This article was downloaded by: [University of Exeter]
On: 14 July 2015, At: 07:26
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:
1072954 Registered office: 5 Howick Place, London, SW1P 1WG

Archaeological Journal

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/raij20>

Remarks on an Effigy of a Knight in Winchester Cathedral

W. S. W.

Published online: 10 Jul 2014.

To cite this article: W. S. W. (1858) Remarks on an Effigy of a Knight in Winchester Cathedral, *Archaeological Journal*, 15:1, 125-136, DOI: [10.1080/00665983.1858.10851074](https://doi.org/10.1080/00665983.1858.10851074)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00665983.1858.10851074>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution,

reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

REMARKS ON AN EFFIGY OF A KNIGHT IN WINCHESTER
CATHEDRAL.

THERE is a remarkable sepulchral effigy in Winchester Cathedral, which has been from time to time the subject of much unsatisfactory speculation. So far from it having been ascertained, who was commemorated by the monument, it has even been left doubtful, whether he were an Englishman or a foreigner. Where there has been so large an amount of unsuccessful conjecture, a little more may, I hope, be tolerated ; but I propose to offer something else than conjecture as to who was intended to be represented by this effigy, though I may not be able to explain completely everything that has occasioned difficulty in determining to whom it should be referred.

It is the only military effigy of its period existing in that cathedral, or, indeed, in the city of Winchester. Removed many years ago from its original place, which was probably against a wall and under a recess, it now lies, detached from the remains of the tomb to which it belongs, behind the choir, between the monuments of Cardinal Beaufort and Bishop Waynflete. The knight was represented in a hauberk, chaperon, and chausses of mail of the time of Edward I., with a surcote reaching a little below the knee. There is no mixture of plate ; but there are fragments of ailettes, and these will require us to ascribe the effigy to the latter part of that reign, if not to the beginning of the next. The legs from the knees downwards are very nearly gone ; but sufficient evidence exists to show that they were crossed, and the feet rested on a lion. The head is slightly inclined, and reposes on two cushions, formerly supported by two angels, the bodies of which remain. The right hand grasps the hilt of the sword, and on the left arm is a shield charged with the following arms, viz., a cross between, in the first and fourth quarters, two cows passant, collared, and belled, and,

in the second and third quarters, three garbs. What was one side or rather the front of the tomb on which, there is good reason to believe, this effigy originally lay, is now built into the eastern wall of the Guardian Angels' chapel. There are carved on it, under five decorated arches, as many

escutcheons suspended by guiges, and bearing respectively the following arms, viz. : 1. The same that are on the knight's shield ; 2. Six eaglets displayed ; 3. England ; 4. France semé ; and 5. Castile and Leon quarterly. About forty years ago the effigy, which had been lying on the floor for some years, was repaired and partially restored. Happily, there was no attempt made to complete the figure, though the time-worn shield underwent that process. More fortunately still, there exists, in Britton's History of this Cathedral,¹ an engrav-

ing from a drawing of this effigy by the truthful pencil of Mr. Blore, which was made before the repair and restoration. This shows that the arms now on the shield agree in all essentials with what were there previously ; and from it is given in the margin a woodcut of the shield and the arms on it as they then appeared. There is also in the same work an engraving from a drawing by the same hand of the front of the tomb ; from which we learn that the arms then upon it remain unaltered in any material respect.

With so much heraldry and such indications of royal connexion or patronage, it might have been expected that there would not have been any great mystery about this effigy. The earliest notice of it which I have met with is in Gale's History and Antiquities of this Cathedral, published in 1715, p. 32 ; where it is thus spoken of : " Behind the Quire on the north side lieth a warlike person, whose figure is much defaced, with this inscription :—

' Hic jacet Willielmus Comes de Insula Vana alias Wineall. ' "

Of this singular inscription, which does not on a first perusal

¹ Pl. xxvi.

impress one with a favourable opinion of its authenticity, I shall presently have more to say. Gough, in his *Sepulchral Monuments*,² published in 1796, after describing the effigy, which he speaks of as in the north aisle, adds, "on his shield (are) two bulls with bells, quartering three gerbes, at his feet a hound. The front of the tomb now fixed against the wall, has the bulls and gerbes, six eagles displayed, three lions passant gardant, old France, Castile and Leon." He says nothing of the inscription.

Dr. Milner, who passed for an authority in his day, and not without some reason, though he is not to be trusted where heraldry is in question, describes the effigy, in his *History of Winchester*,³ as "the mutilated figure of an ancient crusader, armed *cap-à-pie* in a hauberk, with his sword and shield; the latter of which bears quarterly two bulls passant, gorged with collars and bells, and three garbs for the princely family of De Foix, of which was Captal de la Buch, Knight of the Garter of the first creation by Edward III. On an adjoining slab are the arms of the Royal families, to which he appears to have been related, namely, England, France, Castile, Leon," &c. He then goes on to quote from Gale the inscription before mentioned, as one "which is said formerly to have existed here." In his edition of 1809, he has altered these words, and speaks of the inscription as having formerly been "on the monument," but adduces no new authority. It will be observed that he notices only royal arms on the front of the tomb; but there can be no doubt of the others having been there at that time. The omission may, perhaps, be attributed to his not having intended to speak of any but royal alliances.

Britton, in his description of the effigy,⁴ states, that it is "finely executed, and is said to represent William de Foix, of the princely family of that name, who resided on an estate called Vana, or Wineall, near Winchester." As he quotes no authority for this, I presume it is a bold interpretation of the inscription that we owe to Gale, by the light of information too hastily borrowed from Milner.

No trace of the inscription remains, nor is it known where it was placed. It does not read like an original

² Vol. i. pt. ii. p. 201.

³ Vol. ii. p. 75, 1st edition.

⁴ Winchester Cathedral, p. 102.

one, but like one of later date embodying an erroneous tradition, or a tradition misunderstood. No such title as "Comes de Insula Vana," or "Earl of Wineall," is known to have existed in this country or elsewhere. For a while I thought it might have been a foreign title translated into Latin, and rendered into vernacular English; but I can discover none by which it can be explained. Had there been such a count or earl allied to the royal families of England, France, and Castile and Leon, he would surely appear in some of the genealogies or histories, and have been brought to light before now. The Captal de la Buch t. Edward III. was not a De Foix; nor are the arms of the family of De Foix on the monument: they were, *or* three pallets *gu.* It is true that at a later date they were quartered with *or* two cows passant *gu.* collared and belled *az.*; but that was the coat of Bearn, and it misled, no doubt, Dr. Milner. Wineall, formerly Winhale, or Wynthale, and now Winnall, is a small parish very near Winchester, extending some distance up the chalk hills. There is no evidence or probability of its having ever been insulated, though near the river; nor of its having been a lordship vested in any family in which there was an earldom at all resembling in name that mentioned in the inscription.

Some years ago Mr. Planche examined this effigy, and he has discussed it and the heraldry connected with it in vol. i. of the Journal of the British Archaeological Association. He also came to the conclusion, which indeed seems unavoidable, that the inscription mentioned by Gale is not trustworthy, and that the effigy does not commemorate a De Foix, or any earl de Insula Vana, or Wineall. He could not reconcile the arms on the knight's shield, or the six eaglets displayed, with any English family of the period to which the effigy manifestly belongs, associated as they are with the royal coats of England, France, and Castile and Leon. Though six eaglets displayed were borne by several English families, he inclined to refer them to Peter de Gavaston, who bore *vert* six eaglets displayed *or*; but on that supposition he could discover no one to whom he could attribute the effigy. He has concluded his paper by calling "attention to the very unsatisfactory account at present existing of this finely executed and interesting effigy."

Such is the present state of our information as to this

effigy.⁵ I have known it eight years, and had examined it twice or thrice before I was aware of what Mr. Planchè had written on the subject. In much that he states I fully concur. From what has been said, I need not add that I do not credit the inscription, nor can I admit that it commemorated a De Foix. For a while I was a little sceptical as to the arms on the knight's shield: I imagined they might have been carved in the fifteenth century on a blank shield that had once borne the original arms in colours only; but I saw good reason to abandon that supposition, when I found the same arms on the front of the tomb, without there being the slightest ground to question their genuineness. I felt assured too the knight was a foreigner; for those arms are very unlike English heraldry of that or any other period, and more easily reconcileable with some foreign examples; and I am strongly inclined to the opinion, that the arms with the six eaglets displayed were those of Gavaston. Still I might have remained in the same state of uncertainty as Mr. Planchè, had it not come to my knowledge through Mr. Blaauw, who first brought the fact forward in modern times, that a Sir Arnald de Gavaston was buried at Winchester in 1302. When I received this information I had not leisure to take up the inquiry anew; but anticipated that this fact would prove the desired clue to the right appropriation of the monument. So the matter rested till Mr. B. B. Woodward, who is engaged in writing an account of Winchester Cathedral, was very recently referred to me for information about the effigy in question. This led me to return to the subject, and I proceed to give the result of my further researches and speculations.

That Sir Arnald de Gavaston was buried at Winchester in May, 1302, we learn from the *compotus* or account, in 30 Edward I., of John Swanland, a messenger who had been sent, in the month of May in that year, from Guildford, by the King's command, to Winchester, to carry some money and two pieces of cloth of gold for the funeral of Sir Arnald de Gavaston deceased, which was to take place there.⁶

⁵ See note at the end of this Paper.

⁶ 30 Edw. I. Eidem (Johanni de Swanland) misso mense Maij de Guldeford per preceptum Regis usque Wyntone, ad de-

ferendum ibidem tam denarios quam duos pannos ad aurum pro exequiis domini Arnaldi de Gavastone mortui ibidem faciendis, pro vadis suis sic eundo,

This is the document in the Carlton Ride referred to by Mr. Blaauw in his account of the Letters of Edward II. when Prince of Wales, published in the Sussex Archaeological Collections, vol. ii., p. 97; but for want of a definite reference to it, and in consequence of Mr. Blaauw having lost or destroyed his notes, I am greatly indebted to the kindness of Mr. Hunter for having it searched for, and eventually found again. The valuables conveyed by the messenger may perhaps remind some of the present of money and a piece of rich brocade sent to a wife who was supposed to have lost her husband, which is mentioned in one of the tales of the Arabian Nights. In this case the money no doubt was to defray some expenses, and the cloth of gold to add to the splendour of the ceremonial. This rich material was probably used to throw over the coffin, for in the singular Will of Sir Lewis Clifford in 1404, he desires, "that on my stinking carrion be neither laid cloth of gold nor of silk;"⁷ and in the Paston Letters we read of cloth of gold being required for covering the body and hearse of the Duke of Norfolk; and Sir John Paston writes home for that to be sent which he bought for his father's tomb.⁸

The question now arises, who was Sir Arnald de Gavaston? The earliest mention I have found of him is in the 1 Edward I. It will be remembered that when that king, on the death of his father, returned from the Holy Land, he came through France. After doing homage at Paris to Philip III. for Guienne, he proceeded to that Duchy, and received the homage of his vassals there, and among them of Gaston de Moncade, Viscount of Bearn, who had been rebellious, and was still suspected. The king took from him a solemn promise, on pain of forfeiting all his lands held of himself, that he would not quit his court without leave; and four knights, apparently all Gascons, judging from their names, among whom was Sir Arnald de Gavaston, undertook, in a similar manner, that the viscount would keep his promise.⁹ This occurred "apud Saltum" (? Sault), on the Monday after Michaelmas, 1273, and it seems to show

ibidem morando pro negociis dictas exequias tangentibus, et ad curiam redeundo, per vij dies, xvij die Maij, pro primo computu patet, per diem xvij^d, quia ad sumptus domini Johannis de Drokenesford in quibusdam necessariis; xs. vjd."

Carlton Ride Records, T.G. 38,947. As the original was hastily written and is much contracted, I give the words *in extenso*.

⁷ Test. Vetusta, p. 164.

⁸ Vol. ii. letter lxvii.

⁹ Rymer, i. p. 505.

that Sir Arnald was then closely connected in some way with the Viscount of Bearn ; he probably held lands both of him and King Edward, or the viscount may have been a mesne lord between the king, as Duke of Guienne, and Sir Arnald ; for his lands as well as Gaston's were liable to forfeiture in the event of the latter breaking his promise. The next mention that I have found of Sir Arnald is in 16 Edward I. (1288), when he was delivered by King Edward as a hostage, with the same Gaston Viscount of Bearn and many others, to Alphonso III., King of Arragon, to secure the performance by the King of England of an obligation which he had entered into, to pay the King of Arragon 70,000 marcs, in case the Prince of Salerno did not keep his engagements with Alphonso.¹ This transaction took place at Campo Franco, whither Edward had gone as a mediator between Alphonso and the Prince of Salerno, respecting the kingdom of Sicily, which had recently passed from the house of Anjou to that of Arragon after the Sicilian vespers, and also respecting the liberation of the prince himself, who was a prisoner in the hands of Alphonso. Though called Prince of Salerno, he was in reality the son and successor of Charles of Anjou, King of Naples and Sicily, who was then recently dead. How he kept his engagements with Alphonso I must leave the histories of those two kingdoms to tell. The next notice of Sir Arnald that I have met with is in the year 1299, when he appears to have recently escaped from the prison of the King of France, and to have come to England with two other knights, namely, R. de Caupenne and Bertram Pavisalls. This I learn from an entry, in the Household Accounts of the king in that year, of the payment of 7*l.* 10*s.* to them for their expenses in journeying through Brabant, and passing into England. Whether this was his first visit to this country may be questionable, as many Gascons had been brought to England, and employed by Edward in the subjection of Wales, in 1282. We find him mentioned again in the Household Accounts of the 28 Edward I. (1300), published by the Society of Antiquaries, pp. 200-1, where there are entries of two payments of 22*l.* 8*s.* and 15*l.* 12*s.* to Sir Arnald de "Gavoston," banneret, for the wages of himself and his four esquires. The latest and only

¹ Rymer, i. p. 689.

other notice of him, which has come to my knowledge, is that in the before-mentioned Messenger's account, which proves that he died in 1302, and was buried at Winchester. The sending the money and the cloth of gold to Winchester on that occasion shows the king had great regard for him. Of his parentage nothing has been discovered, nor is anything known of any wife or issue, unless Edward II.'s favourite, Peter de Gavaston, were his son, which is highly probable, as I hope to show in a few words, though further evidence is required to justify me in asserting it to be a fact.

With regard to the surname, De Gavaston, I would observe, it is evidently of local origin. We have seen that Sir Arnald was associated with, and most likely a vassal of, the Viscount of Bearn. Now, I cannot find any such place as Gavaston; but in Bearn was an ancient barony called Gabaston, and a place of the name still exists about five or six leagues north-east of Pau. Probably from this barony, either by birth within it or otherwise, Sir Arnald, or some ancestor of his, derived this surname. I need hardly mention that Bearn borders on Spain, where the *b* and the *v* have long been used almost indiscriminately for each other, a practice which is traceable in the language of that part of France. In this country the name was variously spelt, but most commonly either Gavaston or Gaveston, and sometimes Gaverston, yet it occurs in Hemingford as Gaberston. The inhabitants of Bearn were at that time often called Gascons, in like manner as Gascony was used to comprise more than the duchy properly so called.

Sir Arnald was in all probability some years younger than Edward I. Peter was very nearly of the same age as Edward II., perhaps a year or two older, and is said to have been from Gascony, and the son of a knight ("a Wasconia oriundus, filius fuit cujusdam militis"). His father, as far as I can learn, is nowhere mentioned by name, but is said to have been a Gascon (Vasconus)—"regis Edwardi senioris quondam familiaris—miles generosus," who had done the king faithful service; and the king is said to have been not unmindful of his services, but had placed his son Peter in the court of the Prince of Wales, to be brought up (nutritum) with him.²

² See Monachus Malmesb., p. 109; Trokelow, p. 5; Hemingford i. p. 242, Hearne's editions.

Seeing the respect paid by the king to Sir Arnald's memory on the occasion of the funeral, the latter had no doubt rendered much greater services than the scanty notices we have of him show. There is nothing therefore improbable in the supposition that he was Peter's father; on the other hand, I think we have seen that there is a great deal to warrant an opinion that he was the father of Peter.

If such were the fact, or indeed if he were any near relation of Peter, then, with the exception of one coat, all the arms on the monument may be easily accounted for; since, whether executed before the accession of Edward II., or, as seems more probable, after that event when Peter was Earl of Cornwall and in high favour with the king, and married to his niece, his own coat and that of England might be expected to be found there; and the addition of those of France, and Castile and Leon, the realms from which the royal patron of Arnald had married his two queens, one of whom was the mother of Peter's patron, and the other the aunt of his betrothed or actual queen, would be quite in accordance with the usage of the time. The King of France, I may add, was the lord paramount of Sir Arnald's fief in Bearn. The other coat—that which is on the knight's shield and also on the front of the monument, and has occasioned so much difficulty—is not so easily explained. It is not properly two coats quartered with a cross over all; for then the cross would have partially overlaid the other charges; but it is, as I have before blazoned it, a cross between, in the first and fourth quarters, two cows passant, collared, and belled, and, in the second and third quarters, three garbs. The only known quartered coats, I believe, at the time this monument was executed, were Castile and Leon, and probably Hainault, which was composed of Flanders and Holland, and was assumed soon after 1300. The Roll of Arms, t. Edward II. attributes a quartered coat at that time to an English subject, namely, Sir Symon de Montagu;³ but if then used by him, it does not appear to have been continued. Or two cows passant *gu.*, collared and belled *az.*, were the arms of Gaston Viscount of Bearn, of whom we have seen Sir Arnald was probably a vassal. This Gaston

³ Quartile de argent e de azure; en les quarters de azure les griffons de or; en les quarters de argent les daunces de goules.

was also "Dominus Montis Catani et Castelli veteris ;" but the cross and garbs did not belong to those lordships, for the arms of the former were six bezants, and those of the latter a castle, as may be seen in the engraving of his seal in Bysshe's Notes to Upton, p. 56. Garbs were not a common bearing in France : three were borne by families named Brosse and Aust, and also by Briois and Avenieres with what may have been a difference ; but none of these families have been found to be in any way connected with Bearn, nor indeed does the family of the Viscounts of Bearn appear to have been allied to any family bearing garbs. Still I cannot doubt that the cows have reference to Bearn ; and, as we have seen reason to think that Sir Arnald was a vassal of Gaston Viscount of Bearn, I would suggest that the garbs (*tres garbas*) may be a canting allusion to the first two syllables of Gabaston, in accordance with the practice of the time. Though not one of the happiest of such allusive bearings, many might be quoted that were little, if at all, better. The cross may have been adopted merely as a mode of separating the other charges, in the same manner as it may be seen to have been employed in the *signum*, as it is called, of Alphonso IV. of Castile and Leon, to the release by him of his pretensions to Gascony, in 1254,⁴ which was before those arms were quartered on his seal. A similar mode of separating the quarterings was used by the Kings of Castile and Leon, both in the *signum* and on their seals, as late as 1307, as appears by a charter of Ferdinand IV., now in the British Museum.

Thus considered, these arms would be in the nature of a feudal coat, or a coat having a feudal origin, composed in part of the arms of the lord of the fief. This would make it more easy to comprehend why Peter de Gavaston did not use the same arms as his father ; for, even if he succeeded to the fief of his father in Bearn, he had far more important fiefs here ; and, being raised to so high a position, he may have thought the garbs not a happy allusion to his patronymic, and preferred assuming a new and more pretentious bearing. I cannot discover any good reason for his choosing eagles ; but it is remarkable that Ralph Monthermer, another foreigner (I believe) of inferior condition, who at that time

⁴ Rymer, i. opp. p. 310.

had married an English princess, the mother of Gavaston's wife, bore an eagle displayed with the same tinctures as Gavaston, viz., *vert* and *or*, but reversed, his being *or* an eagle displayed *vert*. Neither he nor Gavaston appears to have been in any way connected with the Empire.

Upon the whole, I hope I have shown that it is highly probable that this effigy commemorated Sir Arnald de Gavaston, and that he was the father of Peter de Gavaston. Supposing, however, that he was not the father, but some other relation of Peter de Gavaston, so common was it for different members of the same family, even brothers, at that time to bear coats of arms essentially unlike, according to the different alliances or feudal engagements that they contracted, that there would still be sufficient reason to justify us in regarding this effigy as intended to represent Sir Arnald de Gavaston. In either case, as Peter de Gavaston was put to death in 1312, it could hardly have been executed later than in that year; so that its date must be placed between the death of Sir Arnald in May, 1302, and the death of Peter in 1312, and most probably about 1308.

W. S. W.

NOTE.—After this Paper had been read at a Meeting of the Institute, I discovered that some further observations had been made on this monument by Mr. Planché, which are reported in vol. xii., pp. 94—96, of the British Archaeological Association. He stated that he had received from Mr. F. J. Baigent of Winchester “two rubbings he had taken from the front edge of the slab, of a name which had been twice incised upon it, and which proved to be ‘*Petrus Gauston*,’ or ‘*Gavston*.” Woodcuts of the rubbings are there given. Judging from them, the writing is not earlier than the middle of the fourteenth century, and had been scratched on the stone with a point: most probably, it is mere scribbling, as the words occur twice. The usual mark of abbreviation to indicate *er*, seems omitted after the *u*. It appears to be a contracted form of Gaverston, as we have seen the name was sometimes written. In a MS. chronicle preserved in the Library in

Reigate Church, the name is written Gaverston in the text, and Gau'ston in the margin. That MS. is probably of the latter half of the fourteenth century. The scribbling may have been the record of somebody's conviction that the monument was that of Peter de Gavaston. However, Mr. Planchè could not concur in this opinion, though he thought the effigy might have commemorated some member of his family. He noticed that Gavaston's parentage was unknown, and mentioned "Arnaldo de Gavaston," as if he might have been a relative; but he did not appear to have been aware of his having been buried at Winchester. It is singular this scribbling should not have been found earlier. The particulars of the discovery, and how it was made would have been acceptable. It seems improbable that, within a century after the monument was erected, there could have been a doubt as to whom it was intended to represent. Peter de Gavaston was ultimately buried at King's Langley, Herts, his remains having been removed thither from Oxford in 1314.