending hunts.<sup>422</sup> Since men of a lower social status were required to be visually astute, it would seem very likely that the gentry lord's children would have been expected to have a good knowledge of the visual culture associated with their rank.

It is obvious that, when applying the evidence from Laton's testimony, the act of writing down blazons would be inconsistent with the action of walking through a space. However, the act of recording blazon by hand might have been supplanted in this instance by speaking the blazon, most likely aloud. Karen Gross, in her analysis of the *Boke of St. Albans*, argues that it was through the act of orally describing coats of arms, animals of the hunt and falconry accoutrements that one is able to demonstrate their gentility.<sup>423</sup> Similarly, Chris Woolgar has argued that high standards of articulateness were required for high-ranking professionals during this period, such as physicians and surgeons.<sup>424</sup> The presence of the Noreys' motto - "ffeyth fully serve" - in the background of the Ockwells glass suggests John intended his children to react orally to these windows and possibly recite the family motto on a regular basis. It would therefore appear these windows were intended to encourage his male children to familiarise themselves with the coat of arms of families with whom their father was allied and, possibly, to orally rehearse them whilst moving through the hall. John may have deemed this exercise a useful activity for his sons to engage in before leaving the manor where they may, for instance, have encountered some of those men possibly in a local town or whilst accompanying their father to court.

---

<sup>421</sup> "It[e]m le dit monsieur Rob(er)t de Laton dit p(our) le sement qil ad fait q(ue) son pier (que) fuist veil ho(m)me del age de lxx anz & de long temps travaillez en estraungez guerrez & en temps du peccs en tournaments me comanda descriuire en un cedule touz le armez quil avoit apris de cez auncests dez roys princez dues countez barons... & les ch[eva]ll[ier]s & esquires quil avoit douent en dount en conissance & en memoir..." N. H. Nichols, ed., *De Controversia in Curia Militari inter Ricardum le Scrope et Robertum Grosvenor Milites, Volume 1* (London: Samuel Bentley, 1832) 111.

<sup>422</sup> W. A. Baillie-Grohman and F. Baillie-Grohman, eds. *The Master of Game* (New York: Duffield and Company, 1909), 123-7.

<sup>423</sup> Gross, "Hunting," 213.

<sup>424</sup> Chris Woolgar, *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2006), 96.

The arrangement may have been especially aimed at John's firstborn son, Sir William Noreys. As heir to the Noreys patrimony, John may have intended for Sir William to learn the coats of arms of landed men allied to the Noreys family in order for him to adequately succeed his father and retain these relationships.

#### 4.4. Entering the Hall and the “Genealogie” at Fawsley Hall

The hall at Fawsley is attached at its south-east end to a series of rooms that appears to have been used by the Knightleys' servants. At its north-west end the hall is attached to a series of rooms added in the eighteenth century.<sup>425</sup> Although detached from the hall, Anthony Emery has argued there was originally a series of more private rooms that may have been used by the family located to the north-west of the hall.<sup>426</sup> A principal route through the hall may have therefore led from the location of the original manor porch in the hall's east corner to a door in its south-west wall between windows swIV and swV that Emery argues was intended to provide access to this private suite of rooms to the north east of the hall. Along this route the viewer may have seen the shields representing the descent of the Skenard patrimony likely located in the windows along the south-west wall of the hall (Figure 4.4, Arrow 1) followed by the Knightley "genealogie" in the oriel window (Figure 4.4, Arrow 2).

If Sir Richard IV arranged his glazing in such a manner, he may have intended for his landed neighbours in Northamptonshire to see it when visiting the manor before meeting with him. As described above in relation to Ockwells Manor, it is likely that high-ranking guests were taken through the hall to a separate room where they would eat with the lord of the manor, most likely in his "great chamber." It is possible that the residential range to the north-west of the hall would have contained such a space, meaning guests may have used the hall as a thoroughfare to reach this location. When moving through the hall, a visiting lord may have therefore seen the extent of the lands Sir Richard IV received through his wife and his own patrilineal line.

Sir Richard IV's intentions for his "genealogie" are partially revealed when we compare it with Edmund Beaupré's glazing at Beaupré Hall. The inscriptions that accompany the Beauprés' armorial glass are presented on looping text scrolls above each shield. Each inscription describes the marriage shown in each shield and, where relevant, the status of a woman as an heiress. Similar

---

<sup>425</sup> Heward and Taylor, *The County Houses*, 214-6.

<sup>426</sup> GMHEW 2, 209.

looping text scrolls were used in the neighbouring region of Suffolk in the Clopton chantry chapel at Long Melford. The text scrolls were used in the chantry chapel to include verses of Lydgate's version of the poem, *Quis Dabit*, describing the Virgin's lament for her dead son. Matthew Evan Davies has argued these scrolls were intended to remind the local congregation of the intercessory role of the Virgin in their personal salvation.<sup>427</sup> By using these text scrolls in his glazing, Edmund Beaupré may have intended to appropriate a visual mode of presenting text that people were accustomed to experiencing during acts of prayer in church. However, instead of being concerned with salvation, Edmund may have intended to suggest to his peers the social value of retaining associations with him as a lord with landed power in the East Anglia region. Although Sir Richard's sequence did not contain text scrolls, the use of complex marshalling in the Knightley "genealogie" and especially in light A4, may have been intended to persuade his peers of his social value as a neighbour with a large portfolio of land, shortly before they met with him in his "great chamber." While passing in front of the oriel window, the "genealogie" would have further displayed Sir Richard IV's social status to the viewer by representing his receipt of the Knightley patrimony. This would have been indicated through the use of cut and leaded glass throughout the sequence to represent his receipt of the Golofer inheritance.<sup>428</sup> In addition, the use of indents, complex marshalling and small-scale cut and leaded glass in Sir Richard IV's "genealogie" would have also communicated his extensive financial resources and served to further validate his gentility.

Whilst seeking to authenticate his gentle status to his peers, Sir Richard IV's "genealogie" may have also been intended to address members of the Knightleys' household staff. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Knightleys operated an extensive sheepfarming enterprise at Fawsley which would have required management by a reeve.<sup>429</sup> The manorial accounts may have been stored near the oriel window away from the main body of the hall and the hearth on its south west wall. When intending to consult the manor's accounts from this location, the reeve may have approached the oriel window from either the porch at the hall's eastern corner or the doorway connecting the hall to the suite of rooms on its south-east wall.

---

<sup>427</sup> Matthew Evan Davies, "Lydgate at Long Melford: Reassessing the Testament and 'Quis Dabit Meo Capiti Fontem Lacrimarum' in Their Local Context," *The Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures*, 43.1 (2017): 89-93.

<sup>428</sup> 3.5. Case Study: Constructions of Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Fawsley Hall.

<sup>429</sup> Keith Allison et al, *The Deserted Villages of Northamptonshire* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966), 11.

Sir Richard IV's glazing may have thus been intended to exert his dominance over his reeve through firstly displaying both the extent of the lands inherited through his wife (Figure 4.5, Arrow 1) and the number of lands inherited through his patrilineal line (Figure 4.5, Arrow 2). In addition, through displaying his "genealogie" in shields that suggested his family's aptitude for jousting, Sir Richard IV may have sought to intimidate his household staff through suggesting the Knightleys were familiar with acts of violence and could use aggression, if necessary, as a means of enforcing their domestic rule. Sir Richard IV's warning to his servants might be said to have contrasted with the message communicated by Sir Peter II's "genealogie" at Cotehele (Figures III.4, III.5 & III.10). In contrast to the Knightleys, the Edgcumbes' ancestral series adopted shields used in warfare during the thirteenth century and may have sought to ensure their servants' compliance through stressing the Edgcumbes' ability to protect them in their capacity as trained soldiers.

It seems possible Sir Richard Knightley IV therefore intended for two types of audience to view Fawsley's glazing when entering the hall. Firstly, the glass may to have been intended to impress his local landed peers whilst moving through the hall to meet with Sir Richard IV in Fawsley's "great chamber." Secondly, Sir Richard IV likely meant to exert his authority over his reeve by emphasising his landed status and his capacity for aggression in order to ensure they conducted their duties effectively.

#### 4.5. Stasis and the “Genealogie” at Fawsley Hall

Whilst Sir Richard IV may have intended for certain audiences to experience Fawsley's glazing whilst moving through the hall, the position of the Knightley "genealogie" opposite the hall's fireplace suggests he wished some viewers to engage in more contemplative acts of looking whilst stationary. As Tara Hamling has argued, during the sixteenth century, the domestic fireplace could provide somewhere for one to sit and meditate upon religious imagery.<sup>430</sup>

Sitting in front of the fire, one would have been able to clearly see lights 3e-3g, showing the beginnings of the Knightley “genealogie”, with the majority of the arms in lights a, b, g, h and j being obscured by the reentrant sides of the oriel window (see Figure 4.6).

From my reconstruction of the oriel's glazing, it seems the shields most likely placed in these three lights showed the accumulation of property after the marriage of William de Knightley (d. c. 1394)

---

<sup>430</sup> Tara Hamling, *Decorating the Godly Household* (New Haven and London: Paul Mellon, 2010), 221.

and Dorothy Golofer and its transmission to their son Roger de Knightley. The role played by women in preserving the lord's estates may have been all the more important after his death, given the crucial role they might play as executors of their husbands' estates, ensuring family property passed from one generation of men to the next.<sup>431</sup> Sir Richard IV made provision in his will that Jane should have priority in the dispersal of his goods as his "sole executrice."<sup>432</sup> Through installing his "genealogie" in this position, he may have wished to suggest to Jane the crucial role Dorothy Golofer might have played in ensuring the safe transfer of her husband's estates to her son, Roger. Through encouraging his wife to observe this example of Dorothy Golofer, Sir Richard IV may have intended Jane to contemplate her potential role in ensuring the future prosperity of the Knightleys by ensuring the patrimony passed intact to Sir Edmund, in the event that Sir Richard IV predeceased his wife.

Whilst the oriel's main lights may have been intended to communicate to Jane Skenard her expected role in assisting with the transfer of his lands between generations, the tracery lights may have addressed an audience who held a more direct relationship with the Knightley patrimony. The largest of the oriel's tracery lights, A4, A7, A10 and A13, have shield-shaped profiles (Figure IV.6). If my analysis of the oriel's glazing chronology outlined in Chapter 3 is correct, it would seem Sir Richard IV placed a coat of arms in A4 representing his own marriage at the same time that he commissioned a Knightley "genealogie" for the window's main lights (Figure IV.27).<sup>433</sup> At the same time that Sir Edmund rehoused his parents' glazing showing the Skenard lineage in Fawsley's oriel window, he also appears to have commissioned a shield showing his marriage for tracery light A7 of the oriel window (Figure IV.8 & IV.26).<sup>434</sup> Following Sir Edmund's inability to beget an heir, the hall passed to his younger brother, Sir Valentine, who does not appear to have made additions to the glazing in the oriel window.

Drawing on this chronology of the oriel's tracery glazing, we are able to explore Sir Richard IV's intended audience for this window. Sir Edmund's installation of his own coat of arms into tracery light A7 might suggest Sir Richard IV had initially intended for lights, A7, A10 and A13, to house the coats of arms of his male descendants, thus adding a recent history of the Knightley family beginning with Sir Richard IV's arms in light A4. It would therefore seem Sir Richard IV intentionally designed his oriel to accommodate glazing by future lords of Fawsley.

---

<sup>431</sup> Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 154-60.

<sup>432</sup> TNA PROB 11/25/292.

<sup>433</sup> See 3.5. Case Study: Constructions of Gentry Lordship in the Armorial Glazing of Fawsley Hall.

<sup>434</sup> See 2.3.ii. Female Authorship: The Armorial Glazing of Fawsley Hall.

It would seem likely that during the later medieval period domestic glass was treated as the property of a gentry lord's heir. An account of a court injunction from 1576, detailed in the reports of the lawyer Sir Edward Coke, suggests this had been assumed as a social tradition in English elite culture for some time. The report describes the unlawfulness of a lessee's attempts to regain possession of glazing installed in one of their lessor's houses:

It was adjudged in the Common Pleas, that wast may be committed in glas annexed to windows, for it is parcel of the house, and shall descend as parcel of the inheritance to the heir, and that the executors should not have them.<sup>435</sup>

In light of Coke's report, it seems plausible Sir Richard IV was aware his armorial glass would be inherited by his heir upon his death. At the time Sir Richard IV installed his arms into light A4, it would seem he had installed a form of temporary glazing, most likely white glass into the shield-shaped tracery lights A7, A10 and A13, in order to reserve spaces for his heir and future male descendants to represent themselves. This seems likely given that the Pympe family had used white glass in window V of their church at Nettlestead to reserve spaces for future generations of their family.<sup>436</sup> Through reserving a window light in A7 for Sir Edmund to add his own coat of arms, it seems possible Sir Richard IV wished to enable Sir Edmund to represent himself as heir to Fawsley after inheriting it from his father.

From a position at the hearth, Sir Edmund may have therefore been able to view his father's coat of arms in light A4, and white glass in A7 reserved for him to include his own arms in the sequence upon inheriting Fawsley (compare Figures 4.6 and IV.27). Whilst Sir Richard IV remained lord, these lights may have therefore been intended to inculcate in Edmund, his father's wish for him to remain at Fawsley, in spite of the number of attractive estates contained within his patrimony, as a result of the lands gained through his mother and his wife. By wishing his son to remain at Fawsley, Sir Richard IV appears to have intended for his family to continue to cultivate their historical connection with their manor and thus augment an impression of their gentility within their local community.

---

<sup>435</sup> John Henry Thomas and John Farquhar Fraser, eds., *The Reports of Sir Edward Coke* (London, 1680), 215.

<sup>436</sup> See 2.2.ii. The Will of John Pympe III (d.1496) and Armorial Glazing at St. Mary's, Nettlestead.

From the fireplace, Sir Edmund would have also been able to view A10, which, as described above, was likely also filled with white glass. When planning his armorial sequence for the window, Sir Richard IV likely intended for this light to house the arms of Sir Edmund's heir. By including this shield within Sir Edmund's sightline, Sir Richard IV may have intended for his son to contemplate his father's expectation for him to beget an heir of his own to ensure the family's lasting connection with the manor. Whilst Sir Edmund was unsuccessful in fathering a male heir, his six daughters indicate his continued sexual relationship with Ursula and might suggest the tracery glazing was effective in reminding him of his father's expectation for him to have a male heir.

As I suggested in Chapter 2, it is possible Sir Edmund relocated glazing representing the great extent of the Northamptonshire properties inherited through his mother's line from the south-west windows of the hall to the oriel window. If Sir Edmund rearranged the glazing in such a way, it may have served as a means of distracting viewers from the lack of continuity in his male line that the shields filled with white glass in A10 and A13 might have conveyed.

Due to their shield-shaped profiles, the oriel's tracery lights would have only permitted the representation of future spouses whose families possessed coats of arms. Sir Richard IV's tracery glazing therefore suggests the sequence was intended to instill in his descendants his expectation that they married women whose families were perceived to be of a similar rank to the Knightleys. Through only permitting the representation of women through their family's arms, Sir Richard IV may have additionally intended to increase the chances of his descendants marrying heiresses. Through designing the oriel's tracery lights in this manner, Sir Richard may have therefore sought to prolong not only his family's association with their estate but to increase the size of their patrimony for future generations.

Based on this analysis of the oriel in relation to the fireplace, it would seem Sir Richard IV intended the window to encourage Jane Skenard to recognise her potential role as his executrix and ensure Sir Edmund acquired his estate, in the event that Sir Richard IV died before his wife. In addition, the window appears to have been intended to demonstrate Sir Edmund's duty in prolonging the Knightleys' association with Fawsley and representing this in the tracery glazing. In addition, to continue the family's connection with the manor, Sir Richard IV seems to have intended for his descendants to marry heiresses whose families owned a coat of arms and who were also able to bring land to the family's patrimony.

#### 4.6. Case Study: Exploring Sightlines and Audiences at Athelhampton Hall

Athelhampton's fifteenth-century hall is attached on its south-east side to an arrangement of rooms from the same period that appear to have been used by the manor's servants. The hall also appears to have been attached on its north-west side to a suite of rooms that appear to have served a private, residential function for the Martyns.<sup>437</sup> A possible route through the hall would have been from its entrance at the south corner, through the main body of the hall, to the door leading to the suite of rooms at the hall's north-west corner (Figure 4.7). Along this route, a spectator would have seen the Martyn "alliaunce" in neII (Arrow 1) followed by the Martyn "genealogie" in the hall's oriel window (Arrow 2).

Given the representation of the Martyns' landed neighbours in neII, it is possible the window's author, either Richard or Thomas Martyn, intended to address these men, such as Thomas Faringdon, when they visited Athelhampton. Emery has suggested that the residential rooms attached to the hall's north-west side were comprised of a "solar" and "parlour."<sup>438</sup> However, it is possible, as an adjacent room to the hall, that one of these rooms acted as a "great chamber," in which the lord of Athelhampton could dine with and entertain guests.<sup>439</sup> If visiting the Martyns at Athelhampton, these men would have seen their arms represented alongside the lord of Athelhampton and other landed lords whilst being escorted to the "great chamber." In a similar way to John Noreys' windows at Ockwells, it is possible window neII was therefore intended to reaffirm the lord of Athelhampton's equal status to his landed peers before they encountered him in his private quarters.

Following the construction of Sir William's oriel window, a landed neighbour would have also had Sir William's status reaffirmed to them before encountering the lord of Athelhampton in the "great chamber." The placement of the "genealogie" before the threshold to Sir William's quarters would have therefore emphasised to visitors the history of the Martyns' residence at Athelhampton and the size of Sir William's patrimony as well as his ability to control it. Moreover, Sir William's use of indented shields to frame the arms in the "genealogie" would have also signified his great financial resources given the high price he is likely to have paid for their manufacture.

---

<sup>437</sup> GMHEW 3, 487-9.

<sup>438</sup> GMHEW 3, 489.

<sup>439</sup> Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, 51-2.



Whilst the Martyns would have been acutely aware of the need to impress their landed neighbours, their glazing may have also been intended to assist in the maintenance of their agricultural estate. During the fifteenth century, the Martyns appear to have developed their pasture lands and wider farming enterprises, with a sizeable portion of their livestock being located at Athelhampton.<sup>440</sup> It appears the Martyns principally reared sheep, judging by Sir William's numerous donations of them in his will to local churches at Tolpuddle, Faringdon, Owermoigne and Woodsforde whilst also donating forty rams to his brother Henry.<sup>441</sup>

It seems likely that the Martyns employed a body of servants and agricultural staff to oversee the day-to-day running of their household and farming enterprises. The Martyns would likely have employed a bailiff who oversaw the management of Athelhampton but also their other manors in Dorset and Somerset. Their household also likely included a reeve to audit the manor's accounts. The reeve probably stored these documents in the hall, most plausibly along its north-east wall, away from the fireplace at the north-west end of the hall and the thoroughfare between the hall's entrance and the door to the lord's private rooms (see the route described above in Figure 4.8). Thus upon entering the hall and attending to the manor's accounts the reeve would have seen the Martyns' membership to a group of landowning men (Arrow 1). The sequence would have thus presented their reeve with their lord's membership to an elite group of men in the local area. By positioning their "alliaunce" in this location, it is possible either Richard or Thomas Martyn I intended to exert his male superiority over his reeve in order to remind them of their subordinate position in the household and thus the expectation that they perform their role effectively in service to the lord of Athelhampton. During Sir William's tenure as lord, the reeve might have also seen the Martyn "genealogie" in the oriel window whilst auditing the accounts (Arrow 2). In a similar manner to Sir Richard Knightley IV's "genealogie" at Fawsley, the position of Sir William's sequence within the reeve's line of sight may have intended, through its representation of the Martyns as jousting, to further establish his authority over his servants by suggesting his "prowess" and his ability to reinforce his domestic rule with violence.

---

<sup>440</sup> Sir William donates tools that he describes as being used at Athelhampton for pasture in his will. See 2.2.iii. Male Authorship: A Case Study of Athelhampton Hall.

<sup>441</sup> "[It] lego eccl[es]ie de Tolpedill vj oves /. It[em] lego eccl[es]ie de Affuxedull vj oves /. It[em] lego eccl[es]ie de Tynkelden vj oves /. It[em] lego eccl[es]ie de Werdefford quatuor oves. It[em] lego eccl[es]ie de Faryngdon iiij<sup>or</sup> oves. It[em] lego eccl[es]ie de Ovr[e] Moyne iiij<sup>or</sup> oves ad orand' spe[ciali]t[er] p[ro] a[n]i[m]a mea /." TNA 11/14/123; "[It]e[m] do et lego Henrico Martyn fratri meo xl arietes de gregi." Ibid.

In addition to maintaining a gendered hierarchy in the household, the "alliaunce" may have also been intended to address potential customers visiting Athelhampton to purchase the Martyns' fleeces. Merchants may have travelled from local urban centres such as Salisbury, which appears to have operated as an important hub in the wool trade from the fourteenth century onwards. Its annual Lady Day fair, established during the fifteenth century, saw drapers and merchants travel from London to trade in cloth and wool in the city.<sup>442</sup> There also appears to have been a community of merchants operating out of Poole during the later medieval period, as one can see in surviving domestic architecture.<sup>443</sup> It is possible the Martyns possessed a network of clientele in the town given that the family had owned property there in the early sixteenth century.<sup>444</sup>

Merchants may have entered the hall along the same route taken by the reeve in order to discuss a sale and record their purchase in the manor's accounts. Thus, upon entering the hall, merchants would have been confronted by the Martyn arms in neII showing their connection to other landowners (Figure 4.8, Arrow 1). It is possible, other men in the window also pastured sheep as a means of generating income. For instance, Thomas Faringdon was donated three hundred sheep by his father-in-law.<sup>445</sup> In addition, Sir William also described tools used for pasturing land at Tincton, in a donation to his son, Christopher.<sup>446</sup> Although it is unclear whether the Mohuns, Gages and Pydels were involved in similar ventures, the likelihood of the Faringdons' investment in sheepfarming could suggest the Martyns intended to stress the agricultural proficiency of the group of men represented in window neII. As such, the Martyns may have sought to persuade visiting merchants into buying from them, through suggesting local landed lords operating in the same profession endorsed their products.

Another possible route through the hall would have been from the doorway leading from the private, residential rooms at the north west corner of the hall to the exit to the manor at its south corner. Along this route, the viewer would have seen, in neII, *unmarshalled* coats of arms of his father's peers in the local vicinity (Figure 4.9, Arrow 1). The location of these arms on a route out of the house could suggest either Richard or Thomas I intended to familiarise his heirs with the arms of landed men to whom the Martyns were allied. This display may have been particularly

---

<sup>442</sup> K. H. Rogers, "Salisbury," in *Historic Towns Atlas, Volume 1*, ed. M. D. Lobel (London: Lovell Johns, 1969), 6.

<sup>443</sup> Anonymous, *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset, Volume 2, South East* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1970), 189-240.

<sup>444</sup> IPM 1.3, 242.

<sup>445</sup> Woodger, "Faringdon."

<sup>446</sup> See 2.2.ii. The Will of John Pympe III (d.1496) and Armorial Glazing at St. Mary's, Nettlestead.

aimed at the next Martyn heir to inherit Athelhampton, given their necessity in continuing the father's amicable relationships with the men represented in the window. Through displaying the "alliaunce," the window may have been intended to encourage the viewer to quickly blazon the coats of arms represented in the window as a means of ensuring they would recognise them outside of the family home. The use of the pronouns "HE" and "WE," could suggest either Richard or Thomas I had intended to emphasise to his children that the display represented the Martyns' connection to a larger group of landed men.

Whilst the "alliaunce" may have been aimed at educating young Martyn men in the act of moving through the hall, the placement of the "genealogie" close to the hall's fireplace suggests it may have been intended to address members of the Martyn household whilst they sat by the fire. As established in Chapter 2, the first campaign of glazing in this window saw Sir William commission armorial glass for the first four lights of the oriel window showing the history of the Martyns' residence at Athelhampton, whilst prospectively installing the Martyn arms in the *dexter* sides of the shields in 4e-4h.<sup>447</sup> During the sixteenth century, it then seems that the remaining *sinister* arms in 4e-4h were installed in two campaigns: one comprising the installation of the Cheverel arms in 4e followed by another campaign that saw the installation of the Daubeney, Kelway and Wadham arms in 4f-4h.<sup>448</sup>

After the first campaign of glazing in the oriel window, the shields showing Thomas I's marriage, in 4c, and Sir William's own marriage, in 4d, would have been visible from this position along with two shields in 4e and 4f glazed with the Martyn arms on the *dexter* sides and white glass on the *sinister* sides (compare Figures 4.10 & II.10). It is possible Sir William's mother played a role in securing the transmission of her husband's estate to her son at the death of Thomas Martyn I in 1485. Since Sir William eventually made his second wife, Christina Poulet, his executrix, it seems likely he may have initially intended for his first wife, Isabel, to fulfill this role. As such, this arrangement may have been intended to address Isabel and encourage her to contemplate the important role played by Martyn women in securing the transfer of the Martyn patrimony between generations of men in the family to ensure she effectively fulfilled her duties as his executrix.

Sir William's initial use of white glass on the *sinister* sides of the shields in 4e would suggest he intended Christopher to install glass representing his wife's arms in these lights after inheriting the

---

<sup>447</sup> For an introduction to the appearance of this prospective glazing and its motives see 2.2.iii. Male Authorship: A Case Study of Athelhampton Hall, Dorset.

<sup>448</sup> See Appendix II. Athelhampton Hall, "Stylistic Analysis."

manor's glazing. In doing so, it would appear Sir William intended for his son to represent his identity as lord of Athelhampton, after inheriting the manor from his father. Sir William's intention for his son to inherit and reuse his glazing in this way is paralleled by his bequest of wall hangings from Athelhampton's hall, which he appears to have intended for his son to continue to use in this space.<sup>449</sup> Whilst leaving space for Christopher to represent himself in the oriel window, the use of white glass to fill the *sinister* sides of light 4e would have also presented Sir William's expectation that his heir would continue to reside at Athelhampton. In addition, the inclusion of another shield in 4f containing the Martyn arms with white glass filling its *dexter* side would have emphasised the need for Christopher to acquire a male heir who could inherit Athelhampton and continue to strengthen the family's association with their manor.

In addition to strengthening the Martyns' ties to their estate, the "genealogie" may have also been intended to ensure the family continued to forge bonds with families whom they perceived to be a similar social rank to themselves. Through reserving the *dexter* sides of the shields in lights 4e-4h, Sir William appears to have intended that the future heirs of Athelhampton married a family who owned a coat of arms and therefore most likely possessed land. Through encouraging his descendants to marry a family of such stature, Sir William may have also sought to increase their chances of marrying an heiress and thus continuing to expand the family's patrimony.

#### 4.7. Conclusion

This chapter has examined the gentry lord's placement of armorial glazing within different parts of the hall as a means of gauging its intended audiences. Through an analysis of the glazing from Ockwells Manor and Athelhampton Hall, it would appear gentry lords intended for an "alliaunce" to reaffirm their elite status to their landed neighbours through representing their ties to them and other landowning men, before they encountered the lord in his "great chamber." These displays also appear to have been intended to maintain a male hierarchy within the late medieval household, by exerting the gentry lord's dominance over his reeve who used the hall to transact the business of the estate. Furthermore, due to their representation of other landowners who were likely invested in agriculture, it is possible these glazing sequences were intended to display gentry lords' professional

---

<sup>449</sup> "It[em] do et lego eidem [Christ]ofero tres pecias Saye rubei coloris penden[t'] sup[er] muros aule mei p[re]fat[i] Will[elm]i et Implementu[m]jeiusd[em] aule." TNA PROB 11/14/123; "Saye," according to the Middle English Dictionary was "an esteemed variety of woolen cloth." Anonymous, "Saie n.," Middle English Dictionary, Accessed 25th March 2019, [https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED38273/track?counter=1&search\\_id=589296](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED38273/track?counter=1&search_id=589296).

endorsements to prospective merchant clients. The placement of the glazing at Ockwells and Athelhampton would also suggest an "alliaunce" was intended to enable male children to identify the coats of arms of the gentry lord's landed neighbours when leaving the house.

The examination of the glazing from Fawsley and Athelhampton also suggests gentry lords decided to place their "genealogie" in their oriel window in order to address certain people when moving through the hall. The choice to display a "genealogie" in this position, appears to have been motivated by an intention to impress visiting gentry neighbours before their entrance to the "great chamber" where they would have dined with the lord of the manor. However, the position of these glazing sequences could also reveal an intention to exert the lord's superiority over his reeve, through suggesting his capacity to use violence as a means of exerting his domestic rule. The position of the "genealogie" opposite the hearth at Fawsley and Athelhampton suggests the gentry lord's desire to encourage his wife to contemplate her role in preserving the family patrimony especially between one generation and the next, in her role as his executrix. Whilst seeking to ensure uxorial assistance in the maintenance of the patrimony, these sequences also appear to have been aimed at addressing the gentry lord's heir. At both Fawsley and Athelhampton, prospective glazing sequences appear to have been incorporated into oriel windows to accommodate the representation of their gentry lord's heir. A key function of these series was to reiterate to heirs the importance of continuing to reside at their family homes, despite the attractive prospect of establishing themselves at other manors within their patrimonial lands. Furthermore, the incorporation of additional, prospectively-glazed lights would have been intended to encourage male descendants to recognise the need to produce a male heir of their own in order to ensure the family's continued association with their respective ancestral estates. At Fawsley and Athelhampton, the specific designs of the oriel windows also reinforced the expectation that gentry lords' male descendants would marry women of a similar social status and, in the process, seek to expand the family patrimony.

## Conclusion

This thesis has explored how the domestic armorial glass commissioned by landed families was intended to fashion their identities and social statuses by representing them in relation to later medieval ideas of gentility. The thesis has attempted to uncover the specific intentions behind these sequences by analysing the role of gender in the commissioning of these projects. This conclusion aims to draw together the strands of analysis from the preceding four chapters to give a summary of the intentions underlying gentry domestic glazing.

As demonstrated throughout the thesis, gentry families might commission a “genealogie” to show the history of their residency on their estate as well as to indicate their accumulation of a patrimony over several generations. Judging by the evidence from multiple case studies, gentry lords might commission a “genealogie” to represent their status as the heir of their manor, using a series of *impaled* arms to show a historical connection between their lineage and their lands, as seen at Cotehele House and Beaupré Hall. When gentry lords lacked such a connection, it appears they were prepared to invent this through simplifying representations of their ancestral descent, as suggested through the analysis of Sir William Martyn's "genealogie" in Chapter 2. These displays of patrilineal descent could be used to encourage a gentry lord's wife to recognise her expected role in ensuring the safe transmission of the family patrimony from one generation of men to the next in her role as the lord's executrix.

As another means of representing his heirship, a gentry lord might also request for his glazier to retain cut and leaded glass in the representation of certain arms in his "genealogie" to emphasise his receipt of his family patrimony, as seen in the analysis of the glass from Beaupré Hall and Fawsley Hall in Chapter 3. Through emphasising the receipt of the family patrimony in this way, such displays may have been intended to cover up for a gentry lord's loss of control over his patrimony, brought about through the death of his male heir or his inability to beget one. Through stressing their receipt of the family patrimony, such displays were likely intended to impress one's gentry peers. In the case of Fawsley Hall, the Knightleys' hiring of glaziers who were able to cut and lead glazing at very small scales may have been intended to demonstrate their extensive financial resources as a means of further impressing their peers.

In addition to representing the descent of the family manor, the use of indented shields to frame the arms within a "genealogie" also appears to have been intended to represent the gentry lord's inheritance of the skills required for jousting from his forebears. Through using these shields, it

appears some gentry lords, such as Sir William Martyn and Sir Richard Knightley IV, intended to suggest their "prowess" as jousters and, in doing so, exert their authority over their manorial reeves through implying their ability to enforce their will through violence. In contrast to this more aggressive representation of lordship, it appears men who possessed military experience, such as the Edgcumbes, used a more traditional, militaristic shield type in their "genealogie" to encourage servants' compliance through suggesting their ability to physically protect them. It would appear, however, that some lords, such as Edmund Beaupré, were prepared to fabricate a martial identity for their families through including military shields in their armorial glass, despite lacking personal experience of war. In light of this pretence, it would seem gentry lords' representation of their families as jousters may have been deemed a more convincing means of convincing others that they were able to show the "prowess" expected of socially elite men. As highlighted in Chapter 3, the Martyns and Knightleys, by commissioning glazing with indented shields, may have intended to further impress their gentry peers through commissioning notably expensive armorial glazing.

Whilst representing the gentry lord's connection to his manor and his "prowess" a "genealogie" might also have been intended to represent the great size of his patrimony. As seen in relation to Ockwells Manor and Fawsley Hall, a gentry lord might devise complex arrangements of arms to represent the great extent of his patrimony when the connection between his manor and his lineage came under threat, either due to the lord's decision to move his family's ancestral seat or the premature death of his heir. Displaying the size of one's patrimony in this way appears to have been an attempt by the gentry lord to impress his landed peers, and possibly distract from the instability in his lordship.

A gentry lord's decision to commission a "genealogie" may have also been motivated by his wish to appear as a father figure through preemptively glazing parts of his oriel window, most likely with white glass, for his heir to make later additions, as seen in the example of Sir William Martyn at Athelhampton and Sir Richard Knightley IV at Fawsley. In doing so, it appears such displays may have been intended to impress the gentry lord's peers through suggesting his ability to control the future of the family patrimony. Through preemptively glazing the oriel in this way, a gentry lord may have also intended for his "genealogie" to encourage his male heir to continue to reside at his manor and cultivate his family's relationship with their estate. It would seem, through commissioning such a display, that a gentry lord also intended to remind his heir of the need to beget a son to who would be able to inherit the family patrimony and continue the family's association with their ancestral manor. Through prospectively reserving spaces for coats of arms in the oriel windows at Athelhampton and Fawsley, their respective gentry lords may have attempted

to restrict future male heirs to marrying women of a similar social rank. In doing so, Sir William Martyn and Sir Richard IV may have also sought to increase the chances of male descendants marrying heiresses and thus increasing the size of their patrimonies.

As complementary sequences to a "genealogie," it appears women might have been involved in commissioning series of arms that tracked the inheritance they brought to their husbands' families. For women whose natal kin held a much higher social status than their marital families, it appears they may have contributed to planning these sequences with the intention of retaining a connection to their own ancestors. Although women might benefit from the sequences in this way, they may have equally intended to benefit their husbands, through enabling gentry lords to publicly show the extent of their land holdings acquired through marriage. At Fawsley and Cotehele, it also seems that the mothers of gentry lords may have been involved in the planning stages of domestic glazing. As Chapter 2 examined, women may have consulted their respective sons in relation to the use of armorial glass in their domestic halls and recommended they utilise it to communicate their maternal inheritance. In doing so, these women may have attempted to strengthen their sons' authority during periods in which the relationship between their respective families and manors became unstable.

Gentry lords might also choose to define themselves through commissioning an "alliaunce" showing their connections to other male landowners either in their county or a broader region of the country, such as the south of England. These connections could be demonstrated through using *impaled* arms if the gentry lords' sisters were married to those men represented in the "alliaunce." However at Athelhampton and Ockwells *unmarshalled* arms appear to instead stress the equal status of the men represented in the armorial sequence. It is possible this marshalling form was chosen to highlight a homosocial connection between the gentry lord and his landed brethren, a type of bond that might be further suggested through the appearance of the pronouns "HE" and "WE" in the quarries at Athelhampton. The gentry lord may have intended for his window to reaffirm, the lord's equivalent social status to his landed peers whilst they visited him at his manor. Through displaying his membership to a group of landed men, it appears the gentry lord intended for such displays to reaffirm his superiority over his reeve whilst the latter used the hall to transact the estate's accounts. The representation of the gentry lord's ties to other landowners, who may themselves have profited from agriculture, might have been intended to endorse the gentry lord's wares to merchants who may have visited the manor to purchase fleeces. The placement of the gentry lord's "alliaunce" within the main body of the hall may have been equally intended to



encourage his male children to familiarise themselves with the blazons of his landed peers to enable them to recognise them when outside of the family home.

## Appendix I. Ockwells Manor

### Antiquarian Evidence and Identification of Arms

The following section compares the present arrangement of the windows with the antiquarian evidence for the glass in neI, neII and neIII. The earliest record of these windows is a mid-nineteenth-century watercolour by John Nash, which shows the windows before the renovation of the house undertaken by Edward Barry in the early twentieth century (Figure I.9).

#### Window neI

Nash's illustration includes all six coats of arms in neI in their current positions (for the following compare Figure I.4 with Figure I.9). The arms in neIa are those of Henry Beauchamp, 14th Earl of Warwick.<sup>1</sup> Nash's watercolour suggests that the present appearance of the glass corresponds with its mid-nineteenth century condition. For instance, with reference to the aforementioned window, the watercolour depicts the main vertical lines in the present-day glass, showing the divisions between the nine coats of arms on the shield. The arms in neIb belong to Sir Edmund Beaufort (d.1455).<sup>2</sup> The Beaufort arms appear in Nash's watercolour, where he illustrates the division of the *field* into quarters and the use of blue in the first and fourth quarters of the shield. The third light, neIc, shows the arms of Queen Margaret of Anjou.<sup>3</sup> Nash represents this through red paint and a number of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Impaled arms. Dexter: Quarterly arms.* 1. Beauchamp. DBA 3, 398. Gu a fess betw 6 crosslets Or. Raine-Dunn 2, "c.1420" 2. Clare. DBA 2, 519-20. Or 3 chevrs Gu. Kt. MP Hist Min ii 502. "1245." 3. Newburgh. DBA 2, 273-4. Checky Or and Az chev Erm. NEBURGH. "B 20 "c1255-8." 4. Despencer. DBA 1, 339. Qtly Arg and Gu in 2&3 fret Or bend Sa. Neale & Brayley. "1296." *Sinister: Quarterly arms.* 1. and 4. Montagu. DBA 3, 321. Arg a fess of 3 fusils Gu. FK I, 55. "d 1428." *Sinister* 2. and 3. Mounthermer. DBA 2, 139. Or eagle displ Vt. CK 57 (copy A). (b&l Gu) "temp Edw II". In an escutcheon overall Neville. DBA 4, 359. Gu a salt Arg. BB 115, P5. (d1388). "c.1430."

<sup>2</sup> *Unmarshalled arms.* Beaufort. DBA 4, 41. Az 3 fleurs de lys Or qtg Gu 3 lions pg Or in border gobony Az & Erm, Thos, E of Dorset, KG. (12th stall, Prince's side, St Geo Chapel; d 1426.) "1426."

<sup>3</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter: Quarterly arms.* Arms of Henry VI. The following *quarterly* form of the royal arms were first used by Edward III. 1 and 4. France. DBA 4, 27. Az 3 fleurs de lys Or. FC I, 10. (*qtg Engl, K Edw III sic.*) "c.1412." 2 and 4. England. DBA 1, 287. Gu 3 lions pg Or. LMS 2 "c1310." *Sinister: Quarterly of six.*

1. Hungary. DBA 1, 87. Barry of 6 Arg and Gu. 2. P 15. "1350." 2. Naples. DBA 4, 189. Az semy de lis Or a label Gu. FK I, 33. (imp of Jerusalem.) "1413.", Glass appears without a label *gules*. 3. Unknown. DBA 3, 187. Cross betw 4 crosslets. LMO 31. "c.1420." 4. Anjou. No reference given in DBA. *Azure semy of fleurs-de-lis or a bordure gules*. 5. Bar. DBA 4, 4. Az crusily fitchy 2 barbels addorsed Or. C 30. "c.1275." 6. Loreyne. DBA 2, 10. Or on bend Gu 3 eagles displ Arg. P 36. "1350."

quarterings sketched on the representation of the shield. The arms in the fourth light are those of Sir John De La Pole (d.1491).<sup>4</sup> Nash indicates these in the same window light with lines indicating the quartered appearance of the arms and the colour red, which is used in the arms of Berghersh, with which the arms of De La Pole are quartered. The arms of Henry VI appear in the fifth light of the window.<sup>5</sup> Nash's use of a quartered composition and the use of blue and red paint for the arms of England demonstrates that these arms remained in the same position. The arms in the sixth light are those of Butler, most likely Sir James Butler (d.1462).<sup>6</sup> Nash illustrates their position in the same light, indicated by his use of blue and yellow bands to represent the Butler arms.

### Window swI

Although not included in Nash's illustration, there are two other arms in swI in the hall. The first light (swIa) depicts the arms of The Benedictine Abbey of Berkshire (Figure 1.7).<sup>7</sup> The second and final light in this window (swIb) displays the arms of Richard Beauchamp, Bishop of Salisbury.<sup>8</sup>

### Window neII

Nearly all of the arms in window neII reflect their mid-nineteenth century positions (see Figures I.5 & I.9). The arms in the first light show Noreys' marriage to his second wife, Eleanor Clitherow, with the *impaled* arms of Noreys on the *dexter* and the quartered arms of Clitherow and Oldcastle on the right.<sup>9</sup> This is represented in Nash's picture, with the distinctive *chevron* on the *dexter* side of

<sup>4</sup> *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. De La Pole. DBA 3, 422. Az a fess betw 3 leopard's [sic] faces Or. BG 106. "c.1395." 2 and 3. Burghersh. DBA 3, 24. Arg chf Gu over all lion qf Or. Primary source, Kidlington, Oxf. "15 cent."

<sup>5</sup> *Quarterly* arms. Arms of Henry VI. As in footnote 15. France and England Quarterly.

<sup>6</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Butler. DBA 3, 291. Per fess dancetty Az & Or. Earliest reference in DBA is to Ockwells Manor glass. An earlier variant of the arms is given at DBA 3, 291. Per fess indented Arg & Az. LMO 53. (4th E of Ormonde succ 1405 d 1452.) "c.1420."

<sup>7</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Abingdon Abbey. DBA 3, 181. Arg cross patonce betw 4 martlets Sa. Birch 2545. Seal of John Sante (d.1496). "1496."

<sup>8</sup> *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Beauchamp. DBA 3, 376. Gu a fess betw 6 martlets Or.

I 5. "c.1310" 2. De La Mare. DBA 1, 264. Gu 2 lions pg Arg. AN 315. "c1360."

3. Roche. DBA 4, 11. Az 3 roach naiant in pale Arg. Earliest reference in DBA is to Ockwells Manor glass. Earlier variant at DBA 4, 11. Gu 3 roach naiant in pale Arg. ROCHE, Sir John, of Herfordiae. CV-BM 129. "c.1350."

<sup>9</sup> *Impaled* Arms. *Dexter*: Noreys. DBA 2, 373. Arg chev betw 3 raven's heads erased Sa. No recorded use of arms before its appearance at Ockwells.

*Sinister*: *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Clitherow. DBA 3, 248. Arg 3 covered cups Sa. L1 144, 1.

"1308." 2 and 3. Oldcastle. DBA 2, 247. Sa castle with 3 towers Arg gateway open & barred with chain portcullis raised Or. No direct match before their appearance at Ockwells Manor but an earlier

the escutcheon and the otters as supporters to the achievement. The *sinister* side of this escutcheon is less distinct, although a small line suggesting an arch indicates the arms of Oldcastle, which feature in the glass' present appearance. The arms in the second light belong to Sir John Wenlock (d.1471).<sup>10</sup> The illustration is missing the lower half of the shield below, but a few lines above the helmet suggest the profile and headband of Nash's crest, a saracen's head, suggesting the position of the current arms matches their position in the nineteenth century. The arms in the third light might represent Sir William Lacon (d.1471), although they do not appear to have been part of the initial arrangement in this window.<sup>11</sup> Nash's illustration of the third light (neIIc) in this window suggests that the mid-nineteenth century glass is different from its present appearance, which shows the arms of Lacon. The *azure field* of the present coat of arms is not suggested in Nash's painting, in which the use of blue suggests only the presence of the mantling that survives in the window. On the contrary, Nash uses the colour red, which appears nowhere in the present glass of this light. The glass may have initially been placed elsewhere in Ockwells Manor and then moved to the present location after Nash made his watercolour. The arms in the fourth light belong to Mortimer.<sup>12</sup> Nash's image, which illustrates their position through the use of yellow and blue, corresponds with the appearance of the arms currently in this window light. The fifth light in the window shows the arms of Sir Richard Nanfan (d.1507).<sup>13</sup> Nash's painting depicts its position in the nineteenth century through his inclusion of blue horizontal lines.

### Window neIII

Nash's illustration of the glass in neIII suggests that the majority of surviving glass in the window reflects its mid-nineteenth-century location (for the following compare Figure I.6 with I.9). The coat

---

variant is DBA 2, 247. Sa castle with 3 towers Arg gate Sa with steps Or leading to it. BG 53. "c1395."

<sup>10</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Wenlock. DBA. 2, 375. Arg chev Sa betw 3 saracen's heads erased Ppr wreathed around the temples Arg. Earliest occurrence at Ockwells Manor but there is another variant form from the fifteenth century. DBA 2, 375. Chev betw 3 blackmoor's heads. Birch 5484. "15 cent."

<sup>11</sup> *Unmarshalled* Arms. Lacon. DBA 4, 44. Az 5 fleurs de lys Or. Earliest occurrence is at Ockwells Manor.

<sup>12</sup> *Unmarshalled* Arms. Mortimer. DBA. 1, 104. Barry chf paly corners gyronny Az and Or escutch Erm. G 155 "c1282."

<sup>13</sup> *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Nanfan. DBA. 2, 486. Sa on chev betw 3 dex falcon's wings Arg cross botonny betw 4 erm spots Sa. Ockwells Manor is the earliest occurrence of these arms. A slightly earlier variant is DBA 2, 403. Sa chev Erm betw 3 wings Arg. FK II 755. "1413." 2 and 3. Penpons. DBA 1, 296. Arg 3 wolves passt Az. BA 958. "c1465-90." A slightly earlier variant is DBA 1, 296. Arg 3 wolves passt Sa each couped paleways & the 2 halves separated by roundels Or. ML I 528. "c1450."

of arms drawn in the first light of the window shows Noreys' marriage to his first wife, Alice Merbrooke, with Noreys' arms *impaled* on the *dexter* and the Merbrooke arms on the *sinister* side.<sup>14</sup> Although Nash's illustration is unclear in places, it is possible to distinguish aspects of the Noreys achievement such as, again, of the supporting otters and an outline of the *chevron* on the Noreys arms. The arms in the second light (neIIIb) can clearly be identified as the arms of Langford, mostly likely Edward Langford.<sup>15</sup> These arms were in this light in the mid-nineteenth century, as indicated through Nash's inclusion of the blue chief and red to indicate the *paly field*. The arms in the third light of the window show an unidentifiable coat of arms.<sup>16</sup> Nash's painting only very vaguely illustrates the arms in the third light of the window (neIIIc), providing little evidence for comparison with the present day glass. The fourth coat of arms are those of Purye, most likely Sir John Purye (d.?).<sup>17</sup> These arms are indicated in Nash's watercolour through the use of red and the appearance of a *chevron*. The fifth coat of arms in the window are those of Bulstrode, most likely Sir Richard Bulstrode (d.?).<sup>18</sup> Nash's painting indicates the Bulstrode arms were in their current position in the nineteenth century, due to his use of blue paint to show its *sable field* (the use of black to represent *sable* would have, presumably, been aesthetically unappealing in Nash's watercolour) and the use of red paint to represent the tincture *gules* in the Choppingdon arms, with which the Bulstrode arms are quartered.

---

<sup>14</sup> Impaled arms. *Dexter*. Noreys. For Noreys' arms see footnote 9 above. *Sinister*: *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Merbrooke. DBA 2, 194-5. Bendy Or and Az border Gu. Ockwells Manor is the earliest instance of these arms but a later example confirms they were identified as Merbrooke in at least the sixteenth century. DBA 2, 195. Arch Journ Ixxxvi 67. "c1530." 2 and 3. Unidentifiable arms (Braundeston or Wake?). DBA 1, 46. Or 2 bars Gu bend Az.

<sup>15</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Langford. DBA. 3, 35. Paly Arg & Gu on chf Az lion passt Or. O 112. "1322."

<sup>16</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Unidentifiable Arms. DBA. 1, 322. Arg bend Gu. Multiple families given.

<sup>17</sup> *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Pureye. DBA 3, 487. Arg on a fess betw 3 martlets Sa 3 pd mullets Arg. Earliest reference is that at Ockwells Manor. 2 and 3. Unidentifiable arms. DBA 2, 303. Gu chev Or betw 3 cocks Sa. Earliest instance is at Ockwells Manor.

<sup>18</sup> *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Bulstrode. DBA. 4, 139. Sa buck's head cab Arg mane & attires Or pd through the nostrils with an arrow fesswise Or feathered Arg & in chf cross formy fitchy Or. Earliest example given is Ockwells Manor. A variant appearing c.1470 is at DBA 4, 139. Sa stag's head cab & in chf cross formy fitchy untinc. LO 5 B. "c1470." 2 and 3. Choppingdon. DBA 2, 297. Arg chev Gu bet 3 squirrels sejt erect Sa. Earliest occurrence is at Ockwells Manor. A later variant is DBA 2, 296. Chev betw 3 squirrels sejt erect. Mill Steph. 1517. (qtd 3 by Bulstrode; brass, Upton, Bucks, to Edw Bulstrode & 3 wives). "1517."

## Stylistic Analysis

Due to Ockwells Manor being in private ownership, I have been unable to access the building and have had to rely on photographs provided to me. Scholars who have been able to access the building, such as Richard Marks, have attributed the glazing to the fifteenth century.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 95-7.

## Appendix II. Athelhampton Hall

### Antiquarian Evidence and Identification of Arms

The earliest known record of Athelhampton's glass is its entry in the county survey of Dorset by John Hutchins, first published in 1774.<sup>1</sup> Hutchins only gives a partial account of some of the hall's glazing and appears to have been selective in his description, seeming to omit accounting for the positions of arms if they were unfamiliar to him or if he had already described them elsewhere in the hall. The third edition of the survey also adds further detail in places.

Window neI appears to contain postmedieval armorial glazing which cannot be identified with DBA (Figure II.4). Hutchins does not mention this glass and its stylistic qualities are immediately suggestive of a nineteenth-century commission.

Most of the arms in windows neII, swI and the oriel window can be identified through reference to DBA, or if not Hutchins blazons and identifies them in a way which suggests they may have been familiar to him in other medieval examples throughout Dorset. In window neII (Figure II.5), the first light, neIIa, currently shows the arms of Faringdon which Hutchins records in the window.<sup>2</sup> Window light neIIb contains the arms of Martyn which Hutchins also records here. The use of the Martyn arms is recorded as early as the fourteenth century.<sup>3</sup> The arms currently in light neIIc are not mentioned in the first edition of Hutchins, but the third edition states that "the arms destroyed, but the crest a ram argent, horned or, remains."<sup>4</sup> The editor of the third edition's use of the term, "destroyed", does not necessarily mean that the current arms were not there but rather they thought those in place were not original to the window and therefore not worth describing in detail. Its use of "destroyed" in this sense is demonstrated through its account of the glass in window swI.<sup>5</sup> They

---

<sup>1</sup> Albert H. Smith, "John Nichols and Hutchins's History and Antiquities of Dorset," *The Library, Fifth Series* 15.2 (June, 1960): 81-95.

<sup>2</sup> *Unmarshalled arms. Or on a bend sable three unicorns passant argent.* Hutchins verifies this: "In the E[ast]. Window 1. O[r]. on a bend Sa[ble]. 3 unicorns passant, A[rgent]. Crest, an unicorn of the field. Faringdon." H1, 473.

<sup>3</sup> *Unmarshalled arms. Martyn. DBA, 1, 17. Arg 2 bars Gu. AS 95. "c1331."* Hutchins verifies these, "2. A[rgent]. 2 bars G[ules]. Crest, a monkey or martin seiant, A[rgent]. chained round the neck, O[r]. Martin." H1, 473.

<sup>4</sup> H3, 588.

<sup>5</sup> The account of window swI describes the arms therein as "destroyed" but then mentions the names of those represented by arms in that same window. It states "the arms in the second window are all destroyed. There remains only some portion of the mantling and helmets, and in one light an escallop gules, probably part of the arms of Clevedon; in another light, Kellaway." H3, 588.

can be identified with the Mohun family, who owned Dunster Castle in Somerset until the late fourteenth century, after which they dispersed into several cadet branches.<sup>6</sup> Perhaps the family's origins in Somerset meant Hutchins and his later editors considered them to be of little value for inclusion in their surveys of Dorset or their unfamiliarity may have given the impression they were a later addition to the glazing. The arms in neIIId belonged to Pydel which are described here by Hutchins in his account of the hall's glass. Although these arms do not appear in DBA, they do appear later in sixteenth-century examples.<sup>7</sup>

In his description of window swI, Hutchins gives a sporadic description of its glazing only mentioning one, unidentifiable coat of arms which is now lost.<sup>8</sup> He does not mention the arms in the first light, swIa, which are also unidentifiable.<sup>9</sup> Hutchins makes reference in his description of Athelhampton's glazing to a seventeenth-century manuscript in the British Museum which listed other arms appearing in the manor.<sup>10</sup> He does not mention the appearance of the Loundres family, in the second light of this window, swIb, yet he does mention that the British Museum manuscript recorded these arms in the manor and as such provides a blazon for them, suggesting they may have been familiar to him in other contexts.<sup>11</sup> Hutchins does not mention the arms of Clevedon, which were recorded in prior usage as early as the fourteenth century.<sup>12</sup> Nor does he mention the arms of Kelway in window light swId.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Mohun. DBA 4, 225. Gu a maunch Erm isst therefrom a hand & arm. Wm. Arch Journ, XXXVII, 80. "1257."; For the history of the Mohuns of Dunster see, Maxwell-Lyte, "Dunster," 90-3.

<sup>7</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Pydel. DBA 4, 169. Qtly Arg & Sa 4 bird's heads erased conterch. Gerard. "1633." Athelhampton appears to be the earliest reference. "3. Quarterly, A[rgent]. and Sa[ble]. 4 hawks heads erased, counterchanged. Crest, an hawk's head erased, A[rgent]. De Piddle." H1, 473; Pydel. DBA, 4, 169. Qtly Arg & Sa 4 bird's heads erased conterch. Gerard. "1633."

<sup>8</sup> He mentions an unidentifiable coat of arms: "In the W[est]. Window. Barry G[ules]. and Erm[ine]. in chief, a demi-lion rampant O[r]." H1, 473.

<sup>9</sup> Its blazon is *paly gules and ermine a lion passant guardant argent*.

<sup>10</sup> "A MS. in the British Museum mentions other arms here 1600, particularly Loundres per pale A[rgent]. and S[able]. a chevron counterchanged, G[ules] and O[r] Crest, a peacock. Clavedon. A[rgent] 3 escallops, G[ules]. Crest, a phoenix, O[r]. vulning herself." H1, 473. I have spent many hours trying in vain to locate this MS in the British Library which inherited all of the British Museum's topographical manuscripts, compiling them in the Additional Manuscripts collection: Anonymous, "Museum Libraries and Archives," The British Museum, Accessed 23rd March 2019. [https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/libraries\\_and\\_archives.aspx](https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/libraries_and_archives.aspx).

<sup>11</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Loundres. Hutchins gives blazon for Loundres. See footnote 10.

<sup>12</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Clevedon. DBA 3, 257. Arg 3 escallops Gu. AN 309, "c1360."

<sup>13</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Kelway. DBA 4, 440. Arg 2 glaziers' nippers in salt Sa betw 4 pears Gu in border engr Sa. XX 112. "temp Hen VIII."



The eight shields in the oriel window (Figure II.9) displaying the patrilineal descent of the Martyn family are not mentioned by Hutchins in his account of the hall. However, the recorded use of many of these arms during the medieval period suggests it was commissioned during this period. The first light (4a) contains the arms of Martyn *impaling* Loundres, signifying the marriage of Sir Robert Martyn I (d.1375) to Agnes Loundres.<sup>14</sup> The second light (4b) contains the arms of Martyn *impaling* Pydel, indicating the marriage of Richard Martyn to Elizabeth Pydel.<sup>15</sup> The third light (4c) displays the arms of Thomas Martyn I *impaling* Clevedon (4d), referring to the marriage of Thomas Martyn (d.1485) to Iseult Clevedon.<sup>16</sup> The fourth light (4d) exhibits the arms of Sir William Martyn (d.1504) *impaling* Faringdon, representing the marriage of Sir William Martyn (d.1504) to Isobel Faringdon.<sup>17</sup> The fifth light (4e) contains the arms of Martyn *impaling* Cheverel, indicating the marriage of Christopher Martyn (d.1526) to Christian Cheverel. DBA lists other instances of the Cheverel arms from this period suggesting the glass to be late medieval.<sup>18</sup> The sixth light (4f) shows the arms of Martyn *impaling* Daubeney, indicating the marriage of Thomas II to Mary Daubeney. DBA gives instances of the Daubeney arms from the fourteenth century, suggesting this glass could be part of the window's original glazing.<sup>19</sup> The seventh light (4g) houses the arms of Martyn *impaling* Kelway, referring to the marriage of Robert Martyn II (d.1550) and Elizabeth Kelway.<sup>20</sup> The eighth light (4h) displays the arms of Martyn *impaling* Wadham, indicating the marriage of Nicholas Martyn (d.1595) and Margaret Wadham. DBA identifies other uses of the Wadham arms from this period suggesting their use here to be from the sixteenth century.<sup>21</sup>

### Stylistic Analysis

The following discussion addresses features of the glass which are not dictated by armorial convention, but are the result of glaziers' artistic license. These artistic embellishments by glaziers

---

<sup>14</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter:* Martyn. See footnote 3. *Sinister:* Loundres. Hutchins gives the blazon for Loundres, see footnote 10.

<sup>15</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter:* Martyn. See footnote 3. *Sinister:* Pydel. Hutchins gives the blazon for Pydel, see footnote 7.

<sup>16</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter:* Martyn. See footnote 3. *Sinister:* Clevedon. Hutchins gives the blazon for Clevedon and for its DBA reference see footnote 12.

<sup>17</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter:* Martyn. See footnote 3. *Sinister:* Faringdon. Hutchins gives the blazon for Faringdon, see footnote 2.

<sup>18</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter:* Martyn. See footnote 3. *Sinister:* Cheverel. DBA 4, 413. Arg on a salt Az 5 bougets Or & chf Gu. L10 94, 2. (qr 1 of 6.) "c.1520."

<sup>19</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter:* Martyn. See footnote 3. *Sinister:* Daubeney. A variant without the crescent is given in DBA 3, 324. Gu a fess of 4 fusils Arg AN 43. "c1360."

<sup>20</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter:* Martyn. See footnote 3. *Sinister:* Kelway. See footnote 13.

<sup>21</sup> *Impaled Arms. Dexter:* Martyn. See footnote 3. *Sinister:* Wadham. DBA 2, 343. Gu chev betw 3 roses Arg. WK 440. "temp. Hen VII."

assist in attributing dates to different parts of Athelhampton's glazing. The following section describes the different stylistic features of the glass painting, specifically diapering, and links them to other contemporary examples.

The armorial glass in window neII bears stark resemblances to early fifteenth-century glass from the south-west region of England. In particular, the circular diapering method used in some of the coats of arms, such as those of Faringdon (neIIa) and Martyn (neIIb), is relatable to other examples from this time and region (Figure II.11). Kerry Ayre has dated glazing using this same circular diapering method to the early fifteenth century, specifically an image of the Agnus Dei painted in stained glass in the church of St. Vigor in Stratton on the Fosse, Somerset (Figure II.12).<sup>22</sup> Although Hutchins does not mention the arms of Mohun in the glazing sequence they appear to be stylistically coherent with the other fifteenth-century glass in the window. The same thick black outlines and curvilinear method of painting body parts are used to render both the hand emerging from the *maunch* on the arms of Mohun and the hawks' heads as seen on the arms of Pydel. This similarity in style suggests that the arms of Mohun are contemporary with the other glass in the window, despite having been likely moved from the original glazing sequence in window swI.

This present glass in window swI appears to be a mixture of glass from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries with some additions which appear later still. Due to the extent of later interventions into this window it would be too conjectural to include its glazing in the analysis conducted in the main thesis text.

Some of the glass in the oriel window also features this circular diapering method seen in window neII, suggesting some parts of it were glazed in the fifteenth century. For instance, all of the Martyn arms that appear on the *dexter* side of each shield are rendered with this circular diapering method (Figure II.14). In addition, the *fields* in the arms of Elizabeth Pydel and Isobel Faringdon in the oriel window are also rendered with this circular diapering pattern, suggesting that they too were made in the fifteenth century (see images of lights 4b and 4d in Figure II.14).

The stylistic qualities of other parts of the oriel suggests it contains glass from two other glazing campaigns. The arms of Christian Cheverel, wife of Christopher Martyn (d.1526), in 4e are made with a slightly different diapering pattern to the one seen before, made up of double circles (Figure II.15). This type of diapering is featured in other late fifteenth-century glazing from Midlands

---

<sup>22</sup> Kerry Ayre, *Medieval English Figurative Roundels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 124.

glazing workshops, such as a panel from Stanford church in Northamptonshire showing birds intended to represent Thomas Morton, vicar of the church, who served in this role 1472-86 (Figure II.16).<sup>23</sup> This is not to suggest that the Martyns used glaziers from Northamptonshire, but that the arms of Cheverel were rendered by a glazing studio which might have been in possession of a similar pattern book to those operating in Northamptonshire during this period.

Other coats of arms in this window representing Mary Daubeney in 4f and Margaret Wadham in 4h use a design which appears to be based on a late fifteenth-century leaf diapering pattern (see 4f and 4h in Figure II.14). This leaf diapering design is represented in examples like the stork rebus from Lincolnshire, which Kerry Ayre dates to the late fifteenth century (Figure II.17).<sup>24</sup> However, the arms of Daubeney and Wadham were clearly installed in the sixteenth century, given the chronology of these marriages in the Martyn male line. This could, however, suggest that the Martyns used glaziers who continued to use diapering patterns which had been in use since the fifteenth century.

There are some diapering patterns such as those used for the coats of arms of Agnes Loundres (4a), Elizabeth Clevedon (4c) and Elizabeth Kelway (4g) for which I have been unable to find stylistic parallels. This may be because the pieces of glass used to represent these arms are postmedieval repairs to the window or they may have been the work of a local, small-scale glazing studio with no surviving examples of work to which these might be compared.

Taking these likely postmedieval repairs into account, it would seem all of the glass in lights 4a-4d along with all of the Martyn arms in 4e-4h was installed in a single campaign. It would seem that the arms of Cheverell were then inserted into light 4e in a subsequent campaign. Finally, it would seem all three of the *sinister* arms in lights 4f-4h were initially installed in a single campaign, given the stylistic homogeneity between the arms of Daubeney and Wadham.

---

<sup>23</sup> Ayre, *Medieval English*, 96.

<sup>24</sup> Ayre, *Medieval English*, 70.

### Appendix III. Cotehele House

#### Antiquarian Evidence and Identification of Arms

F.V.J. Arundell compiled the earliest known description of the glass in the hall in 1840 as an accompaniment to a series of watercolours made of the hall by the antiquarian Nicholas Condy. His account of the hall's glass demonstrates that much of the glass is in the same position as when he observed it, suggesting some of it may reflect its original position.<sup>1</sup>

The two arms in nII begin the patrilineal descent of the Edgcumbes through Peter Edgcumbe's marriage to Elizabeth Holland, represented in light nIIa (Figure III.4).<sup>2</sup> The second light, nIIb, shows the arms of Sir Richard Edgcumbe's marriage to Joan Tremayne.<sup>3</sup> Arundell describes both of these arms as being in these positions in his account.<sup>4</sup> The two arms in nI describe the marital associations of Sir Richard's son, Sir Peter II. The shield in nIa represents the marriage of Sir Peter II to Joan Durnford (Figure III.5).<sup>5</sup> The shield in nIb shows a marriage from the ancestry of Joan Durnford, possibly those of her parents, James Durnford and Joan Cole, although a cross-reference cannot be found to verify the arms of the latter. They may have belonged to a former wife of James Durnford who later died, as Arundell identifies them as belonging to Radigund Cotterell, daughter of Nicholas Cotterell, although I have been unable to cross-reference this with any historical record. Again, Arundell verifies the current position of these arms in his survey of the hall.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas Condy and F.V.J. Arundell, *Cotehele on the Banks of the Tamar* (London: Nicolas Condy, 1840), unpaginated.

<sup>2</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Edgcumbe. DBA 2, 98. On bend cotised 3 heads (boar's) Gu on bend Sa (sic) cotised Or 3 boar's heads coupé Arg. PLN 2051. "1480-1500." However, a much earlier but slightly altered coat of arms is DBA 2, 98. Gu on bend Ermines cotised Or 3 boar's heads coupé Arg. I2 [1904], 166. "c1310." *Sinister*: Holland. There are no references to a tinctured version of the Holland arms but there is an earlier example on a seal. DBA, 1, 228. Lion gard betw 6 fleurs de lis. Birch 11403. "1387."

<sup>3</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Edgcumbe. See footnote 2. *Sinister*: Tremayne. DBA 2, 333. Or Chev betw 3 escallops Az. XV II 41. "c1525."

<sup>4</sup> "Earliest in order of time are those in the north window, the first being, Gules, on a bend ermine, between two cottises or, three boars' heads coupé, argent, the arms of Edgecomb. In the same window are the arms of Edgecomb, impaled with or, a chevron between three escallops, azure, usually called the arms of Tremaine..." Condy and Arundell, *Cotehele*, unpaginated.

<sup>5</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Edgcumbe. See footnote 2. *Sinister*: Durnford. DBA 4, 134. 1 sheep's face. WB III 116b, 3. "15 cent."

<sup>6</sup> "In the next window is the impalement of Edgecombe with Dernford: sable, a ram's head argent, the horns or, Sir Piers Edgecombe, K.B. and Banneret, having married Jane, the heiress of Dernford of East Stonehouse. In the second light of this window is the impalement of Dernford, with, argent, a bend nebuly sable, Cotterell, for Stephen Dernford married Radigund, daughter of Nicholas Cotterell." Condy and Arundell, *Cotehele*, unpaginated.

Some of the window lights on the south side of the hall exhibit the arms of local men who married Sir Peter II's sisters. In Window sI, the first window on the south-western side of the hall, there are the arms of Trevanion impaling Edgcumbe in light sIa, indicating the marriage of Sir William Trevanion to Agnes Edgcumbe (Figure III.6).<sup>7</sup> In sIb of the window, the escutcheon contains the arms of Raleigh impaling Edgcumbe, illustrating the marriage of Elizabeth Edgcumbe to Wymond Raleigh.<sup>8</sup>

Arundell records these arms here in 1840 but states they were the other way around, with Raleigh impaling Edgcumbe in sIa and Trevanion impaling Edgcumbe in sIb.<sup>9</sup> Window sII, the second window on the south side of the hall, is positioned over the hall's entrance (Figure III.7). In its first light (sIIa) are the arms of Tremayne impaling Carew, showing the marriage of Sir Peter II's maternal grandparents.<sup>10</sup> In the second light (sIIb) of this window the escutcheon features an unusual combination of three coats of arms relating to the marriage of William St. Maur to Margaret Edgcumbe. On the *sinister* side are the arms of Edgcumbe, whilst on the *dexter* side of the shield there are two coats of arms, one of which can be identified as St. Maur, whilst the other cannot be identified.<sup>11</sup> Arundell recorded both of these arms as being in these positions. He notes that the shield of St. Maur is "repairing", which might suggest it was in a state of disrepair when he saw it.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Trevanion. DBA 3, 490. Arg on a fess Az betw 2 chevs Gu 3 escallops Or. AN 316. "c.1360." *Sinister*: Edgcumbe. See footnote 2.

<sup>8</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Raleigh. There is no direct match No direct match but a variant is DBA 1, 357. Gu bend lozy of 5 Arg. BA 1283. "c1465-90." *Sinister*: Edgcumbe. See footnote 2.

<sup>9</sup> "On the south side of the hall, we have first an impalement of Raleigh with Edgecombe, gules, four fusils in bend argent, a label, azure. Walter Raleigh, grandfather of Sir Walter, married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Richard Edgecumbe, Henry VII.'s comptroller and favourite. In the second light of this window is the impalement of Trevanion and Edgecomb: argent, on a fess azure, three escallop shells or, between two chevrons, gules, Sir William Trevanion having married Anne, another daughter of Sir Richard." Condy and Arundell, *Cotehele*, unpaginated.

<sup>10</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Tremayne. See footnote 3. *Sinister*: Carew. DBA 1, 284. Or 3 lions passst Sa. CG 467. "1340."

<sup>11</sup> *Impaled* arms. There is an unusual marshalling form used on the *dexter* side where there is a division along the fess line of the shield. The first coat of arms above this is St. Maur. DBA 2, 504. Arg 2 chevs Gu label Vt. AS 147. "c1331." I have been unable to draw a link between the St. Maur line and the Lovell male line who seem to have used this coat of arms. DBA 1, 146. Or crusily botonny lion Az. CT 135. "15 cent." *Sinister*: the version of Edgcumbe arms used here is the older form with an ermines bend dated to "c1310." See footnote 2 for further details.

<sup>12</sup> "In the second window, are the arms of Tremaine – that is, Trenchard – impaled with Carew of Antony, or, three lions passant in pale, sable, armed gules... The shields belonging to the second light of the second window are at present repairing. Argent, two chevrons gules, with a label azure, the arms of St. Maur, impaling Edgecumbe." Condy and Arundell, *Cotehele*, unpaginated.

In window sIII, the first light, sIIIa, shows the arms of Courtenay (Figure III.8).<sup>13</sup> The second light in the window, contains a shield showing an unusual arrangement of arms. The *sinister* arms on the shield are unidentifiable, whilst on the *dexter* side the field is divided along the fess line to incorporate two charges, like that used in relation to the arms of St. Maur in sIIb. The upper coat of arms is missing, whilst the lower coat of arms shows the arms of Bigbury.<sup>14</sup> In his account, Arundell mentions that both of these arms were in these window lights.<sup>15</sup>

The Bay window contains a royal coat of arms, although this is painted in a distinctively later style to the other arms in the hall (Figure III.9).

### Stylistic Analysis

Iterations of three different glazing projects are suggested by stylistic differences in the rendering of the arms of Edgcumbe (*gules on a bend sable cotised or three boar's heads couped argent*), the most frequently occurring arms in the glazing of Cotehele House. The analysis assumes that facial features are a reliable indicator of a particular glazier's style and therefore a means of distinguishing the different glazing campaigns at Cotehele. Dating the glass to the mid fifteenth century and the early sixteenth centuries is supported by numerous stylistic parallels with other glass in Cornwall from this period of time.

A distinctive method for representing eyes in the arms of Edgcumbe and Durnford in the shields in nIb, nIIa and nIIb demonstrates the first identifiable glazing sequence (hereafter Sequence 1). In each instance, the eyes of the boars in the Edgcumbe arms and the rams in the Durnford arms are

---

<sup>13</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Courtenay. DBA 4, 341. Or 3 roundels Gu & label Az. AN 27. "c.1360."

<sup>14</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: There is an unusual marshalling form used on the *dexter* side of this shield, identical to that in sIIb, where one coat of arms, now lost, appears to have been accommodated above a division at the fess line. A second coat of arms below the fess line still survives, representing Bigbury. DBA 2, 136. Az eagle displ Or. PO 323. "c1350." *Sinister*: Trutt. DBA 2, 316. Arg chev Sa betw 3 round buckles Or (sic). WB III 116b, 4. "c1480." I have been unable to find an association between Bigbury and Trutt.

<sup>15</sup> "Sir William St. Maur married Margaret, daughter of Sir Richard Edgecombe, the builder of Cothele, who was also married to Sir William Courtenay, of Powderham, commonly called the Great, whose arms are in the third window (first light.) Courtenay: or, three torteaux, with a file, the labels azure, bezanty. In the second light of the third window, is, quarterly – the first gone, but probably Durnford, because the second is Bigbury – azure, an eagle displayed, or; and the third, Fitzwalter, argent, a chevron sable, between three round buckles, or. James Durnford married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir William Bigbury, afterwards remarried to Thomas Arundell of Talvern." Condry and Arundell, *Cotehele*, unpaginated.

represented with black circles surrounded by encompassing grey circles (Figure III.11). This method of representing eyes also appears in the mid-fifteenth-century glazing of St. Winnow, in the donor portrait of William Kayle (Figure III.12). This method is also represented in the rendering of the eyes of St. Anne (Figure III.13) in Cotehele's Chapel glazing, which Richard Marks has attributed to the later fifteenth century.<sup>16</sup> Based on these observations, it would seem that all of the shields showing the Edgcumbe ancestry in nIIa, nIIb and nIa formed part of Sequence 1. Within this sequence can be included the shield possibly showing the marriage of James Durnford in nIb. Given their respective relevance to the Edgcumbe and Durnford ancestral lines, it seems most likely that the shields showing the marriage of Joan Tremayne's parents in sIIa and the shield from the ancestry of Elizabeth Bigbury, in sIIIb, also formed part of this commission.

A second glazing sequence (hereafter Sequence 2) is suggested by the appearance of the Edgcumbe arms in light sIIb. In this window, the coat of arms representing Margaret Edgcumbe is made with an alternate blazon: *gules on a bend ermines cotised or three boars' heads argent*.<sup>17</sup> This rendition of the Edgcumbe arms is unlike any other used in the hall, yet its use by the family is recorded in the fourteenth century.<sup>18</sup> Some elements of the arms are similar to those in Sequence 1, such as the execution of the eyes through the use of black pupils surrounded by an iris, suggesting a wish to achieve a degree of stylistic homogeneity. Yet there are numerous features of the boars' heads that suggest they are part of a different campaign and possibly a different hand, for instance, each head has rounded cheeks with an extruded tongue (Figure III.14).

A third style (hereafter Sequence 3) is used in the shields displaying the marriages of Sir William Trevanion to Agnes Edgcumbe (sIa) and Wymond Raleigh (sIb) to Elizabeth Edgcumbe (Figure III.15). In these shields, the boars' eyes are represented through a simpler means of a brow and a black pupil without a surrounding iris, unlike in Sequence 1.

The earliest shield in the Edgcumbe ancestry, which depicts the marriage of Peter Edgcumbe and Elizabeth Holland, is made with a combination of the first two styles. The eyes used for the *lion rampant* in the arms of Holland (*azure a lion rampant between six fleur-de-lys argent*) follow the style outlined in Sequence 1 with a black pupil surrounded by an iris (Figure III.16).<sup>19</sup> However, the eyes of those used for the *boars' heads* in the Edgcumbe arms look similar to those in Sequence 3,

---

<sup>16</sup> Marks, *Stained Glass*, 96.

<sup>17</sup> See footnote 2.

<sup>18</sup> See footnote 2.

<sup>19</sup> See footnote 2.

characterised by its sharp brow and pupil. The simplest conclusion would be that the shield displaying the marriage of Peter Edgcumbe and Elizabeth Holland was executed as part of the chronologically-earlier Sequence 1, with the Edgcumbe arms being repaired during the execution of Sequence 3.



## Appendix IV. Fawsley Hall

### Antiquarian Evidence and Identification of Arms

The following discussion outlines probable distributions of glazing at Fawsley Hall during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Firstly, the analysis attempts to reconstruct the glazing as it appeared in the early seventeenth century, using drawings made of Fawsley's windows in the 1610s by the Northamptonshire antiquarian, William Belcher. Secondly, the analysis will use the reconstruction based on Belcher's drawings to propose a likely arrangement of glass during the tenure of Sir Edmund Knightley (d.1542) as Fawsley's resident lord. Finally, the analysis will suggest an arrangement of glass in Fawsley's oriel window during the tenure of Sir Richard IV (d.1534) as Fawsley's lord.

### Arrangement of Shields during William Belcher's visit

William Belcher made the earliest record of the Knightleys' stained glass in their hall and parish church of St. Mary's Fawsley. Belcher's drawings - comprising part of MS Top. Northants e1 in The Bodleian Library, Oxford - describe the coats of arms and tombs in the Knightleys' parish church, St. Mary's, Fawsley, from f.25v to half way down f.26, and the armorial glass in their hall follows this, from f.26-f.30. A copy of Belcher's notes, produced between 1718-22, and also in The Bodleian Library, provides further details about the position of some of this glass.<sup>1</sup>

Belcher's notes provide indications of the placement of glass in the hall and his sketches are divided based on its topography (Figure IV.9). His grouping of the drawings onto individual pages corresponds with the known number of windows in the hall during the early sixteenth century. Each page likely corresponds to the distribution of glass within a single window, and two folios (f.29v-f.30) appear to be devoted to illustrating the glass in the oriel window; the latter is corroborated by the later copy of Belcher's notes. In addition, Belcher mostly groups shields in rows of three, with some exceptions, suggesting that the arrangement of his drawings corresponded with the three-light composition of the hall's windows.

Where relevant, the discussion matches Belcher's drawings with surviving glazing in the Burrell Collection. Due to the great number of ancestors included in the Knightleys' glazing, the appendix

---

<sup>1</sup> Bodl. MS Top. Northants. c13. 8-17. The date of this manuscript is provided by Richard Marks in Marks, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Northamptonshire*, 65.

identifies individuals represented in the following armorial glass, in order to relieve lengthy discussion in the main thesis text.

### **Belcher's record of Window swI**

Beginning on f.26, Belcher prefixes his illustrations with the title "in the southern part of the hall."<sup>2</sup> Given the southern-most window in the hall is swI, it seems likely that these six shields were arranged in two rows in this window. For the sake of simplicity it is assumed here that the arrangement of shields started from light 3a and continued in 3b and 3c, with the next row following in 2a, 2b and 2c (Figure IV.10). Thus, swI 3a contained the arms of William de Knightley (d. c. 1394), represented through an *unmarshalled* coat of arms of Knightley.<sup>3</sup> Light swI 3b displayed William Knightley's marriage to Dorothy Golofer.<sup>4</sup> The following light, swI 3c, exhibited the arms of their son and heir, Roger Knightley (d.1349).<sup>5</sup> The first two lights in the second row of swI are related to the parents of Roger's daughter-in-law, who married his son Sir John Knightley (d.1413). The first shield showed, through *impaled* arms, in swI 2a, the marriage of Sir John Burgh and Elizabeth Cowley.<sup>6</sup> The arms in swI 2b represented their daughter Eleanor Burgh.<sup>7</sup> Following this, arms representing the marriage of Sir John Knightley (d.1413) and Elizabeth Burgh, which survive in the Burrell Collection, were placed in swI 2c.<sup>8</sup>

### **Belcher's record of Window swII**

On f.26v, Belcher's title "adhuc" implies that the page also contains glass "in the southern part of the hall," most likely corresponding with swII. Belcher's nine illustrations of escutcheons are arranged into three rows of three, corresponding with all of the likely available spaces in the window (Figure IV.11). Light swII 3a would have contained the surviving shield containing the

<sup>2</sup> "in boreali p(ar)te aula", Bodl. MS Top. Northants e1. f.26.

<sup>3</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Knightley. DBA 2, 196. Qtly 1&4 Or 3 pales Gu 2&3 Erm all in border Az. PLN 2050. "1480-1500."

<sup>4</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Knightley. See footnote 3. *Sinister*: Golofer. DBA 4, 132. Az buck's face Or. DV 53b. "c1470."

<sup>5</sup> *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Knightley. See footnote 3. 2 and 3. Golofer. See footnote 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Burgh. DBA 4, 406. Arg on a salt Sa 5 swans Arg. TJ 361 "1410." 2 and 3. Cowley. No corresponding entry for Cowley in DBA closest is DBA 1, 242. Arg lion & border engr Sa. Evidence cited in the family tree can verify marriage of Sir John de Burgh and Elizabeth Cowley.

<sup>7</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Burgh. See footnote 6. *Sinister*: Cowley. See footnote 6.

<sup>8</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: *Quarterly* arms. 1. and 4. Knightley. See footnote 3. 2 and 3. Golofer. See footnote 4. *Sinister*: *Quarterly* arms. 1. and 4. Burgh. See footnote 6. 2. and 3. Cowley. See footnote 6; Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.295.

arms of Richard I Knightley (d.1416).<sup>9</sup> Light swII 3b represented his wife's parents, Sir John Gifford and his wife, whose name I have been unable to find.<sup>10</sup> The shield in swII 3c displayed Richard I's own marriage to Joan Gifford.<sup>11</sup> The shield Belcher saw in swII 2a showed the marriage of Thomas and Katherine Purefoy, the parents of Sir Richard I's daughter-in-law, Elizabeth Purefoy (married to Richard Knightley II).<sup>12</sup> The shield in swII 2b showed the arms of one of Elizabeth's relatives although they are unidentifiable. The arms in swII 2c represented the marriage of Richard II Knightley (d.1442) to Elizabeth Purefoy.<sup>13</sup> The shields in the first row of the window exhibited the ancestry of Richard II's daughter-in-law, Eleanor Throckmorton, who married his heir Richard III. The shield which appeared in swII 1a displays the marriage of Eleanor Throckmorton's grandparents, Sir Guy Spyne (d. c. 1427) to his wife, whose arms cannot be identified.<sup>14</sup> The shield in swII 1b showed the marriage of Eleanor Throckmorton's parents.<sup>15</sup> Finally, the shield in swII 1c displayed Richard Knightley III's marriage to Eleanor Throckmorton.

### Belcher's record of Window swIII

The following folio, f.27, seems to correspond with the position of window swIII, given Belcher's title for this page, "in the greater part of the hall", and this window's position in the third bay of the five bay hall; precisely half way.<sup>16</sup> The page depicts a royal coat of arms, most likely those of Henry VIII with supporters at the top of the page, followed by a row of three shields and a row of two shields underneath (Figure IV.12). The position of Henry VIII's arms in the middle of the page suggests it appeared centrally, most likely in 3b. The following row of shields most likely appeared in lights 2a-2c, whilst the remaining two lights appeared in 1a and 1b.

<sup>9</sup> *Quarterly* arms. 1. Knightley. See footnote 3. 2. Golofer. See footnote 4. 3. Burgh. See footnote 6. 4. Cowley (arms of Cowley now lost). See footnote 6; Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.296.

<sup>10</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Gifford. DBA 4, 428. Az 3 stirrups & leathers & buckles Or. I.2 244. "c.1310." *Sinister*: Cross. DBA, 2, 321. Gu chev betw 3 crosses botonny Arg. XV I 574. "c.1525."; Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.305.

<sup>11</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Knightley. See footnote 10. *Sinister*: Gifford. See footnote 17; Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.298.

<sup>12</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: No direct match but a variant is Purefoy. DBA 4, 122. Gu 2 hands couped at the wrists & clasped fesswise in dex chf. L2 405. "c.1520." *Sinister*: Unidentifiable arms.

<sup>13</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: *Quarterly* arms. 1. Knightley. See footnote 3. 2. Golofer. See footnote 4. 3. Burgh. See footnote 6. 4. Cowley. See footnote 6. *Sinister*: *Quarterly* arms. 1 and 4. Purefoy. See footnote 12. 2 and 3. Unidentifiable arms.

<sup>14</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Spyne. DBA 2, 319. Sa chev Arg betw 3 crescs Or. DV 8a, 293. "c.1470." *Sinister*: Unidentifiable arms.

<sup>15</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Throckmorton. DBA 2, 424. On chev 3 bars gemel. Mill Steph. (brass, Fladbury, Worcs, to Jn T & w Eleanor Spiney). "1445." *Sinister*: Spyne. See footnote 14.

<sup>16</sup> "in superiori parte aule." Bodl. MS Top. Northants e1. f.27.

The first coat of arms in 3b were those of Henry VIII. The first and second rows of lights are devoted to arms displaying the earliest stages in the De Vere ancestry. Light 2a contained the arms of De Vere *impaling* the arms of England, possibly intending to represent a member of William the Conqueror's household, although such a connection cannot be established. Light 2b showed an unidentifiable coat of arms. The shield in light 2c contained the arms of Aubrey de Vere, whose arms are *impaled* with those of his wife, Alice de Clare.<sup>17</sup> The shield in light 1a contains the coat of arms corresponding with Aubrey's grandson, Aubrey de Vere, 2nd Earl of Oxford and his marriage to Alice Bigod.<sup>18</sup> The next shield in the sequence, in 1b, exhibited the *impaled* arms of his brother, Robert de Vere, 3rd Earl of Oxford and his wife Isabel de Bolobec.<sup>19</sup> This is followed in light 1c, by a shield displaying the arms of his son, Hugh de Vere, 4th Earl of Oxford *impaled* with those of his wife, Hawise de Quincy.<sup>20</sup>

### Belcher's record of Window swIV

Over the page, the drawings on f.27v are preceded by the title "also in the greater part of the hall," suggesting they represent shields initially placed in swIV.<sup>21</sup> There are two rows of three shields followed by a row of two shields demonstrating that Belcher recorded armorial glass in 3a, 3b, 3c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 1a and 1b (Figure IV.13). The shield in light 3a contained the arms of Robert de Vere, 5th Earl of Oxford (d.1296) and his wife Alice Sanford.<sup>22</sup> The shield in 3b held the arms of Robert de Vere, 6th Earl of Oxford and his wife, Margaret Mortimer.<sup>23</sup> The shield in 3c exhibited the arms of John de Vere, 7th Earl of Oxford and his wife Maud de Baldesmere.<sup>24</sup> The shield in 2a showed the arms of Thomas de Vere, 8th Earl of Oxford and his wife Maud de Ufford.<sup>25</sup> The shield in 2b

<sup>17</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: De Vere. DBA 4, 326-7. Qtly Gu & Or & in dex chf mullet Arg. H 99. "1298". *Sinister*: Clare. DBA 2, 519. Or 3 chevs Gu. Q 3. "c.1295."; Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.329.

<sup>18</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: De Vere. See footnote 17. *Sinister*: Bigod. DBA 1, 144. Per pale Or and Vt lion Gu. LMS 31. (1189-1245). "c.1310."

<sup>19</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: De Vere. See footnote 17. *Sinister*: Bolobec. DBA 1, 139. Vt lion Arg. TJ 49. "1410."; Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.331.

<sup>20</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: De Vere. See footnote 17. *Sinister*: Quincy. DBA 4, 210. F 27. "c.1285."; Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.330.

<sup>21</sup> Bodl. MS Top. Northants e1 f.27v.

<sup>22</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: De Vere. See footnote 17. *Sinister*: Sanford. Unable to find reference to arms.

<sup>23</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: De Vere. See footnote 17. *Sinister*: Mortimer. DBA. 1, 104. Barry chf paly corners gyronny Az and Or escutch Erm. G 155 "c1282."; Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.326.

<sup>24</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: De Vere. See footnote 17. *Sinister*: Baldesmere. DBA 3, 516-7. Arg a fess double cotised Gu. A 21. "c1275."

<sup>25</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: De Vere. See footnote 17. *Sinister*: Ufford. Untinctured version at DBA 3, 166. Cross lozy & in dex chf fleur de lys. Birch 12706. 1437. "1437."

housed the arms of Robert de Vere, 9th Earl of Oxford and his wife, Philippa de Courcy.<sup>26</sup> The arms in light 2c showed the arms of Aubrey de Vere, 10th Earl of Oxford and his wife, Alice FitzWalter.<sup>27</sup> The shield in the first lights of the first row, in light 1a, displayed the arms of John de Vere, 12th Earl of Oxford and his wife Alice Sargeaux.<sup>28</sup> Finally, the shield of arms in light 1b held the arms of John De Vere, 12th Earl of Oxford and his wife Elizabeth Howard.<sup>29</sup>

### **Belcher's record of Window swV**

The following folio, f.28, does not contain a title, indicating Belcher has moved on simply to describe the shields in window swV. The page depicts four shields arranged in two rows of two, suggesting that armorial glass appeared in 3a, 3b, 2a, and 2b of swV (Figure IV.14). The shield in 3a held the coat of arms of John de Vere, 13th Earl of Oxford (d.1513) and his wife Margaret Neville. The second shield in light 3b displayed John De Vere's second marriage to Elizabeth Scrope. The shield in light 2a exhibited the coat of arms of John de Vere, 14th Earl of Oxford and his wife Anne Howard. Finally, light 2b contained a coat of arms displaying the marriage of Sir Edmund Knightley and Ursula de Vere.

### **Belcher's record of the Oriel Window**

Overleaf, on the folios, f.28v and f.29, there are illustrations of eleven shields preceded by the title "in the southern part of the hall."<sup>30</sup> As stated, a later, redacted version of Belcher's notes suggests that Belcher's f.28v-f.29 describe the shields placed "in the Bay Window" suggesting the author had revisited Fawsley sometime after Belcher to verify their position.<sup>31</sup> The layout of the drawings across the two pages is somewhat sporadic and unlike any of the others. On f.28v, there is a row of

<sup>26</sup> *Impaled arms. Dexter: Quarterly arms. 1 and 4.* Belcher's drawing is blank but another source suggests they were filled with special *quarterings* adopted by Robert de Vere: Azure three crowns or." ("azure, three crowns or, bordure argent quarterly with Vere; grant 3 Jan. 1386, pat. I. m. 1 Cotton MS. Julius C. VII. fo. 237." Joseph Foster, *Some Feudal Coats of Arms from Heraldic Rolls, 1298-1418* (London: J. Parker, 1902), 187.). 2 and 3. De Vere. See footnote 17. *Sinister*: I have been unable to find references to the Courcy arms.

<sup>27</sup> *Impaled arms. Dexter: De Vere.* See footnote 17. *Sinister*: FitzWalter. DBA 3, 384. Or a fess betw 2 chevs Gu. PO 42. "c1350."

<sup>28</sup> *Impaled arms. Dexter: De Vere.* See footnote 17. *Sinister: Quarterly 1 and 4.* Sargeaux. Unable to find reference to Sargeaux arms.

<sup>29</sup> *Impaled arms. Dexter: De Vere.* See footnote 17. *Sinister impaling Howard.* DBA 1, 383. Gu bend betw 6 crosslets fitchy Or. TJ 1248. "1410."

<sup>30</sup> "in boreali parte" Bodl. MS Top. Northants e1. f.28v; the two folios are separated by a piece of card which seems to have been a later insertion into Belcher's notes.

<sup>31</sup> Bodl. MS Top. Northants. c13. 14.

four small shields, followed by a row of three slightly larger shields, followed by two rows of two shields (Figure IV.15). On f.29, there is a small shield drawn in the upper left-hand corner as well as two large shields with accompanying armorial accoutrements in the upper-right and the bottom of the page. Based on a synthesis of the positions of the drawings on the page, the number of lights in the oriel and the identities of those represented, the most likely arrangement is as follows (see Figure IV.16 and compare with Figure IV.6 for the numbering of each light). The row of four shields at the top of f.28v showed the arms of Henry VIII, which appeared in 3a, the arms of St. George, which appeared in 3b, the arms of St. Edward the Confessor, which appeared in 3c and the arms of Catherine of Aragon which appeared in 3d.

Below this row of four shields on f.28v, the three shields displayed the arms of Jane Skenard, which appeared in 2a.<sup>32</sup> A shield showing the marriage of her parents appeared in 2b.<sup>33</sup> Another shield exhibiting the marriage of Jane's uncle appeared in 2c.<sup>34</sup> Below this, the next two shields on f.28v show the arms of Margery Harwedon before her marriage to Henry Skenard, which would have appeared in 1a.<sup>35</sup> The shield Belcher drew to the right of this depicts the marriage of William de Harwedon to Margaret de St. John, in light 1b.<sup>36</sup> The first of the final two shields illustrated on this page displays the arms of Margaret de St. John before her marriage to William de Harwedon and

---

<sup>32</sup> The following marshalling form is highly unusual as quarter 2 contains four arms and quarter 3 contains three arms. In the following description these arms are indicated through lower case roman numerals. *Quarterly* 1 and 4. Skenard. No reference in DBA. *Sable a chevron between three hawk's lures argent*. The four arms in 2: There are the arms of i. Harwedon. DBA 2, 7. Arg on bend Gu bend of 5 lozs Or. DV 53b, 2113. "c1470." ii. St. John. DBA, 1, 28. Gu 2 bars Arg canton Erm. S 598. "c1395." iii. Bagot. DBA, 2, 309. Arg chev Gu betw 3 martlets Sa "1471." iv. Combemartin. No entry in DBA but an unreferenced entry is given in P, 80. Gules a lion rampant vairy or and azure. The three arms in 3. i. Lions. DBA 1, 124-5. WJ 201 "c.1380." ii. Dillon-Lee. There is no reference in DBA but an unsourced reference is given in P, 742. "Argent between a fess azure three crescents gules." iii. Willeby. No direct reference in P but there is a variant at DBA 3, 59. On chf 5 loz "1332."

<sup>33</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Skenard. See footnote 32. *Sinister*: *Quarterly of eight*. For references to the following see footnote 32: 1. Harwedon. 2. St. John. 3. Bagot. 4. Combemartin. 5. Lions. 6. Unidentifiable arms. 7. Willeby. 8. Harwedon.

<sup>34</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: *Quarterly of eight*. For references to the following see footnote 32: 1. Harwedon. 2. St. John. 3. Bagot. 4. Combemartin. 5. Lions. 6. Dillon-Lee. 7. Willeby. 8. Harwedon. *Sinister*: Harwedon *impaling Quarterly* 1 and 4. Vaux. DBA 2, 436. Checky Arg and Gu on chev Az 3 roses Or. WK 216. "temp. Hen VII." 2 and 3. Unidentifiable arms.

<sup>35</sup> *Quarterly of eight*. For references to the following see footnote 32: 1. Harwedon. 2. St. John. 3. Bagot. 4. Combemartin. 5. Lions. 6. Unidentifiable arms. 7. Willeby. 8. Harwedon.

<sup>36</sup> *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: Harwedon. *Sinister*: *Quarterly of six*. For references to the following see footnote 32: 1. St. John. 2. Bagot. 3. Combemartin. 4. Lions. 5. Dillon-Lee. 6. Willeby.

would have been placed in 1c.<sup>37</sup> Finally Belcher would have seen the shield containing the arms of Maud Lions, in light 1d.<sup>38</sup>

On the following page, f.29, the shield in the upper-left hand corner represents the marriage of Maud de Lions' parents, which would have been placed in 3e.<sup>39</sup> The shield at the bottom of f.29 shows the marriage of Sir Edmund to Ursula De Vere and would have logically appeared in the tracery light A7 (see Figure IV.8).<sup>40</sup> The earliest photograph of the glass in the hall verifies this position (Figure IV.18). Tracery lights A4, A7, A10 and A13 possess a shield-shaped profile, suggesting they were designed with the intention of housing shields of this shape. Indeed, the final shield Belcher illustrated in the top-right hand corner of the page displays the marriage of Sir Richard Knightley IV to Jane Skenard.<sup>41</sup> This shield was accompanied by the Knightley stag crest and elaborate mantling, suggesting it would have been too big and elaborate to fit in one of the main oriel lights, but, like that showing his son's marriage in A7, was initially placed in one of the shield-shaped tracery lights (Figure IV.7). Given the chronology of the two marriages represented in these larger shields, it is most probable it was placed in A4, to the left of the shield in A7 representing his son's marriage and therefore preceding it chronologically.

---

<sup>37</sup> *Impaled arms: Dexter: Quarterly of six.* For references to the following see footnote 32: 1. St. John. 2. Bagot. 3. Combemartin. 4. Lions. 5. Dillon-Lee. 6. Willeby. *Sinister:* 1. Lions. 2. Dillon-Lee. 3. Willeby. 4. St. John. 5. Bagot. 6. Combemartin.

<sup>38</sup> These last two shields would most logically been in these lights as there are only three rows of lights in the oriel window and four rows of shields drawn on the f.28v. ; *Quarterly arms.* 1 and 4. Lions. See footnote 32. 2 and 3. *Quarterly arms.* 1 and 4. Dillon-Lee. See footnote 32. 2 and 3. Willeby. See footnote 32.

<sup>39</sup> When comparing the position of the two pages it would seem this shield was a continuation of the third row of lights on f.28v; *Impaled arms. Sinister:* Lions. See footnote 32. *Dexter: Quarterly arms.* 1 and 4. Lions. See footnote 32. 2 and 3. Willeby. See footnote 32.

<sup>40</sup> *Impaled arms. Dexter: Quarterly of twenty-four.* 1. Knightley. See footnote 3. 2. Golofer. See footnote 4. 3. Skenard. See footnote 32. 4. Harwedon. See footnote 32. 5. St. John. See footnote 32. 6. Bagot. See footnote 32. 7. Burgh. See footnote 6. 8. Cowley. See footnote 6. 9. Combemartin. See footnote 32. 10. Lions. See footnote 32. 11. Dillon-Lee. See footnote 32. 12. Willeby. See footnote 32. 13. Skenard.. 14. Harwedon.. 15. St. John.. 16. Bagot. 17. Knightley. 18. Golofer. 19. Combemartin. 20. Lions. 21. Dillon-Lee. 22. Willeby (now lost) 23. Burgh. 24. Cowley.

<sup>41</sup> *Impaled arms. Dexter: Quarterly.* 1. Knightley. See footnote 3. 2. Golofer. See footnote 4. 3. Burgh. See footnote 6. 4. Cowley. See footnote 6. *Sinister: Quarterly of eight.* For the following references see footnote 32. 1. Skenard. 2. Harwedon. 3. St. John. 4. Bagot. 5. Combemartin. 6. Lions. 7. Dillon-Lee. 8. Willeby.

### Belcher's record of Window neIII

Overleaf, f.29v is preceded with the title "also in the northern part of the hall."<sup>42</sup> Here, Belcher has drawn two rows of three shields, followed by a row of two shields (Figure IV.19). In the top row of illustrated shields, the first shield, which would have been in 3a, shows the mother of Maud Lions. The second shield contained the marriage of the maternal grandparents of Maud Lions, in 3b, and the final shield, which would have been in 3c, held the arms of Giles de St. John before his marriage to Maud Lions. The first row of shields underneath showed, in 2a, the arms of William de St. John before his marriage to Isobel Combemartin. The shield in light 2b displayed the marriage of William de St. John to Isobel Combemartin and light 2c showed the marriage of William de St. John's parents. The first of the two shields underneath shows the arms of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, in 1a which is now in the Burrell Collection.<sup>43</sup> The second coat of arms in light 1b showed another coat of arms representing the marriage of Richard Knightley V (d.1534) to Jane Spenser, in 1b, which is now lost.<sup>44</sup> The style and materials used to make the coat of arms of Henry VIII (mostly enamel paints) suggest it is later in date than those commissioned by Sir Richard IV and Sir Edmund, possibly being a later addition to the glazing by Sir Valentine Knightley (d.1564) or his son Richard Knightley VI (d.1615). It is unclear when the arms displaying Richard Knightley V's marriage were commissioned. It may have been commissioned by Sir Richard V during his short tenancy as lord of Fawsley before his brother, Sir Edmund, inherited the hall, on the former's death in 1534 or it may be a retrospective commission intended to reinforce the Knightley's connection to the Spensers - the Knightleys' neighbours. This desire to display a connection is further exemplified in neII (examined next) showing the marriage made by Sir Richard V and Sir Edmund's sister, Susan, to William Spenser, which is of a later stylistic date and design than Sir Richard and Sir Edmund's glazing sequences.

### Belcher's record of Window neII

The final set of illustrations, on f.30 - most likely corresponding with the glass in neII - include a single shield at the top of the page, followed by two rows of two shields (Figure IV.20). Each shield in this window appears to have been made at a later date to the glass made by Sir Richard IV and Sir Edmund, due to their rendering in enamels and appearing stylistically later. The shield at the top

<sup>42</sup> "adhuc aula boreali p(ar)te." Bodl. MS Top. Northants e1. f.29v.

<sup>43</sup> Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.318.

<sup>44</sup> The word "Spenser" is visible on the *sinister* side of the Belcher's drawing. Bodl. MS Top. Northants e1. f.29v.



of the page, from 3a, showed an unidentifiable coat of arms.<sup>45</sup> The shield from 2a contained another lost coat of arms displaying Sir Richard V's marriage to Jane Spenser. The shield which Belcher saw in 2b contained a coat of arms of Sir Valentine Knightley's marriage to Anne Ferrers.<sup>46</sup> The shield from 1a contained a coat of arms of William Spenser's marriage to Susan Knightley.<sup>47</sup> The shield in 1b shows another Knightley marriage, which cannot be identified.<sup>48</sup>

### **Sir Edmund Knightley's arrangement**

**N.B.** The following discussion and the main body of the thesis text, use the prefixed roman numerals **I.** and **II.** when indicating the different arrangements of armorial glass in individual window lights resulting from the first and second glazing sequences at Fawsley Hall. Taking their cue from Belcher's drawings, individual window lights in the reconstruction of Sir Edmund's glazing sequence is referred to with the prefix **II.**, whilst the first arrangement under Sir Richard IV is referred to with the prefix **I.**

Based on the evidence from the previous reconstruction, this section will now examine the likely arrangement of glazing in the hall under Sir Edmund Knightley; that is, the positions of his father's glazing displaying the Knightley ancestry and the position of his mother's ancestry and also the position of the glazing showing his wife's ancestral descent from the De Vere line.

### **swI-swII (Knightley ancestry)**

Sir Edmund's arrangement of the glass in swI is very similar to that seen by Belcher (Figure IV.21). However, the shields Belcher saw in swI2a and swI2b, representing the ancestors of Elizabeth de Burgh, would have been switched around, so that the *impaled* coat of arms would have appeared in swI2a preceding the quartered coat of arms which would therefore have been placed in swI2b. The arrangement of glass into two rows, leaving the first row of lights blank, suggests Sir Edmund may have wished to increase the amount of white light entering the room for visual impact. Sir Edmund's ordering of glass in swII is accurately represented in Belcher's drawing of the window (Figure IV.22).

---

<sup>45</sup> Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.323.

<sup>46</sup> Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.319.

<sup>47</sup> Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.320.

<sup>48</sup> Burrell Collection Catalogue No. 45.321.

### **swIII-swV (De Vere ancestry)**

Belcher's recording of the De Vere lineage in windows swIII-swV largely reflects its arrangement by Sir Edmund, although a few panels had been moved around since their installation. All of the arms in swIII, as described by Belcher, reflect their position under Sir Edmund's tenure as lord of Fawsley (Figure IV.23). All of the arms Belcher recorded in swIV reflect Sir Edmund's arrangement, except for one missing coat of arms which would have been in light II. swIV 1c representing the marriage of John de Vere, 13th Earl of Oxford, and his first wife, Margaret Neville (Figure IV.24). Belcher initially saw this coat of arms in swV 3a. Therefore, the arms in swV under Sir Edmund would have been as follows (Figure IV.25). In swV3a, there would have been the arms showing John De Vere and his second wife Elizabeth Scrope (originally in light 3b), in swV3b, the arms of John de Vere, 14th Earl of Oxford (d.1526) and his wife, Anne Howard and in swV3c the arms of Sir Edmund Knightley (d.1542) and Ursula de Vere.

### **Oriel Window and neIII-neII**

Belcher's record of arms from the ancestry of Sir Edmund's mother, Jane Skenard, in the oriel window suggests Sir Edmund had this armorial glazing moved here during his lifetime along with the other shields from her ancestry that Belcher recorded in neIII. The oriel would have thus housed the entire Skenard ancestry. This is likely given the probable influence Sir Edmund's mother had on him. The golden falcon badge of Skenard is, for instance, represented as a supporter in his arms in A7. Other reasons for this are given in Chapter 4.

A likely reconstruction would be as follows (Figure IV.26). The third row of lights in the oriel window would have contained the arms of Henry VIII in 3a, the arms of St. George in 3b, the arms of St. Edward the Confessor in 3c and the arms of Catherine of Aragon in 3d. The next four lights (3e-3h) would have displayed a line of descent from the father of William de St. John, down to Giles de St. John. The shield in 3j and the first three shields in lights 2a-2c represented a line of descent from Maud de Lions' maternal grandparents to her. The shield in 2d showed Margaret de St. John, who was the culmination of the preceding two lines of descent, St. John and Lions. The following shield in 2e displayed the arms of her husband, William Harwedon I (d.1423). The following shield in 2f contained the arms of his son William Harwedon II. The shield after that in 2g held the arms of Margaret Harwedon (d.1501). The shield in 2h contained the marriage of Henry Skenard to Margaret Harwedon. The final shield in 2j shows the arms of Jane Skenard, before her marriage to Sir Richard Knightley IV.

In addition to this, the armorial glass in the oriel window's tracery lights would have displayed in A4 the coat of arms representing the marriage of Sir Richard IV and Jane Skenard. Sir Edmund also commissioned a coat of arms showing his marriage to his wife Ursula in light A7. Given this arrangement, it appears that neII and neI were filled with clear glass or filled with other shields, perhaps some of which were commissioned by Sir Edmund's deceased elder brother.

### **Sir Richard Knightley IV's arrangement**

Before Sir Edmund's relocation of his mother's ancestry to the oriel window, Sir Richard Knightley IV probably housed his ancestral sequence here, given that the Martyns of Athelhampton Hall placed their male ancestry in their own oriel window.

A likely reconstruction would be as follows (Figure IV.27). Sir Richard IV's sequence would have occupied the three rows of lights in the oriel window. The first four shields in the third row would have shown the arms of Henry VIII in 3a, the arms of St. George in 3b, the arms of Edward the Confessor in 3c and the arms of Catherine of Aragon in 3d. The shield in 3e represented William de Knightley (d. c. 1394) and the shield in 3f displayed his marriage to his wife Dorothy Golofer. The arms in 3g were of Roger de Knightley (d.1349). The arms in 3h represented Sir John de Burgh and Eleanor Cowley, the parents of Roger's daughter-in-law, Elizabeth Burgh, who was herself shown in 3j.

The second row of lights began in 2a with arms displaying the marriage of Sir John Knightley, the son of Roger de Knightley (back in light 3g), to Elizabeth Burgh (back in light 3j). The next shield, in 2b, represented Sir John Knightley's son, Richard Knightley I (d.1416). The next shield in 2c shows the marriage of Richard Knightley I's parents-in-law, Sir John Gifford and his wife. The shield in 2d displayed the marriage of Richard Knightley I to the Giffords' daughter, Joan. The shield in 2e displayed the marriage of the parents of Richard I and Joan's daughter-in-law, Thomas and Katherine Purefoy. The shield in 2f represented a marriage of a Purefoy child that cannot be identified. The shield in 2f would have displayed the shield showing an unidentifiable marriage within the Purefoy family. The shield in 2g showed the marriage of Richard II (d.1442) to Elizabeth Purefoy (d.1474). The remaining two shields in the second row related to the ancestry of Richard II and Elizabeth's daughter-in-law, Eleanor Throckmorton. The shield in 2h showed the marriage of Eleanor's grandparents Sir Guy Spyne and his wife whilst the shield in 2j represented the marriage of her parents Sir John Throckmorton and his wife Eleanor. The final shield in 1a showed the

marriage of Richard Knightley III, son of Richard II and Elizabeth Purefoy (back in 2g), to Eleanor Throckmorton. As part of this original glazing sequence, it seems likely that the now lost shield representing the marriage of Sir Richard IV and Jane Skenard (Figure IV.7) was placed in tracery light A4 of the oriel window.<sup>49</sup> It appears plausible - as discussed in Chapter 4 - that Sir Richard IV filled the remaining tracery lights with white glass to function as a temporary form of glazing.

For the sake of space the analysis is unable to speculate at length about the position of the Skenard ancestry under Sir Richard IV, although this sequence may have originally been located in the windows along the southwest side of the hall (swI-swV).

---

<sup>49</sup> On the rationale behind the original location of this shield see above, “Belcher’s record of the Oriel Window.”

## Appendix V. Beaupré Hall

### Antiquarian Evidence and Identification of Arms

**N.B.** The following evidence gives transcriptions of the antiquarian manuscript in footnotes, where text is irrelevant or illegible, the abbreviation “[...]” is used.

The earliest account of the armorial glass at Beaupré Hall comes from a late sixteenth-century heraldic visitation in BL MS Lansdowne 260, f.232v-f.233v. The British Library Catalogue states the manuscript was compiled in the reign of Elizabeth I (1558-1603), most likely by the herald William Flower (d.1588).<sup>1</sup> The text, beginning on f.232v, describes five coats of arms in one window, before moving on to describe four coats of arms in another.<sup>2</sup> In the first window, the first light appears to have contained an *unmarshalled* coat of arms of John FitzGilbert, the man who inherited Beaupré Hall from his wife Christian St. Omer, and thereafter adopted the surname Beaupré.<sup>3</sup> The second light displayed an *unmarshalled* coat of arms of Christian’s father, Sir Thomas St. Omer.<sup>4</sup> After this point, the remaining arms in the window appear to have been *impaled* arms. The third light appears to have contained arms representing John FitzGilbert’s marriage to Christian St. Omer.<sup>5</sup> The fourth light exhibited the arms of Richard Beaupré, John’s son, and his marriage to Catherine Mundeford.<sup>6</sup> The fifth light held the arms of Sir Thomas I Beaupré and his

---

<sup>1</sup> Anonymous, “A Volume of Miscellanies,” British Library Explore Archives and Manuscripts, Accessed 27th March 2019, [http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo\\_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=IAMS040-002074291&indx=1&recIds=IAMS040-002074291](http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=IAMS040-002074291&indx=1&recIds=IAMS040-002074291).

<sup>2</sup> It begins on BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.232v, “On one payne of glasse/...”

<sup>3</sup> “John fil[ius] Gilberti fil[ius] Warini fil[ius] simonis fil[ius] Roberti fil[ius] Sinolphi Arg[ent] on gobon betwene 6 croses bordde or on a bende az[ure]:” BL MS Lansdowne 260, f.233. No corresponding blazon in DBA. *Unmarshalled* arms. Beaupré. These arms came to be associated with John FitzGilbert’s heirs, following the acquisition of Beaupré Hall. Flower identifies them belonging to “Beawpre” in windows chronologically later in this sequence (see footnote 5).

<sup>4</sup> “On the second payne of glas/ Tho[mas] de S[an]c[tus] Omero miles d[omi]n[u]s m[agister] de Beawpre hall az[ure] a fes betwene 6 croses budde or/.” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233; *Unmarshalled* arms. St. Omer. DBA 3, 396. Az a fess betw 6 crosses botony Or. PO 180. “c.1350.”

<sup>5</sup> “On the third payne of glas/. Joha(nne)s fil(ius) Gilberti ssepit [sic] in uxore [...] de S(an)c(t)o Omero fil[iae] Tho[mas]; de S(anc)te Omero milit[es] Beawpre & suche? S(t) Omer/.” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233.

<sup>6</sup> “On the iiii(th) payne/. Rich[ard] filius Joh(ann)is cep(it): in uxore Katherina fil(ia) Osberti mondeford [...] Beawpre & St. Omer qw(a)r(ter)ly/ & [...] arg(ent) 3 flowerdeluce g(ules).” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233; *Impaled* arms. *Dexter*: *Quarterly* arms 1 and 4. Beawpre. No entry in DBA for the Beaupré arms. Argent on a bend azure three crosslets or. 2 and 3. St. Omer. See footnote 4. *Sinister*: Mundeford. DBA 4, 26. Arg 3 fleurs de lys Gu. L1 444, 3. “c.1520.”; V&A Object Number: C.62-1946.

marriage to Joan Holbeach.<sup>7</sup> As this window cannot be identified in the original building it will be referred to as Window I during the remaining discussion (see Figure V.3).

Halfway down f.234, the text then begins to describe the arms in another window. The first light of this window contained the arms of Nicholas Beaupré I (d.1380) and his wife, Margaret Holdich.<sup>8</sup> The arms of his son, Nicholas Beaupré II (d.1452), are not included. The second light contained the arms of Thomas Beaupré II, Nicholas II's son, and of his first wife, Margaret Merys, which survives in the V&A.<sup>9</sup> The arms of Nicholas II's son, Thomas Beaupré III, and his wife Margaret Ashfield appeared in the third light of the window.<sup>10</sup> The fourth light displayed the arms of Thomas III's son, Nicholas Beaupré, who married Margaret Foderingaye, and survives in the V&A.<sup>11</sup> Light IIe held the arms of Nicholas III's son, Edmund Beaupré (d.1567).<sup>12</sup>

There are a number of panels which appear to have constituted another part of this set of glass but were not described in the earliest account. They appear for the first time in the second earliest account by Christopher Hussey in *Country Life* magazine in 1923, which also provides the first

<sup>7</sup> “On the v(th) payne The Beawpre [...] Tho(mas) f[iliu]s R[i]c[hardi], cepit in ux[ore] Johana f(i)lia Sir [...] Holb(e)ach [...] vert 6 skallopps arg[ent].” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233. Holbeach. DBA 3, 262. PT 658. “temp Hen VI.”

<sup>8</sup> “In the next wyndow Nic[holas] de Beawpre, cepit in uxore m(ar)g(ar)t(e) filia Eliz(a)beth Holdich [...] a(zure) on a shev(er)on on [sic] 3 [...] peys prop(er).” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233; Holdich. DBA, 427. Az on chev Or 3 pies Ppr. L2 247, 6. “c.1520.”

<sup>9</sup> “Tho[mas]: de Bewp(re) cepit m(ar)g(ar)e(t) filia Joh[ann]is [...] Merys [...] g(ules) a fess twixt 3 bowge (ermine).” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233; *Impaled Arms. Dexter*: 1 and 4. Beaupré. See footnote 3. 2 and 4. St. Omer. *Sinister*: Merys. DBA 3, 379. Gu a fess betw 3 bougets Erm. WJ 802. “c.1380.”; V&A Object Number: C.60-1946.

<sup>10</sup> “Tho[mas] de Beawp(re) cep[i](t) [...] m(ar)g(ar)t(e) f(i)lia Rob(er)t Ashefeld his [...] armys: w[i](t)h s(able) a fess engr(ailed) twixt 3 (fleur-de-lis) ar(gent).” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233. Ashfield. DBA 3, 412. Sa a fess engr betw 3 fleurs de lys Arg. MY 24. “c.1446.”

<sup>11</sup> “Nic[holas] de Beawp(re) cep(i)t [...] m(ar)g(ar)t(e) f(i)lia & coheredem Thom(as) ffoderingay [...] g(ules) a crosse lozengie ar(gent)...w(it)h q(uar)ter g(ules) an eagle[...] in a borde or engr(ailed)/... qu(er)ter dorerward [...] (ermine) on a chev(er)on s(able) 3 (crescents)...w[i](t)h q(uar)tarly ar(gent) a crosse twixt 4 skallops s(able)...& Harsick or a chief ended g(ules)...” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233. *Impaled arms. Dexter: Quarterly arms*. 1 and 4. Beaupré. See footnote 3. 2 and 3. St. Omer. See footnote 4. *Sinister: Quarterly* 1 and 4 (4 now lost). (1. *Quarterly* 1 and 4. Foderingaye. A slightly altered blazon is recorded in DBA 3, 169. Gu cross of loz Arg & in sin chf eagle Arg. PT 710. “temp Hen VI.” 2 and 3. Strange. DBA 2, 160. Gu eagle displ Arg border engr Or. Suff. L10 106b(cii), “c.1520.”) 2 and 3. (*Quarterly of Six*. 1 and 6. Dorward. DBA 2, 429. Erm on chev Sa 3 crescs Or. DV 16a, 608. “c.1470”. 2 and 4. Coggeshall. DBA 3, 190. Arg cross betw 4 escallops Sa. N 463. “c1312”. Harsyk. DBA 3, 19. Or chf indented Sa. CKO 299. “c1340.”) V&A Object Number: 63-1946.

<sup>12</sup> “Edm(und) de Beawp(re) Esquire thaere son and here ma(rried) m(ar)g(er)y da(ughter) to S(ir) John Wyseman...” BL MS Lansdowne 260 f.233.

illustrations of the glass.<sup>13</sup> Hussey's account only describes two windows, which he calls the "chief windows" in the "drawing-room." He states that the windows are placed on the south-east and north-west of the hall (see Figure V.2), but he does not specify which window is positioned on the south-east side and which was on the north-west side.<sup>14</sup> Due to this lack of specificity, these windows are described hereafter as Windows III & IV. Window III was made up of two rows of four lights (see Figure V.5 & Figure V.6 for a diagram with CVMA numbering conventions). Window IV was slightly smaller, having consisted of two rows of three lights (see Figure V.8 and similarly, see Figure V.9 for a diagram).

Window III contained the arms of Nicholas Beaupré in 1a. 1b contained a shield showing the arms of Thomas II Foderingaye (d.1490) and his marriage to Elizabeth Dorward. 1c contained the arms of Coggeshall, most likely intending to represent Sir William Coggeshall (d.1426) or one of his ancestors whilst 1d displayed the arms of Le Strange, most likely, John Le Strange (d.1392). In the next row of lights in Window III, it contained, in 2a, the arms of Thomas II Beaupré and his wife Margaret Mundeford. Light 2b held the arms of Nicholas III Beaupré (d.1513) and his wife Margaret Foderingaye.<sup>15</sup> The arms of Richard Beaupré, showing his marriage to Catherine Mundeford, are placed in light 2c. Finally, the arms of Nicholas III Beaupré (d.1513) are placed in light 2d.

There are six coats of arms in Window IV, with one being placed in each light (Figure V.8). Window IV contained, in light 1a, another version of the arms of Edmund Beaupré (d.1567). Light 1b contains the Bell arms quartered with another, possibly Osborne, his mother's arms, and thus representing Sir Robert Bell (d.1639) himself.<sup>16</sup> Light 1c contained another version of the arms of Nicholas Beaupré III (d.1513) and his wife, Margaret Foderingaye. Lights 2a and 2b contained *unmarshalled* instances of the Bell arms, and 2c contained an instance of the Bell arms impaling the arms of Harrington, although no connection can be established between the two.

When comparing the reconstructions in Figures V.3 and V.4 with Hussey's photograph of Window III in Figures V.5, it is evident that the four surviving panels initially in Id, IId and IIE had since

---

<sup>13</sup> Hussey, "Beaupré Hall," 754-60.

<sup>14</sup> Hussey, "Beaupré Hall", 759.

<sup>15</sup> On the *dexter* side of this shield, the 3rd quarter is filled with quarries and a set of Beaupré arms have been erroneously placed in the fourth quarter.

<sup>16</sup> Chris Kyle, "BELL, Sir Robert," History of Parliament, Accessed 27th March 2019, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/bell-sir-robert-1589-1639>.

the late sixteenth century been moved into III2c, III2a, III2b and III2d respectively, and in the process were moved out of their chronological order.

### Stylistic and Material Analysis

The earliest series of Beaupré panels bear stylistic similarities to other late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century glazing. Some of the diapering in Nicholas Beaupré's series of glass shares resemblances to glass of a late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century date. A shield displaying the arms of Smith (*gules on a chevron between three bezants or as many crosses paty fitchy sable*) in Stanford-on-Avon church in Northamptonshire renders its *gules field* with ruby glass and bears a very similar foliate form of diapering to that used on the blue glass in the arms of Mundeford in Id (compare IId in Figure V.4 with Figure V.10). Additionally, a form of "beaded" diapering (as Richard Marks refers to it), again from Stanford church, is used to decorate the *field* of the arms of the London Mercers' Company (*gules the Virgin's head couped argent*). This panel, which can be dated to the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, is very similar to that used on the blue glass in arms representing Thomas Beaupré II in the shield originally in IIb, showing his marriage to Margaret Merys (compare Figures V.11 & V.12).

The glass colours used in some of the Beaupré glass are also similar to surviving glass in the church of St. Clement's, Outwell, where Nicholas Beaupré III (d.1513) asked to be buried. The glass, most likely commissioned by Nicholas III, as Claire Daunton has argued, appears in the tracery glass in nIII of the Beaupré's chantry chapel.<sup>17</sup> For instance, the blue used in some of the tracery glass, such as that used for the *azure field* in the unidentifiable coat of arms in tracery light C2, is very similar to that used to represent the tincture *azure* in the arms representing Richard Beaupré in Id (compare Figures V.13 with Id in Figure V.3). Other examples of ruby glass in St. Clement's east window, such as that used to represent the *gules field* the arms of King Arthur (*gules three crowns or*) in A3, appear similar to the that used to represent Margaret Merys, wife of Thomas Beaupré II in IIb (compare Figure V.13 with IIb in Figure V.4).

Those shields which resemble members of the Beaupré family in Window IV are made with much brighter colours of glass and yellow-stain, suggesting they are from a different glazing campaign to those seen in Window III. The tint of yellow produced by the yellow-stain in the shield in nIV 1c,

---

<sup>17</sup> Claire Daunton, "A Saint from Over the Seas? A Virgin Martyr at St Clement's, Outwell." *Vidimus*, Issue No. 49., Accessed 27th March 2019, <https://vidimus.org/issues/issue-49/panel-of-the-month/>.



representing Nicholas Beaupré III (d.1513) and his wife, Margaret Foderingaye, is very similar to that used for the Bell arms in the second row of lights in the window (compare Figures V.14 & V.15).

## Appendix VI. St. Mary's, Nettlestead

### Antiquarian Sources Overview

Various antiquarians have described the furnishings of St. Mary's, Nettlestead. Whilst Thomas Philipott mentions specific objects of interest such as the Cobham tomb, only John Thorpe provides any detailed information about the church's glass.<sup>1</sup> In his antiquarian study of 1769, *Registrum Roffense*, Thorpe provides details of the church's glazing, albeit in a rather sporadic fashion.<sup>2</sup>

### Arms of the Window I (Arms of the Gentry and Pympe arms)

In the east window of the church are the arms of Cobham and Salman (Figure VI.4).<sup>3</sup> During Thorpe's visit he recorded the arms of Pympe, Pympe impaling Brumston, signifying the marriage of John III's half sister, Margery, to John Brumston, and also Pympe impaling Browning, whose significance I have been unable to identify.<sup>4</sup>

### Window nIII, Lights A1-A6 (Arms of the Local Gentry)

The glass in the tracery lights A1-A6 of nIII contains arms of members of the local gentry from the early fifteenth century. The people represented in this window were prominent members of the Kent gentry during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Lights A1-A6 in the nave windows show the arms of locally influential people, who might have been reasonably regarded as being within the "gentry" of Kent, Sussex and Wiltshire and the south-east due to their holding of county office and lands in these regions. In window nIV, light A1 contains the arms of William Rikhill of Ilfied (d. c. 1447) impaling those of his wife Catherine Coventry.<sup>5</sup> Rikhill had been Commissioner

<sup>1</sup> Philipott, *Villiarie Cantianum*, 242.

<sup>2</sup> John Thorpe, *Registrum Roffense* (London: W. and J. Richardson, 1769), 806-8.

<sup>3</sup> Cobham. DBA 2, 425. Gu on chev Or 3 lions Sa. ML 36. "c1450." The "three lions sable" no longer appear in the instance at Nettlestead; Salmon. DBA 2, 146. Arg 2head eagle displ Sa ch on breast with leopard's face Or. CV-BM 48. "c1350."

<sup>4</sup> "In the East window are the pictures of S[t]. Mary, and some other saint, with these three coats. I. Gules two bars argent, a chief vair. II. The same coat impaling azure, three bars wavy argent. III. Gules gutte d'eau, a fesse nebulee argent, impaling gules, two bars argent, a chief vair." Thorpe, *Registrum*, 806; Pympe. DBA 1, 33. Untinc 2 bars Untinc chf Vair. Gen Mag 14, 19-21. "1502."; Brumston. DBA 3, 327-8. Gutty fess nebuly. The Genealogist 14, 19-21. "1502."

<sup>5</sup> *Impaled* arms. Dexter: Rikhill. DBA 1, 49.: Gu 2 bars betw 3 annulets Arg "Ruckhyll". "c.1446." Sinister: Coventry. DBA 2, 131.: Eagle displ "COVENTRY" Priory of St Mary's. Bow L II 7b.

of Array for Kent in 1419, and held substantial lands in Kent and the south-east. Light A2 shows the arms of either Sir William Septvance (d.1407) or his son Sir William Septvance (d.1447/8), who held lands in Milton, about twenty miles from Nettlestead.<sup>6</sup> Light A3 displays the arms of Fiennes, representing either Sir William Fiennes (d.1403) of Herstmonceaux in Sussex or his son, Sir Roger (d.1449).<sup>7</sup> Light A4 holds the arms of Freningham, most likely signifying Sir Ralph Freningham of Farningham in Kent (d.1410) and his son John Freningham (d.1410).<sup>8</sup> Light A5 contains the arms of the Cheynes. William Cheyne (d.1441) held lands in Shurland in Eastchurch on the Isle of Sheppey, off the northern coast of Kent. He had also held important administrative roles in the County, being Sheriff for Kent four times between 1412-24.<sup>9</sup> Finally, Light A6 holds the arms of the St. Legers, who held lands in Ulcombe in Kent.<sup>10</sup> Out of all of these arms, Thorpe recorded those of Septvance (A2), Fiennes (A3) Cheyne (A4) and St. Leger (A6).<sup>11</sup>

Those represented in the glazing suggest the scheme dates to the early fifteenth century, given that the people who are likely represented, such as Sir Roger Fiennes (d.1449) died during this period. Therefore, the most likely candidate for its authorship would be Regnolde Pympe II (d.1436).

---

“1413/14.” L. S. Woodger, “RICKHILL, William,” *History of Parliament*, Accessed 28th March 2019, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/rickhill-william-1385-1447>.

<sup>6</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Septvance. DBA 4, 453. 3 winnowing vans or. A 9. “c.1275.”; Edward Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 9*, (Canterbury: W Bristow, 1800), 28-32.

<sup>7</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Fiennes. DBA 1, 277. Az 3 lions Or. CV-BM 30. “c.1350.”; L.S. Woodger, “FIENNES, Sir Roger (1384-1449),” *History of Parliament*, Accessed 29th March 2019, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/fiennes-sir-roger-1384-1449>.

<sup>8</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Freningham. DBA 1, 331-2. Erm bend Gu. SK 720. “c.1460”; L.S. Woodger, “FRENINGHAM, John (1345-1410),” *History of Parliament*, Accessed 29th March 2019, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/freningham-john-1345-1410>.

<sup>9</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Cheyne. DBA 1, 316. Az 6 lions Arg canton Erm. BA 824. “c.1465-90.”; Woodger, “CHEYNE, William (d.1441).”

<sup>10</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. St. Leger. Az fretty Arg chf Or. DBA 3, 8. A 18. “c.1275.”; Hasted, *The History: Volume 5*, 385-396.

<sup>11</sup> Thorpe’s description of the Cheyne arms suggests they have been slightly repaired since he saw them. “III. Azure, three wheels Or. IV. Azure, three lions rampant Or. V. Azure, six mens (sic) heads 3. 2. and 1. argent, a canton ermine. VI. Azure, a fret argent, a chief Or.” Thorpe, *Registrum*, 807.

### Window nIV, Lights A1-A6 (Arms of the Local Gentry)

Most of the arms in these lights relate to marriages associated with the Cheyne patrilineal line (see Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 7: Cheynes). Light A1 holds the arms of Robert Crall, father of Margery Crall, who became wife of Richard Cheyne.<sup>12</sup> Light A2 contains an unidentifiable coat of arms. The third light, A3, contains the arms of John Cheyne (d.1487).<sup>13</sup> The fourth light, A4, contains the arms of Sir Robert Shottesbrooke, father to his John Cheyne's wife, Eleanor.<sup>14</sup> The fifth light holds the arms of Thomas Towne (d. c. 1420), husband of John Cheyne's sister, Joan.<sup>15</sup> The sixth light shows the arms of either James or Reginald Peckham.<sup>16</sup> All six of these arms are recorded here by Thorpe in his visitation.<sup>17</sup> Given that many of the arms exhibited here relate to the patrilineal descent of the Cheyne family, the likely author of the arms in these lights is John II (d.1454) whose first wife was Isabel Cheyne.<sup>18</sup>

### Windows nIII, nIV, sIII & sIV, Lights C1 & C2 (Stafford Lineage)

The tracery lights C1 and C2 in windows nIV, nIII, sIII and sIV show marriages from the Stafford family, from whom the Pympe held their lands at Nettlestead through enfeoffment (see Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 8, Staffords).

<sup>12</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Cralle. DBA 2, 178. Sa 3 swans Arg. CY A 163, 651. "temp. Ric 2."; Crall is reference in Woodger, "CHEYNE, William."

<sup>13</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Cheyne. DBA 1, 316. Az 6 lions Arg on canton Erm annulet Gu. RB 318. "temp Hen VI."; Cokayne, et al, eds. *Complete Peerage*, 191-2.

<sup>14</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Shottesbrooke. DBA 3, 52. Erm on chf per pale indented Or & Gu a rose Gu in dex. WB I 38, 19. "c.1480."; Cokayne, et al, eds. *Complete Peerage*, 191-2.

<sup>15</sup> Quarterly Arms. 1 and 4. Towne. DBA 2, 430. Arg on chev Sa 3 crosses botonny Erm. FK II 700. "1413." 2 and 3. Detling. DBA 1, 315. LY A 181."temp Hen VI." The ancestry of Thomas Towne is described in L. S. Woodger, "TOWN, Thomas," History of Parliament, Accessed 29th March 2019,

<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/town-thomas>.

<sup>16</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Peckham. DBA 3, 14. Erm chf qtly Or & Gu. PLN 1286. "1480-1500."; L.S. Woodger, "PECKHAM, James (d.1400)," History of Parliament, Accessed 29th March 2019, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/peckham-james-1400>; for the Peckham's family history see, Hasted, *The History: Volume 5*, 6-32.

<sup>17</sup> III. Sable, three swans in pale argent. IV. Argent, a chevron gules, between three mullets pierced sable. V. Azure six mens (sic) heads 3. 2. and 1. argent, in a canton ermine, an annulet of the second. VI. Ermine, a chief per pale, indented Or and gules, in dexter point a roe of the last. VII. Two coats quarterly. (1.) Argent, on a chevron sable three cross croslets (sic) of the field. (2.) Sable, six griffins sergeant, 3. and 3. argent.. (3.) as (2.) (4.) as (1.) VIII. Ermine, a chief quarterly, Or and gules." Thorpe, *Registrum*, 807.

<sup>18</sup> Compare family trees in Volume 2: Family Trees, Tree 8: Stafford Lineage and Tree 6: Pympe of Nettlestead.

Window nIII contains, in tracery light C1, a coat of arms displaying the marriage of Humphrey Stafford (d.1460), 6th Earl of Stafford and 1st Duke of Buckingham, to Anne Neville (d.1480), who through this marriage became Duchess of Buckingham (Figure VI.12).<sup>19</sup> Light C2 contains a shield exhibiting the marriage of Humphrey's parents, Edmund Stafford (d.1403), 5th Earl of Stafford and Anne Woodstock, Countess of Stafford (d.1438). The latter coat of arms is the wrong way round; for a correct version of the same arms, see that in light C1 of nIV.<sup>20</sup> Thorpe observed the arms in these positions and, from Thorpe's account, it would appear those in C2 had been the wrong way round since his initial visit in the eighteenth century.<sup>21</sup>

Window nIV contains, in tracery light C2, the arms of Stafford, most likely those of Edmund Stafford, 5th Earl of Stafford (d.1403) (Figure VI.13), based on his marriage being represented in C1.<sup>22</sup> Tracery light C1 shows another shield (like that in nIII, C2; only these are the right way around) displaying Edmund Stafford's marriage to Anne Woodstock, Countess of Stafford (d.1438). Both these arms are described in this position by Thorpe.<sup>23</sup>

Window sIII houses a shield in tracery light C2 containing the arms of Stafford, most likely Edmund Stafford (d.1403), 5th Earl of Stafford to Anne Woodstock, Countess of Stafford (d.1438) (Figure VI.14).<sup>24</sup> The arms in tracery light C1 exhibit the Woodstock arms signifying either Anne, before her marriage to Edmund Stafford, or her father, Thomas Woodstock, 1st Duke of Gloucester (d.1397), from whom she inherited the Woodstock arms.<sup>25</sup> These arms appear to have been in these locations when Thorpe visited Nettlestead.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> *Impaled arms. Dexter:* Stafford. DBA 2, 266. Or chev Gu. CG 123. "1340." *Sinister:* Neville. DBA 4, 359. Gu saltire Arg. PO 224. "c.1350."

<sup>20</sup> With the arms turned the other way around they would be as follows, *Impaled arms. Dexter:* Stafford. See footnote 19. *Sinister:* Woodstock. DBA 4, 54. Semy de lis qtg 3 lions pg in border Arg. Leake.

<sup>21</sup> "In one of the north are there [sic] six coats, viz. I. Or, a chevron gules, impaling gules, a saltier (sic) argent. II. The arms of France and England quarterly, within a bordure argent, impaling Or, a chevron gules." Thorpe, *Registrum*, 807.

<sup>22</sup> *Unmarshalled arms.* Stafford. See footnote 19.

<sup>23</sup> "'In another of the North windows. I. Or, a chevron gules, impaling quarterly the arms of France and England, within a bordure argent. II. Or, a chevron gules..." Thorpe, *Registrum*, 807. See footnote 20 for a description of their arms.

<sup>24</sup> *Unmarshalled arms.* Woodstock. See footnote 20.

<sup>25</sup> *Unmarshalled arms.* Stafford. See footnote 19.

<sup>26</sup> "In one of the South windows are these three coats, viz. I. The arms of France and England Quarterly, within a bordure argent. II. Or, a chevron gules." Thorpe, *Registrum*, 807.

Window sIV contains a shield in tracery light C2 that depicts the arms of Stafford, most likely those of Humphrey Stafford, 7th Earl of Stafford (d.1458) (Figure VI.15).<sup>27</sup> Light C1 shows the arms of Beaufort, most likely those of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Stafford (d.1474).<sup>28</sup> Thorpe describes these arms in these positions in his account of the church's glass.<sup>29</sup>

### Stylistic Analysis

The design of the forward-facing shield-bearing angels in windows nIII and nIV, especially those in A3 of each window, is comparable to other mid fifteenth-century glass representing angels in south-east England, such as that at St. Peter and St. Paul in Salle, Norfolk, which David King has dated to c.1440 (compare Figures VI.16 & VI.17 with Figure VI.18).<sup>30</sup> The rendering of the eyes in nIV, especially in nIVA1, is very similar to other depictions of angels which were likely made during the fifteenth century such as the glass at St. Mary Magdalen, Mulbarton in Norfolk (compare Figures VI.17 & VI.19).

The Pympe were also likely responsible for the set of tracery lights in A1-A6 and C1 and C2 in window sV. These window lights also house angels holding shields, however these shields are filled with clear, unpainted glass (Figure VI.8). The angels in these lights also share design characteristics of the aforementioned fifteenth-century examples, indicating they are of a similar date (Figure VI.20). It is unclear who was responsible for commissioning the tracery glass in sV, yet these stylistic comparisons support prior suggestions made in this appendix about the authors of sIII and sIV.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Stafford. See footnote 20.

<sup>28</sup> *Unmarshalled* arms. Beaufort. DBA 4, 54. Az semy de lis Or qtg Gu 3 lions pg Or in border gobony Az & Arg. PCL IV, 41. "c1410."

<sup>29</sup> "In another of the South windows the four following coats, viz. I. Or, a chevron gules. II. The arms of France and England quarterly, within a bordure gobonated, azure and argent." Thorpe, *Registrum*, 807.

<sup>30</sup> David King, "Norfolk: Salle, Parish Church of St. Peter and St. Paul," CVMA Publications, Accessed 20th March 2019, <http://www.cvma.ac.uk/publications/digital/norfolk/sites/salle/catalogue.html>.

## List of Abbreviations

**N.B. Male names.** When describing individual men in this thesis the first and surnames are given along with their number in an ancestral line, e.g. Sir Peter Edgcumbe II. However, for the sake of brevity, in the same section such people are mentioned their names may be shortened to include their title, if a knight, first name and number, e.g. Sir Peter II or, simply, John III.

**N.B. Female names.** The thesis describes women using their first name followed by their maiden name. For instance, Sir Richard Knightley IV's wife, Jane, is described as Jane Skenard even after her marriage.

**N.B. Blazon.** When citing the previous uses of coats of arms the thesis uses references from the *Dictionary of British Arms*, which cites uses of coats of arms in England during the medieval period. The thesis does not explain the many abbreviated forms of blazon used in these volumes. For explanations of these please refer to any "Terminology" section in one of these volumes, which are available online and are open access. For links to the four volumes see the following footnote.<sup>1</sup> For a visual reference glossary to most of the armorial blazon terms used in this thesis see Volume 2: Appendix VIII. Armorial Glossary.

**N.B. Citation of DBA.** Throughout the thesis references are given in footnotes to the *Dictionary of British Arms* in order to establish the earliest recorded use of a coat of arms. In such instances, references are given in the following form:

Family Name. Volume Number, Page Number. Blazon. Source. "Date."<sup>2</sup>  
E.g. Beauchamp. DBA 3, 376. Gu a fess betw 6 martlets Or. I 5. "c.1310."

BL	British Library, London.
BIHR	Borthwick Institute for Historical Research, York.
Cal PR 1	Henry Maxwell-Lyte, ed., <i>Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward IV, Henry VI, 1467-1477</i> (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1900)
Cal PR 2	Henry Maxwell-Lyte, ed., <i>Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward IV, Edward V, Richard III, 1476-1485</i> (London: Mackie & Co., 1901)

---

<sup>1</sup> Volume 1: <http://www.oapen.org/search?identifier=634733>; "Terminology," xxxviii-xlv.  
Volume 2: <http://www.oapen.org/search?identifier=634734>; "Terminology," xlii-li.  
Volume 3: <http://www.oapen.org/search?identifier=634735>; "Terminology," xxxviii-li.  
Volume 4: <http://www.oapen.org/search?identifier=634759>; "Terminology," xxxviii-lii.

<sup>2</sup> "Date" means the earliest recorded occurrence of the said arms. Both the "Blazon" and "Source" entries will be the abbreviated forms given in the *Dictionary of British Arms* Volume from which each respective reference is taken. For a list of corresponding abbreviations see the Volume of the *Dictionary of British Arms* in question, the link to which is given above.

- Cal PR 3 Henry Maxwell-Lyte, ed., *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Henry VII, Volume. I, 1485-94* (Hereford: The Hereford Times Ltd., 1914)
- Cal PR 4 Henry Maxwell-Lyte, ed., *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Henry VII, Volume. II, 1495-1509* (Hereford: The Hereford Times Ltd., 1916)
- DBA 1 Hubert Chesshyre and Thomas Woodcock, eds., *The Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary, Volume One* (London: Society of Antiquaries, 1992).
- DBA 2 Thomas Woodcock, et al. eds., *The Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary, Volume Two* (London: Society of Antiquaries, 1996).
- DBA 3 Thomas Woodcock and Sarah Flower. eds., *The Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary, Volume Three* (London: Society of Antiquaries, 2009).
- DBA 4 Thomas Woodcock and Sarah Flower. eds., *The Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary, Volume Four* (London: Society of Antiquaries, 2014).
- DBA Used to refer, collectively, to the latter four volumes.
- GMHEW 1 Anthony Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales: Volume 1, Northern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- GMHEW 2 Anthony Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales: Volume 2, East Anglia, Central England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- GMHEW 3 Anthony Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales: Volume 3, Southern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- H1 John Hutchins, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset, Volume 1, 1st Edition* (London: W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, 1774)
- H3 William Shipp and James Hodson, eds. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset, Volume 1, 3rd Edition* (London: W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, 1861)
- HAS John Gage Rokewode, *The History and Antiquities of Suffolk: Thingoe Hundred* (Bury St. Edmund's: John Deck, 1838)
- I. Used as a prefix when referring to the position of armorial glass in specific window lights during Sir Richard Knightley IV's tenure as lord of Fawsley Hall



II.	Used as a prefix when referring to the position of armorial glass in specific window lights during Sir Edmund Knightley's tenure as lord of Fawsley Hall
IPM 1.1	Anthony Maskelyne and Henry Maxwell-Lyte, eds., <i>Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and other Analogous Documents preserved in the Public Record Office, Henry VII, Volume 1</i> (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898).
IMP 1.3	M. C. B. Dawes, ed. <i>Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and other Analogous Documents preserved in the Public Record Office, Henry VII, Volume 3</i> (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1955).
IPM 25	Clare Noble, ed. <i>Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and other Analogous Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office, Volume XXV, 16 to 20 Henry VI (1437-1442)</i> (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009).
LSEW	H. C. Maxwell-Lyte, ed. <i>List of Sheriffs of England and Wales from the Earliest Times to A.D. 1831</i> (New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation 1963)
MS	Manuscript
n	North
ne	North East
NRO	Norfolk Record Office
nw	North West
P	G.D. Squibb, ed. <i>Papworth's Ordinary of British Armorial</i> (London: Tabard Publications, 1961) <sup>3</sup>
s	South
se	South East
sw	South West
TNA	The National Archives, Kew.
V&A	Victoria and Albert Museum, London

---

<sup>3</sup> This source is sometimes used to supplement DBA although P does not provide historical sources for the coats of arms listed therein.

## Bibliography<sup>1</sup>

### Unpublished Primary Sources

BIHR Probate Register 4  
 BL MS Additional 7097  
 BL MS Egerton 2341a  
 BL MS Egerton 2341b  
 BL MS Lansdowne 260  
 BL MS Lansdowne 874  
 Bodl. MS Top. Northants. c13  
 Bodl. MS Top. Northants. e1  
 NRO Norwich Consistory Court, 20 to 23 Popy.  
 NRO Will Register Spurlinge, 93-98.  
 TNA PROB 11/5/240  
 TNA PROB 11/11/124  
 TNA PROB 11/25/292  
 TNA PROB 11/14/123  
 TNA PROB 11/32/278  
 Somerset Heritage Centre, Taunton. MS DD\X\LY/1

### Published Primary Sources

Baillie-Grohman, W. A. and F. Baillie-Grohman, eds. *The Master of Game*. New York: Duffield and Company, 1909.  
 Block, K.S, ed. *Ludus Coventriae or the Plaie Called Corpus Christi*. Oxford: Early English Text Society, Extra Series 120, 1922; reprint, 1961.  
 Boorde, Andrew. *The Boke for to Learne a Man to Be Wyse in Buyldying of his Howse for the Helth of Body*. Oxford: Ann Arbor, 2013.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sources are grouped according to their use in the thesis and the accompanying appendices. ‘Unpublished Primary Sources’ and ‘Published Primary Sources’ refer to documents used in the interpretation of lost and extant programmes of glazing and their architectural contexts, both in the main thesis text and in the archaeological reconstructions of glazing conducted in the appendices. ‘Unpublished PhD and MA Theses,’ ‘Electronic Secondary Sources,’ ‘Published Secondary Sources’ and ‘Unpublished Secondary Sources’ cover works cited in relation to the thesis’ salient issues, e.g. “gender.” Literature used to establish historical contexts, architectural chronologies, biographical details and family histories are also listed under this group of headings.

- Carpenter, Christine, ed. *Kingsford's Stonor Letters and Papers, 1290-1483*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caxton, William, trans. *Myrrour of the Worlde*. Westminster: William Caxton, 1481.
- Challoner, Richard, ed. *Douay-Rheims Bible*. Dublin, 1750.
- Chesshyre, Hubert and Thomas Woodcock, eds. *The Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary, Volume One*. London: Society of Antiquaries, 1992.
- Condy, Nicholas and F.V.J. Arundell. *Cotehele on the Banks of the Tamar*. London: Nicolas Condy, 1840.
- Davies, Norman, et al, eds. *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century, Volume I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Dawes, M. C. B., ed. *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and other Analogous Documents preserved in the Public Record Office, Henry VII, Volume 3*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1955.
- Douglas, Gavin. *The XIII Bukes of Eneados of the Famoso Poete Virgill, Volume 5*. London: William Copland, 1553.
- Dugdale, William. *The Antiquities of Warwickshire Volume I*. London: J. Osborn and T. Longman, 1730.
- Edwards, Anthony N. G, et al, eds. *The Yale Edition of The Complete Works of St. Thomas More: Volume I*. Yale: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Furnivall, Frederick, ed. *Political, Religious and Love Poems from the Archbishop of Canterbury's Lambeth MS. No. 306*. London: Earl English Text Society 15, 1903.
- Halliwell, James, ed. *A Selection from the Minor Poems of Dan John Lydgate*. London: C. Richards, 1840.
- Horstmann, Alexandria, ed. *The Life of St. Katherine of Alexandria by John Capgrave*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Horstmann, Carl, ed. *The Lyvys of Seyntys*. London: W. Nichols, 1835.
- James, Montague, ed. *Vulgaria*. Oxford: The Roxburghe Club, 1926.
- Kerry, Charles. *The History and Antiquities of the Hundred of Bray, in the County of Berkshire*. London: Savill and Edwards, 1861.
- MacCracken, H. N, ed. *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*. London: Kegan Paul, 1911.
- MacCracken, Henry, ed. *The Minor Poems, Volume 2*. London: Oxford University Press, Early English Text Society Extra Series 107, Original Series 192, 1911-1934.
- Maskelyne, Anthony and Henry Maxwell-Lyte, eds. *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and other Analogous Documents preserved in the Public Record Office, Henry VII, Volume I*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898.

- Maxwell-Lyte, Henry, ed. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward IV, Henry VI, 1467-1477*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1900.
- Maxwell-Lyte, H. C., ed. *List of Sheriffs of England and Wales from the Earliest Times to A.D. 1831*. New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation 1963.
- Morris, Richard., ed. *Cursor Mundi (The Cursur o The World). A Northumbrian Poem of the XIVth Century in Four Versions*. London: Early English Text Society, 1874-93.
- Myers, Alec, ed. *English Historical Documents. 1327-1485. Volume 4*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Nichols, J.B, ed. *The Boke of Noblesse*. London: Roxburghe Club Publications 77, 1860.
- Nichols, N. H, ed. *De Controversia in Curia Militari inter Ricardum le Scrope et Robertum Grosvenor Milites, Volume 1*. London: Samuel Bentley, 1832.
- Noble, Clare, ed. *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and other Analogous Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office, Volume XXV, 16 to 20 Henry VI (1437-1442)*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009.
- Orme, Nicholas, ed. *Cornish Wills 1342-1540*. Exeter: Devon & Cornwall Record Society, 2007.
- Parker, R. E, ed. *The Middle English Stanzaic Versions of the Life of Saint Anne*. Oxford: Early English Text Society, Original Series 174, 1928; reprint, 1987.
- Philipott, Thomas. *Villiare Cantianum. Or, Kent Surveyed and Illustrated*. London: William Godbid, 1659.
- Raine, James, ed. *Testamenta Eboracensia. A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Volume 4*. Durham: Andrews & Co., 1869.
- Rivers, Earl, trans. *The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*. London: Elliot Stock, 1877.
- Rokewode, John Gage. *The History and Antiquities of Suffolk: Thingoe Hundred*. Bury St. Edmund's: John Deck, 1838.
- Salzman, L. F. "Medieval Glazing Accounts." *Journal of the British Society of Master Glass Painters* 3.1 (April, 1929): 25-30.
- Smith, Lucy Toulmin, ed. *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1535-1543, Volume 1*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1907.
- Smith, Lucy Toulmin, ed. *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1535-1543, Volume 3*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1907.
- Steele, R., ed. *The English Poems of Charles of Orleans*. London: Oxford University Press, Early English Text Society, Original Series 215, 1941; reprint 1970.
- Steele, R., and T. Henderson, eds. *Three Prose Versions of the Secreta Secretorum*. London: Oxford University Press, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 74, 1898; reprint 1973.

Thomas, John Henry and John Farquhar Fraser, eds. *The Reports of Sir Edward Coke*. London, 1680.

Thorpe, John. *Registrum Roffense*. London: W. and J. Richardson, 1769.

Weever, John. *Antient Funeral Monuments, of Great-Britain, Ireland, and the Islands Adjacent* London: W. Tooke, 1767.

### Unpublished PhD and MA Theses

Newton, Peter. "Schools of Glass Painting in the Midlands 1275-1430." PhD diss., The Courtauld Institute of Art, 1961.

James, Alison. "'To Knowe a Gentleman.' Men and Gentry Culture in Fifteenth-Century Yorkshire." PhD diss., University of York 2012.

Rice, Dorothy. "Patterns of Progress and Social Mobility." PhD diss., University of Leicester, 1996.

Stacey, Megan. "'A Veritable Tour de Force of Mechanical and Artistic Dexterity': An Investigation into the Medieval Techniques of Inserting 'Jewels' in Stained Glass." MA Diss., University of York, 2015.

### Electronic Secondary Sources

Anonymous. "A Volume of Miscellanies," British Library Explore Archives and Manuscripts, Accessed 27th March 2019.

[http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo\\_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=IAMS040-002074291&indx=1&recIds=IAMS040-002074291](http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=IAMS040-002074291&indx=1&recIds=IAMS040-002074291)

Anonymous. "Church of St. Mary," Historic England, Accessed 28th March 2019.

<http://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1060645>

Anonymous. "MARTIN, William." History of Parliament, Accessed 19th March 2019.

<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/martin-william>

Anonymous. "Tartsche." Langenscheidt, Accessed 29th March 2019.

<https://en.langenscheidt.com/german-english/tartsche>

Anonymous. "blaunk adj." Middle English Dictionary, Accessed 21st March 2019.

[https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED5130/track?counter=5&search\\_id=526796](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED5130/track?counter=5&search_id=526796)

Anonymous. "alliaunce, n." Middle English Dictionary, Accessed 19th March 2019.

[https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED1179/track?counter=1&search\\_id=479114](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED1179/track?counter=1&search_id=479114).

- Anonymous. "fader n." Middle English Dictionary, Accessed 21st March 2019.  
[https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED15113/track?counter=1&search\\_id=526796](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED15113/track?counter=1&search_id=526796)
- Anonymous. "graunt-sire n." Middle English Dictionary, Accessed 21st March 2019.  
[https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED19278/track?counter=1&search\\_id=526796](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED19278/track?counter=1&search_id=526796)
- Anonymous. "impale, v." Oxford English Dictionary, Accessed 21st March 2019.  
<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/92060?redirectedFrom=impale>
- Anonymous. "Saie n." Middle English Dictionary, Accessed 25th March 2019.  
[https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED38273/track?counter=1&search\\_id=589296](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED38273/track?counter=1&search_id=589296)
- Anonymous. "spear, n." Middle English Dictionary, Accessed 19th March 2019.  
[https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED42136/track?counter=1&search\\_id=2780924](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED42136/track?counter=1&search_id=2780924)
- Anonymous. "genealogy, n." Oxford English Dictionary, Accessed 3rd July 2019.  
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/77484?redirectedFrom=genealogie#eid>
- Anonymous. "heir, n." Oxford English Dictionary, Accessed 19th March 2019.  
<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/85509?rskey=VeB15S&result=1>
- Anonymous. "ordinary n.," Accessed 9th July 2019.  
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/132360?rskey=v122bh&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid>
- Anonymous. "Site of Beaupré Hall." Norfolk Heritage Explorer, Accessed 27th March 2019.  
<http://www.heritage.norfolk.gov.uk/record-details?MNF4210>
- Anonymous. "Museum Libraries and Archives." The British Museum, Accessed 23rd March 2019.  
[https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/libraries\\_and\\_archives.aspx](https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/libraries_and_archives.aspx)
- Carley, James. "Leland, John (c. 1503–1552), poet and antiquary." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 19th March 2019.  
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-16416>
- Castor, Helen. "Paston, Sir John (1442-1479)." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Accessed 21st March 2019.  
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21512/version/0>
- Coros. D.F. "LUCAS, John (by 1512-56)." History of Parliament, Accessed 27th March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/lucas-john-1512-56>

- Coros, D. F. "RAYNSFORD (RAINFORTH), Sir John." History of Parliament, Accessed 21st March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/raynsford-%28rainforth%29-sir-john-1482-1559>
- Cunningham, Sean. "Guildford, Sir Richard." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 1st August 2019.  
<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11723>
- Dale, M.K. "MARNEY, Sir John (by 1485-1525)." History of Parliament, Accessed 29th March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/marney-sir-john-1485-1525>
- Daunton, Claire. "A Saint from Over the Seas? A Virgin Martyr at St Clement's, Outwell." Vidimus, Issue No. 49, Accessed 27th March 2019.  
<https://vidimus.org/issues/issue-49/panel-of-the-month/>
- Dearagon, Ragen C. "Vere, Aubrey de (d.1141)." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 23rd February 2019.  
<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-28203#odnb-9780198614128-e-28203>
- Goodall, John. "Ockwells Manor, Berkshire: An insight into the splendours of grand living in 15th-century England," Country Life, Accessed 30th March 2019,  
<https://www.countrylife.co.uk/architecture/ockwells-manor-berkshire-an-insight-into-the-splendours-of-grand-living-in-15th-century-england-175132>
- Goring, J.J. "EDGECOMBE, Sir Peter (1468/69-1539)." History of Parliament Online, Accessed 3rd January 2019.  
<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/edgecombe-sir-peter-146869-1539>
- Goring, J. J. "EDGECOMBE, Richard (c.1499-1562)." History of Parliament Online, Accessed 3rd January 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/edgecombe-richard-1499-1562>
- Kekewich, Margaret Lucille. "Wenlock, John, first Baron Wenlock." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 19th March 2019.  
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29043>

- King, David. "Norfolk: Salle, Parish Church of St. Peter and St. Paul." CVMA Publications, Accessed 20th March 2019.  
<http://www.cvma.ac.uk/publications/digital/norfolk/sites/salle/catalogue.html>
- Kirby, J.L. "Edgcumbe [Edgecombe], Sir Richard, (c. 1443–1489)." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 21st March.  
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8470>
- Kirby, J.L. "Edgcumbe, Sir Peter (1477–1539)." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Accessed 21st March.  
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8469>
- Kirk, L.M. and A.D.K. Hawkyard. "COURTENAY, Sir William I." History of Parliament, Accessed 21st March 2019.  
<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/courtenay-sir-william-i-1485-1535>
- Kyle, Chris. "BELL, Sir Robert." History of Parliament, Accessed 27th March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/bell-sir-robert-1589-1639>
- Miller, Helen. "GUILDFORD, Sir Edward (by 1479-1534)." History of Parliament, Accessed 19th March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/guildford-sir-edward-1479-1534>
- Miller, Helen. "RALEGH, Walter (1504/5-81)." History of Parliament, Accessed 21st March 2019.  
<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/raleigh-walter-15045-81>
- Rawcliffe, C. "LANGTON, Sir John (c.1387-1459)." History of Parliament, Accessed 21st March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/langton-sir-john-1387-1459>
- Richmond, Colin. "Paston family." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Accessed 23rd March 2019.  
<https://www-oxforddnb-com.libproxy.york.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-52791?rskey=aT3oVI&result=1>



- Roskell, J.S. and L.S. Woodger. "PYMPE, Reynold (c.1371-1426)." History of Parliament, Accessed 19th March 2019.  
<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/pympe-reynold-1371-1426>
- Virgoe, Roger. "TREVANION, John, (by 1483-1539 or later)." History of Parliament, Accessed 5th August 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/trevanion-john-1483-1539-or-later>
- Woodger, L. S. "CHEYNE, William (d.1441)." History of Parliament, Accessed 19th March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/cheyne-william-1441>
- Woodger, L. S. "LANGFORD, Sir William (c.1366-1411)." History of Parliament, Accessed 19th March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/langford-sir-william-1366-1411>
- Woodger, L.S. "FARINGDON, Thomas (d.1444)." History of Parliament, 19th March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/faringdon-thomas-1444>
- Woodger, L.S. "RODY, Nicholas (d.1458)." History of Parliament, Accessed 22nd March 2019,  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/rody-nicholas-1458>
- Woodger, L. S. "RICKHILL, William." History of Parliament, Accessed 28th March 2019,  
<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/rickhill-william-1385-1447>
- Woodger, L.S. "FIENNES, Sir Roger (1384-1449)." History of Parliament, Accessed 29th March 2019.  
<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/fiennes-sir-roger-1384-1449>
- Woodger, L.S. "FRENINGHAM, John (1345-1410)." History of Parliament, Accessed 29th March 2019.  
<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/freningham-john-1345-1410>
- Woodger, L.S. "CHEYNE, William (d.1441)." History of Parliament, Accessed 29th March 2019.  
<https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/cheyne-william-1441>
- Woodger, L. S. "TOWN, Thomas." History of Parliament, Accessed 29th March 2019.

<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/town-thomas>

Woodger, L.S. "PECKHAM, James (d.1400)." History of Parliament, Accessed 29th March 2019.

<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1386-1421/member/peckham-james-1400>

### Published Secondary Sources

Anonymous. *Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the County of Dorset, Volume 3: Central*.

London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1970.

Anonymous. *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset, Volume 2, South East*. London:

Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1970.

Anonymous. *A History of the County of Warwick: Volume 4*. London: Victoria County History, 1913.

Anonymous. *A History of the County of Worcester: Volume 3*. London: Victoria County History, 1913.

Ailes, Adrian. "The Knight, Heraldry and Armour: The Role of Recognition and the Origins of Heraldry." In *Medieval Knighthood: Papers from the Fifth Strawberry Hill Conference*, edited by C. Harper-Bill and R. Harvey, 1–21. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1992.

Ailes, Adrian. "Heraldic Marshalling in Medieval England." In *Académie Internationale d'Héraldique: VIIIth Colloquium Canterbury*, edited by Cecil Humphrey-Smith, 15-29. Canterbury: 1995.

Ailes, Adrian. "The Development of the Herald's Visitations in England and Wales 1450-1600." *The Coat of Arms* 3rd series, 5.217 (2009): 7-23.

Ailes, M. J. "The Medieval Male Couple and the Language of Homosociality." In *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, edited by D. M. Hadley, 214-37. Longman: London and New York, 1999.

Aird, W. M. "Frustrated Masculinity: The Relationship between William the Conqueror and his Eldest Son" In *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, edited by D. M. Hadley, 39-55. Longman: London and New York, 1999.

Allison, Keith, et al. *The Deserted Villages of Northamptonshire*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966.

Anglo, Sidney. "Anglo-Burgundian Feats of Arms: Smithfield, June 1467." *Guildhall Miscellany* 2 (1965): 271–83.

Armstrong, Jackson. W. "The Development of the Office of Arms in England, c.1413-1485." In *The Herald in Late Medieval Europe*, edited by Katie Stevenson, 9-28. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009.

- Atkinson, T. D, et al."Wisbech Hundred: Outwell and Upwell," in *A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 4, City of Ely; Ely, N. and S. Witchford and Wisbech Hundreds*, edited by R. B. Pugh, 206-219. London: Victoria County History, 2002.
- Ayre, Kerry. *Medieval English Figurative Roundels*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Backhouse, Janet. "Hours Inscribed by Henry VII to his Daughter Margaret." In *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, edited by Richard Marks and Paul Williamson, 184-5. London: V&A Publications, 2003.
- Baker, George. *History and Antiquities of the County of Northampton*. London: John Bowyer, 1822-30.
- Baker, John. *The Legal Profession and the Common Law*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1986.
- Barber, Richard and Juliet Barker, *Tournaments: Jousts, Chivalry and Pageants in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013.
- Barron, Caroline. "Chivalry, Pageantry and Merchant Culture." In *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*, edited by Maurice Keen and Peter Coss, 217-41. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002.
- Berryman, Duncan. "Two Wiltshire Manors and their Manorial Buildings." *The Wiltshire Archaeology & Natural History Magazine* 109 (2016): 116-125.
- Blomefield, Francis. *An Essay Towards A Topographical History of the County of Norfolk: Volume 7*. London: W. Miller, 1807.
- Blomefield, Francis. *An Essay Towards A Topographical History of the County of Norfolk: Volume 11*. London: W Miller, 1810.
- Bonfield, Lloyd. "What did English Villagers Mean by 'Customary Law?'" In *Medieval Society and the Manor Court*, edited by Zvi Razi and Richard Smith, 103-16. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Brooke-Little, J. P. ed. *Boutell's Heraldry*. London: Frederick Warne, 1950.
- Brown, Sarah. "The Windows." In *Life, Death and Art: The Medieval Stained Glass of Fairford Parish Church: A Multimedia Exploration*, edited by Sarah Brown and Lindsay MacDonald, 49-69. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997.
- Brown, Sarah. 'Our Magnificent Fabrick.' *York Minster An Architectural History, c.1220-1500*. Swindon: English Heritage, 2003.
- Brown, Sarah and David O' Connor. *Medieval Craftsmen: Glass-Painters*. London: British Museum Press, 1991.
- Burgess, Clive. "Time and Place: The Late Medieval English Parish in Perspective." In *The Parish in Late Medieval England. Proceedings of the 2002 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Clive Burgess and Eamon Duffy, 1-28. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2006.

- Burke, Bernard. *The General Armory of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales*. London: Heritage Books, 2009.
- Campbell, Jill. "A House is Not Just a Home: Means of Display in English Medieval Gentry Buildings." In *Dwellings, Identities and Homes: European Housing Culture from the Viking Age to the Renaissance*, edited by Mette Svart Kristansen and Kate Giles, 175-84. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2014.
- Carpenter, Christine. "The Fifteenth-Century English Gentry and their Estates." In *Gentry and Lesser Nobility in Late Medieval Europe*, edited by M. Jones, 36-58. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.
- Carpenter, Christine. *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society 1401-1499*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Carpenter, Christine. "England: The Nobility and the Gentry." In *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages*, edited by S. H. Rigby, 261-82. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.
- Collins, Arthur. *The Peerage of England: Or, An Historical and Genealogical Account of the Present Nobility*. Arthur Collins, 1715.
- Chandler, John. ed., *John Leland's Itinerary: Travels in Tudor England*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1993.
- Chapman, Adam. "The Posthumous Knighting of Dafydd Gam." *The Journal of Medieval History* 43 (2017): 1-17.
- Cokayne, George, et al, eds. *Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Extant, Extinct or Dormant Volume III: Canonteign to Cutts*. London: The St Catherine Press, 1913.
- Cokayne, George and G. H. White, eds. *The Complete Peerage Volume XII (Part 2) Tracton to Zouche*. London: The St. Catherine Press, 1951.
- Colbourne, Amanda. "Sir William Martyn: The True History of the Builder of Athelhampton Hall," *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 113 (1991): 192-3.
- Cooper, Nicholas. *Houses of the Gentry 1480-1680*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Coss, Peter. "The Formation of the English Gentry." *Past and Present* 147 (1995): 38-64.
- Coss, Peter. "Knighthood, Heraldry and Social Exclusion in Edwardian England." In *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*, edited by Peter Coss and Maurice Keen, 39-68. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003.
- Coulson, Charles. *Castles in Medieval Society: Fortresses in England, France and Ireland in the Central Middle Ages*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- Crawford, Patricia. *Blood Bodies and Families in Early Modern England*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2004.
- Damen, Mario. "Tournament Culture in the Low Countries and England." In *Contact and Exchange in Later Medieval Europe: Essays in Honour of Malcolm Vale*, edited by H. Skoda, et al., 247-66. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012.
- Davies, Matthew Evan. "Lydgate at Long Melford: Reassessing the Testament and "Quis Dabit Meo Capiti Fontem Lacrimarum" in Their Local Context." *The Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures*, 43.1 (2017): 77-114.
- Denton, Joe. "Genealogy and Gentility: Social Status in Provincial England." In *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval Britain and France*, edited by Raluca Radulescu et al., 143-158. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008.
- DeVries, Kelly and Robert Douglas Smith. *Medieval Military Technology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.
- Dixon, Philip and P. Marshall. "The Great Tower at Hedingham Castle: A Reassessment." *Fortress* 18 (2003): 23-42.
- Dressler, Rachel. "Cross Legged Knights and Signification in English Medieval Tomb Sculpture," *Studies in Iconography* 21 (2001): 91-121.
- Dressler, Rachel. "Continuing the Discourse: Feminist Scholarship and the Study of Medieval Visual Culture," *Medieval Feminist Forum* 43.1 (2007): 15-34.
- Driver, Martha and Michael Orr. "Decorating and Illustrating the Page." In *The Production of Books in England, 1350-1500*, edited by A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin, 104-28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580*. Yale: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Duffy, Eamon. "The Parish, Piety, and Patronage in Late Medieval East Anglia: The Evidence of Rood Screens." In *The Parish in English Life, c.1400-1600*, edited by Katherine French, et al., 133-62. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Emery, Anthony. "The Development of Raglan Castle and Keeps in Late Medieval England." *Archaeological Journal* 132.1 (1975): 151-186.
- Emery, Anthony. *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales: Volume 1, Northern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Emery, Anthony. *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales: Volume 2, East Anglia, Central England and Wales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Emery, Anthony. *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, Volume 3: Southern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Farmer, D. L. "Two Wiltshire Manors and their Markets." *The Agricultural History Review* 37.1 (1989): 1-11.
- Farrer, William and J. Brownbill, *A History of the County of Lancaster: Volume 4*. London: Victoria County History, 1911.
- Faussett, T. G. "On a Fragment of Glass in Nettlestead Church," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 6 (1866): 129-34.
- Fleming, Peter. "Charity, Faith, and the Gentry of Kent, 1422-1529." In *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History*, edited by Tony Pollard, 36-58. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.
- Fleming, Peter. "Household Servants of the Yorkist and Early Tudor Gentry." In *Early Tudor England: Proceedings of the 1987 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by D. Williams, 19-36. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1989.
- Foister, Susan. "The Buxton Achievement." In *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, edited by Richard Marks and Paul Williamson, 291-2. London: V&A Publications, 2003.
- Foster, Joseph. *Some Feudal Coats of Arms from Heraldic Rolls, 1298-1418*. London: J. Parker, 1902.
- Franks, Augustus Wollaston. *Ornamental Glazing Quarries: Collected and Arranged from Ancient Examples*. London: John Henry Parker, 1849.
- Gee, Loveday Lewes. *Women, Art and Patronage from Henry III to Edward III, 1216-1377*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002.
- Giesicke, Barbara and Mylène Ruoss, "Function, Meaning and Iconography in Civic Stained Glass Donations in Switzerland and Southern Germany." In *Painting on Light: Drawings and Stained Glass in the Age of Dürer and Holbein*, edited by Barbara Butts, 43-57. Los Angeles: The Paul Getty Trust, 2000.
- Girouard, Mark. *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Gittos, Brian and Moira Gittos. *The Monuments of the Athelhampton Chapel Puddletown*. Puddletown: Puddletown PCC, 2014.
- Given-Wilson, Chris. *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: The Fourteenth-Century Political Community*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Goodall, John A. "Two Medieval Drawings," *The Antiquaries Journal* 58.1 (1978): 159-162.
- Goodall, John A. "The Architecture of Ancestry at the Collegiate Church of St. Andrew's Wingfield, Suffolk." In *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Richard Eales and Shaun Tyas, 156-71. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2003.

- Goodall, John. A. A. "The Architecture of War." In *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, edited by Richard Marks and Paul Williamson, 187-91. London: V&A Publications, 2003.
- Graves, Pamela. "Social Space in the English Medieval Parish Church." *Economy and Society* 18.3 (1989): 297-322.
- Green, Everard. "The Identification of the Eighteen Worthies commemorated in the Heraldic Glass in Hall Windows of Ockwells Manor House." *Archaeologia* 56 (January, 1899): 323-36.
- Gross, Karen. "Hunting, Heraldry, and The Fall in the Boke of St. Albans." *Viator* 38.2 (2007): 191-215.
- Gunn, Steven. *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Hamling, Tara. *Decorating the Godly Household*. New Haven and London: Paul Mellon, 2010.
- Harris, Barbara. *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Harris, Barbara. "Defining Themselves: English Aristocratic Women, 1450–1550." *The Journal of British Studies* 49.04 (2010): 734-752.
- Harris, Barbara. *English Aristocratic Women and the Fabric of Piety, 1450-1550*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018.
- Hasted, Edward. *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 5*. Canterbury: W. Bristow, 1798.
- Hasted, Edward. *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 6*. Canterbury: W. Bristow, 1798.
- Hasted, Edward. *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 9*. Canterbury: W Bristow, 1800.
- Hebgin-Barnes, Penny. *The Medieval Stained Glass of the County of Lincolnshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Hebgin-Barnes, Penny. *The Medieval Stained Glass of Lancashire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Hebgin-Barnes, Penny. *The Medieval Stained Glass of Cheshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Hérolde, Michel. "'Cartons' et Pratiques d'Atelier en Champagne Méridionale dans le Premier Quart du XVIe Siècle." In *Memoire de Verre: Vitraux Champenois de la Renaissance*, edited by J. Cailleateau and F. Corbineau, 61-83. Charlons-sur-Marne: Cahiers de l'Inventaire, 1990.
- Heward, John, and Robert Taylor, *The Country Houses of Northamptonshire*. London: Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1996.

- Hiltmann, Torsten. "The Emergence of the Word 'Heraldry' in the Seventeenth Century and the Roots of a Misconception." *The Coat of Arms* 11.2 (2015): 107-16.
- Howard, Maurice *The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics 1490-1550*. London: George Philip, 1987.
- Hussey, Christopher. "Beaupré Hall, Wisbech" *Country Life* (December 1st, 1923): 754-60.
- Hutchins, John. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset, Volume 1, 1st Edition*. London: W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, 1774.
- James, Susan, E. *The Feminine Dynamic in English Art, 1485-1603: Women as Consumers, Patrons and Painters*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Jessup, Ronald. *Kent, 7th Edition*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1950.
- Jütte, Daniel. "Comfort, Class and Climate Change: The Rise of Glass in Late Medieval and Early Modern Domestic Architecture," *The Journal of the Social History Society*, 15 (2018): 621-41.
- Karras, Ruth Mazo. *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Medieval Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Kaminsky, Howard. "Estate, Nobility and the Exhibition of Estate in the Later Middle Ages," *Speculum* 68.3 (1993): 684-709.
- Keen, Maurice. "Heraldry and Hierarchy: Esquires and Gentlemen." In *Orders and Hierarchies in Late Medieval and Renaissance Europe*, edited by Jeffrey Denton, 94-109. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Keen, Maurice. *Origins of the English Gentleman: Heraldry, Chivalry and Gentility in Medieval England, c.1300 - c.1500*. Stroud: Tempus Publishing Limited, 2002.
- Keen, Maurice. "Chivalry." In *Gentry Culture in Late Medieval England*, edited by Raluca Radulescu and Alison Truelove, 35-50. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- King, David. "Anne Harling Reconsidered." In *Recording Medieval Lives: Proceedings from the 2005 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited Julia Boffey and Virginia Davis, 204-22. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2009.
- King, David. "Glass-Painting in Late Medieval Norwich: Continuity and Patronage in the John Wighton Workshop." In *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Paul Binski and Elizabeth New, 316-32. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012.
- Kurmann-Schwartz, Brigitte. "Gender and Medieval Art." In *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe*, edited by Conrad Rudolph, 128-158. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell, 2006.



- Levitt, Emma. "Scoring Masculinity: The English Tournament and the Jousting Cheques of the Early Sixteenth Century." *Postgraduate Perspectives on the Past* 1.1 (2014): 53-5.
- Liddy, Christian, and Christian Steer. "John Lord Lumley and the Creation and Commemoration of Lineage in Early Modern England." *Archaeological Journal* 167 (2010): 197-227.
- Lindquist, Sherry. "Gender." *Studies in Iconography* 33 (2012): 113–130.
- Livett, G. M. "Nettlestead Church." *Archaeologia Cantiana* 28 (1909): 251-282.
- Lysons, Daniel and Samuel Lysons. *Magna Britannia: Volume 3, Cornwall*. London: T Cadell and W Davies, London, 1814.
- MacFarlane, K.B. *The Nobility of Later Medieval England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- MacMichael, N. H. "The Descent of the Manor of Evegate in Smeeth with Some Account of its Lords." *Archaeologia Cantiana* 74 (1960): 1-47.
- Maddern, Philippa. "Gentility." In *Gentry Culture in Late Medieval England*, edited by Raluca Radulescu and Alison Truelove, 18-34. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- Malden, H. E. "Parishes: Burstow." In *A History of the County of Surrey: Volume 3*, edited by H. E. Malden, 176-182. London: Victoria County History, 1911.
- Marks, Richard. *Stained Glass in England during the Middle Ages*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Marks, Richard. *The Medieval Stained Glass of Northamptonshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Marks, Richard. "The Age of Consumption." In *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, edited by Richard Marks and Paul Williamson, 12-25. London: V&A Publications, 2003.
- Marks, Richard. "Entumbid Right Princely: The Beauchamp Chapel at Warwick and the Politics of Interment." In *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval England, Proceedings of the 2008 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Caroline Barron and Clive Burgess. Donington: Shaun Tyas 2010. 163-9.
- Marks, Richard. "Wills and Windows: Documentary Evidence for the Commissioning of Stained Glass Windows in Late Medieval England." In *Studies in the Art and Imagery of the Middle Ages*, edited by Richard Marks, 200-15. London: Pindar Press, 2013.
- Maxwell-Lyte, Henry. "The Lytes of Lytescary," *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society* 38.2 (1892): 1-101.
- Mercer, Malcolm. "Kent and National Politics, 1461-1509." In *Late Medieval Kent, 1220-1540*, edited by Sheila Sweetinburgh, 251-72. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2010.
- Morgan, D. A. L. "The Individual Style of the English Gentleman." In *Gentry and Lesser Nobility in Late Medieval Europe*, edited by Michael Jones, 15-35. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.

- Morley, Beric. *Hylton Castle: Tyne and Wear*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1979.
- Neal, Derek. *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Neubecker, Ottfried, and John Brooke-Little. *Heraldry: Sources, Symbols, and Meaning*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.
- Newman, Paul B. *Growing Up in the Middle Ages*. Jefferson: MacFarland & Company, Inc., 2007.
- Newton, Peter. *The County of Oxford: A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass*. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Noble, Elizabeth. *The World of the Stonors: A Gentry Society*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009.
- Norton, Christopher. "Richard Scrope and York Minster." In *Richard Scrope, Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr*, edited by Jeremy Goldberg, 138-213. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2007.
- Orme, Nicholas. *From Childhood to Chivalry: Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy*. London and New York: Methuen, 1984.
- Orme, Nicholas. "Children and Literature in Medieval England." *Medium Aevum* 68.2 (1999): 118-40.
- Page, William. *A History of the County of Bedford: Volume 2*. London: Victoria County History 1908.
- Page, William and J. W. Willis-Bund. *A History of the County of Worcester: Volume 4*. London: Victoria County History, 1924.
- Page, William and P. H. Ditchfield. *A History of the County of Berkshire: Volume 3*. London: Victoria County History, 1923.
- Page, William and P. H. Ditchfield. *A History of the County of Berkshire: Volume 4*. London: Victoria County History, 1924.
- Pastoureau, Michel. *Traité D'Héraldique*. Paris: Picard, 1979.
- Pastoureau, Michel. "Stratégies héraldiques et changements d'armoiries chez les magnats florentins du XIVe siècle," *Annales, Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 43 (1988): 1241-1256.
- Payling, Simon. "The Economics of Marriage in Late Medieval England: The Marriage of Heiresses," *Economic History Review* 54.3 (2001): 413-29.
- Phelps, W. *The History and Antiquities of Somersetshire*. London: J.B. Nichols, 1836.
- Phillips, Kim. "Masculinities and the Medieval English Sumptuary Laws," *Gender and History* 19 (2007): 22-42.
- Power, Eileen. *The Wool Trade in English Medieval History: Being the Ford Lectures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Ragen, Brian. "Semiotics and Heraldry," *Semiotica* 100 (1994): 5-34.

- Richardson, Douglas. *Plantagenet Ancestry: A Study in Colonial and Medieval Families, 2nd Edition*. Salt Lake City: Genealogical Publishing Company, 2011.
- Richmond, Colin. *The Paston Family in the Fifteenth Century: Endings*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 2000.
- Richmond, Colin. *The Paston Family in the Fifteenth Century: Volume 1, The First Phase*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Riden, Philip and Charles Insley, *A History of the County of Northamptonshire: Volume 5, The Hundred of Cleley*. London: Victoria County History, 2002.
- Roffey, Simon. *The Medieval Chantry Chapel: An Archaeology*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007.
- Rogers, K. H. "Salisbury." In *Historic Towns Atlas, Volume 1*, edited by M. D. Lobel, 1-9. London: Lovell Johns, 1969.
- Rogers, Nicholas. "A Pattern for Princes: The Royal Window at the Greenwich Greyfriars." In *Saints and Cults in Medieval England: Proceedings of the 2015 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Sue Powell, 318-38. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2017.
- Rosenthal, Joel. *Patriarchy and Families of Privilege in Fifteenth-Century England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.
- Rümelin, Hanjörg and Gisela Jaacks, "Bild und Raum: Die Bilder der Herzöge, Könige und Kaiser im Fürstensaal des Lüneburger Rathauses." In *Das Lüneburger Rathaus: Ergebnisse der Untersuchungen 2008 bis 2011, Band 1*, edited by Joachim Ganzert, 305-27. Petersberg: Imhof Verlag, 2014.
- Rylands, Harry, ed. *The Four Visitations of Berkshire Made and Taken by Thomas Benolte, Clarenceux anno 1532 1566, 1623 & 1665-6*. London: The Harleian Society, 1908.
- Salzman, L.F. *A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 2*. London: Victoria County History, 1948.
- Sanders, Ivor. *Feudal Military Service in England: A Study of the Constitutional and Military Powers of the Barones in Medieval England*. Greenwood Press, 1980.
- Santolaria Tura, Anna. *Glazing on White-Washed Tables*. Girona: Institut Catala de Recerca en Patrimoni Cultural, 2014.
- Saul, Nigel. *Scenes from Provincial Life: Knightley Families in Sussex, 1280-1400*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Saul, Nigel. "Bold as Brass: Secular Display in English Medieval Brasses." In *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*, edited by Maurice Keen and Peter Coss, 169-94. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002.
- Saul, Nigel. *Death Art and Memory in Medieval England: The Cobham Family and their Monuments 1300-1500*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

- Saul, Nigel. *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Saul, Nigel. "The Gentry and the Parish." In *The Parish Church in Later Medieval England. Proceedings of 2002 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Clive Burgess and Eamon Duffy, 243-256. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2006.
- Schleif, Corine and Volker Schier. "Views and Voices From Within: Sister Katerina Lemmel on the Glazing of the Cloister at Maria Mai." In *Glasmalerei im Kontext: Bildprogramme und Raumfunktionen: Akten des 22. Internationalen Colloquiums des Corpus Vitrearum Nürnberg, 29. August–1. September 2004*, edited by Rüdiger Becksmann, 211-28. Nuremberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum, 2005.
- Sheingorn, Pamela. "'The Wise Mother': The Image of St. Anne Teaching the Virgin Mary." *Gesta* 32.1 (1993): 69-80.
- Shipp, William and James Hodson, eds. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset, Volume 1, 3rd Edition*. London: W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, 1861.
- Smith, Albert H. "John Nichols and Hutchins's History and Antiquities of Dorset." *The Library, Fifth Series* 15.2 (June, 1960): 81-95.
- Smith, Kathryn, A. *Art, Identity and Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England*. London: The British Library, 2003.
- Sprakes, Brian. *The Medieval Stained Glass of South Yorkshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Stacey, Megan. "Artistic and Technical Dexterity: An Investigation of Medieval Jewel Techniques in Stained Glass." In *Stained Glass: Art at the Surface: Creation, Recognition, Conservation: Transactions of the 10th Forum for the Conservation and Technology of Stained Glass, Cambridge, 3th-5th September, 2017*, edited by Sarah Brown et al, 43-59. Burwood: ISCCSG, 2017.
- St. John Hope, W. H. "The Architectural History of the Cathedral Church and Monastery of St. Andrew at Rochester." *Archaeologia Cantiana* 23 (1898): 194-328.
- Stone, David. "The Productivity and Management of Sheep in Later Medieval England." *The Agricultural History Review* 51.1 (2003): 1-22.
- Thompson, Michael. *The Medieval Hall: The Basis of Secular Domestic Life, 600-1600 AD*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995.
- Thoresby, Ralph. *Ducatus Leodiensis: Or, the Topography of the Ancient and Populous Town and Parish of Leedes*. London: Maurice Atkins, 1715.
- Tscherpel, Gundrun. "The Political Function of History: The Past and Future of Noble Families." In *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton*

- Medieval Symposium*, edited by Richard Eales and Shaun Tyas, 87-105. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2003.
- Vivian, John Lambrick. ed. *The Visitations of the County of Devon: Comprising the Herald's Visitations of 1531, 1564 & 1620*. Exeter: H. S. Eland, 1895.
- Wagner, Anthony. *Heralds and Heraldry in the Middle Ages: An Inquiry Into the Growth of the Armorial Function of Herald's*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Wayment, Hilary. "Twenty-Four Vidimuses for Cardinal Wolsey." *Master Drawings* 23/24, no.4 (1985): 503-17.
- Wright, Thomas. *The Roll of Arms of the Princes, Barons, and Knights who attended King Edward I to the Siege of Caerlaverock in 1300*. London: John Camden Hotten, 1864.
- Wood, Margaret. *The English Mediaeval House*. London: Bracken Books, 1985.
- Woodcock, Thomas, et al. eds. *The Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary, Volume Two*. London: Society of Antiquaries, 1996.
- Woodcock, Thomas and John Martin Robinson. *The Oxford Guide to Heraldry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Woodcock, Thomas and Sarah Flower, eds. *The Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary, Volume Three*. London: Society of Antiquaries, 2009.
- Woodcock, Thomas and Sarah Flower. eds. *The Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary, Volume Four*. London: Society of Antiquaries, 2014.
- Woolgar, Chris. *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Woolgar, Chris. *The Senses in Late Medieval England*. Yale: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Yates, Margaret. *Town and Countryside in Western Berkshire, c.1327-c.1600: Social and Economic Change*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007.
- Young, Alan. *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments*. London: George Philip, 1987.

### **Unpublished Secondary Sources**

- Rainer, John. *Little Saxham Hall, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk: Report on Geophysical Survey, September 2014*. Suffolk Archaeological Field Group, Unpublished Report Series, 2014.