

ON THE MONUMENTS IN HORLEY CHURCH.

By J. G. WALLER.

THE ancient monuments in this church, which deserve the attention of the archæologist, are not numerous, but they consist of an effigy of the 14th century of unusual interest, a fine brass of the 15th century, another of the end of the same era, but of no great value.

Of these, the effigy, as earliest in date, must first be considered. It lies beneath the arch at the east end of the north aisle, which forms part of the arcade dividing the nave from the latter, and is on the level of the pavement. It is upon a table slightly ridged *en dos d'âne*, forming doubtless the lid of the coffin or tomb, and is recumbent in the usual manner, the head resting on a cushion, with a lion at the feet. The mutilations and defacements are comparatively slight, but consist in the loss of the right hand and upper part of the sword, part of left foot and termination of the scabbard. The surface is worn, but the other injuries of time, &c., are not very serious and in no way impair the interest which its details declare.

The posture deviates from the common formal type. The limbs are not parallel, but are arranged in such a manner that if we consider the figure as standing, which we really ought to do, we shall find the central line of gravity to fall very nearly to the heel of the left foot; it is a position of ease. The right hand must have held the sword drawn, but the end of the latter only is preserved. The left hand rests upon the shield, which is suspended by a *guige* over the right shoulder.

The figure is armed in interlaced chain mail, viz. hauberk, with sleeves extending to the elbow; hosen of



EFFIGY OF A MEMBER OF THE SALAMAN FAMILY.

HORLEY CHURCH, SURREY.

the same material, with knee-pieces (*genouillières*) of plate; and on the outer side of these is a cockle-shell ornament, possibly for protecting the strap attaching them. The head has a bascinet (*bascinet ronde*), about the edge of which is an ornament of a type not uncommon at the time, and also three pendent scale-form defences on each side, an additional protection for the cheek; and a camail is attached covering the chin, throat, and neck. I have noted that the sleeve of the hauberk extends only to the elbow; but there is a short supplemental sleeve of mail beneath the other, evidently covering the elbow, and which is carried from it halfway down the arm. To show that this is a separate piece from the hauberk, it is necessary to point out the precise manner in which it is executed. The mail of the upper arm shows itself in longitudinal rows, an appearance entirely due to the fall of the interlacing rings, whilst that of the forearm is transverse, in which the fall or arrangement is in the contrary direction. It is difficult to explain this, but is easily understood when manipulating an actual piece of mail. As this arrangement is not usually seen, it is worthy of notice, and a glance at the plate will serve to explain, at least, the appearance.

The forearm has the rest of its protection formed of overlapping scales, which may or may not be composed of metal, but were possibly of horn or whalebone: each scale has a central ridge. The hands were defended by gauntlets, which were now developing and superseding the mittens of mail. These were doubtless of leather, further strengthened by plates of steel; but the fingers have the surfaces too much injured to detect the form of those which existed. In an effigy at Clehongre,¹ Herefordshire, only a few years later in date, we find a fully-developed gauntlet, and this may not have been very different from it.

Besides the knee-pieces, we get the next adopted plate defences, which followed in this chronological order,—viz. roundels for the shoulders and elbows; and these take

¹ Engraved by Hollis.

the form of a lion's head, which is not unfrequent : those of the elbow show that they are fastened by a strap over the arm.

In addition to the hauberk, there are supplemental padded defences ; one worn beneath it, perhaps the gambeson or haketon, for they are similar in character and only differed in the materials used, the latter also being stiffer, and are known by the parallel quiltings. They were of oriental origin, and of very ancient use, as they may be seen upon the Assyrian sculptures in the British Museum. Over the hauberk we have another of the padded defences, the pourpoint, so called from the stitchings passing through and being secured by a button on the surface : some of these remain, but most of them are worn off : this garment has its edges fringed. Over all these the knight wears the modified surcoat called "Cyclas," differing mainly from the former in that the front is shortened, and being open at the sides ; it is also generally made to fit closer to the body, and, as in this instance, is often laced up on one side (the right). *Mamellières* of plate embossed, of a sexfoil shape, are on each breast, forming attachment for chains, one of which passes over the left shoulder, possibly to be attached to a tilting-helmet. That of the left side passes downwards, and its office is somewhat obscure, but it was most probably attached to the sheath of the dagger, as this weapon has also a chain affixed to its handle and depending from the girdle or ceinture round the waist. There is also a chain attached to the lower sleeve of mail of the right arm : it is difficult to say what its office could be, if not to be fastened to the sword-hilt ; but its termination is lost beneath the arm.

These special features are exceedingly interesting ; for although they occur partially in several monuments of the same time, yet it is not usual to find these chains in use for so many purposes. In the brass of Sir John de Northwood, Minster-Shepey,¹ there is one *mamellière*

¹ Engraved in Stothard's *Sepulchral Effigies*, and in vol. ix. *Archæologia Cantiana*.

with chain passing over left shoulder. In St. Peter's Church, Sandwich, is an interesting fragment which is very closely allied to the effigy under consideration.¹ Here are two *mamellières* formed of lions' heads, and a chain from that on the right passes over the left shoulder without doubt to the helm; a chain also from ceinture secures the dagger by its handle: in other ways this is much like the figure at Horley, and is possibly by the same hand. Both these monuments referred to have the roundels for shoulders and elbows. The baldric by which the sword is suspended is enriched by rosettes very much defaced; similar decorations, though smaller, are on the ceinture and guige. The shield is of an intermediate size between the small heater-shaped form, and the long one which almost covered the body, but it adheres to the form of the latter, being incurved. It is emblazoned with a double-headed eagle displayed, charged on the breast with a lion's head.

In the endeavour to ascertain the date of a memorial, we must always bear in mind that it must generally have been executed a year or two at least after decease, and sometimes even longer. In many cases this would influence the costume, the artist often following the prevailing fashion, supposing a considerable time to have elapsed after death. Nevertheless, we have evidence to show that occasionally the variations of costume between two epochs are strictly attended to, as in the fine brass of Sir Robert and Sir Thomas Swinbourne, at Little Horkeley, Essex:² here father and son evidently appear in the costume appropriate to each. Nor can it be doubted, that in very many, perhaps in most cases, effigies follow the attire of the deceased, and where specialities of detail are to be found, we may assume this to be always so.

In the monument of Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford,³ in Hereford Cathedral, we find an advance in

¹ *Vide* plate in *Archæological Journal*, No. 31.

² Engraved in Waller's *Monumental Brasses*.

³ Engraved by Hollis.

development upon that at Horley, in a further extension of plate. Now the date of decease is given 1321, and the special costume I should place twenty years later. By comparing the brasses of Sir John de Creke, in Westley, Waterless, Cambridgeshire,¹ 1325, and Sir John de Northwode, *cir.* 1330, we may find analogies with the figure at Horley; therefore, in assuming an approximate date, one cannot be far wrong in fixing it about 1320, and it might be a few years earlier. The armour is in a period of transition, and no example is more curious in illustration of it than the Horley effigy.

It may be well to note the conventions it has in common with others, such, for instance, as the hand resting upon the shield, which may be seen in that of De Bohun, and it may be in the torso at Sandwich. The drawn sword often occurs, as in the series of knights in the Temple Church, and there is one at Newton Solney, Derbyshire,² but these are earlier in date. The fine Flemish brass now preserved in the vestibule of the hospital in the Place St. Pharailde at Ghent, to the memory of its founder, Williem Wenemaer,³ 1325, shows the drawn sword, but uplifted; and it has other analogies, such as the chains depending from the breast, through two openings of the surcoat, one of which is attached to the handle of the sword, and another to the handle of the dagger; thus illustrating the use of these appendages. There is also the hand upon the shield. This must be considered as a few years later than the effigy at Horley. We may refer, for further illustration, to an effigy of a Blanch-front at Alvechurch, engraved by Stothard, and also by the effigy of Thomas Giffard at Leekhampton.

The monument is doubtless to the memory of one of the Salaman family, as the arms upon the shield would indicate, and they were seated in this parish. One Roger Salaman died 16 Edw. III., 1343-44, seised of the manor of Imworth, held of the Prior of Merton; but this is too

¹ *Vide* Waller's *Monumental Brasses*.

² Engraved in *Archæological Journal*, No. 28.

³ Engraved in *Archæological Journal*, No. 27.

late a date for the characters of the effigy, which have been previously discussed. It is more likely to commemorate the father of Roger, but no information whatever exists respecting him, or even of his Christian name. The badge of the lion's head, which is on the breast of the eagle, is seen in painted glass in several of the windows of this aisle, which may have been built by one of the family, and a chantry founded in it.

The fine brass in the north aisle,¹ now barbarously defaced by having sleepers for the support of the organ-loft resting upon it, represents the figure of a lady with hands conjoined in prayer, beneath an elegant canopy, and an inscription at the feet, which, however, does not belong to it. The date of the memorial, judging from its general characters, would place it about 1415, and when it is collated with others of a similar time, this is confirmed. The figure is attired in a long, full overdress, girded high in the waist, according to a prevalent fashion, and with exceedingly long sleeves, which, narrowing on the shoulder, gradually expand, and when reaching the wrist are open, and hang down in rich folds to the ground. Beneath these are seen those of an under-robe, closely fitting to the wrist, but which end in a full bag-like expansion, which may have been of a different material to the rest. The outer dress has also a large double collar, which falls upon the shoulders. She wears the horned head-dress, the pads or enclosures for the hair, projecting considerably on each side; and the veil, which covers it, is somewhat gathered up behind, instead of being pendent in the usual manner. On her neck is a collar of SS, or of the livery of Lancaster.

There are two brasses which closely resemble this in the costume, especially in the duplicated collar, and in the long flowing sleeves. One is that of Lady Peryent at Digswell, Herts, 1415, the other of Millicent Meryng, East Markham, Notts;² but neither of them is quite

¹ The head is engraved in Boutell's *Monumental Brasses and Slabs*, p. 87.

² Engraved in Haines's *Monumental Brasses*, Part I.

similar as regards the head-dress. But both are remarkable examples, that of Lady Peryent being unique. We may also compare the brass at Kingston, 1420, to Robert Skerne and lady, and the fine one at Beddington, 1432, to Nicholas Carew and lady, both of which illustrate the Horley brass.

The canopy is fine, and is of a single arch with cusps, above which rises a crocketed pediment surmounted by a finial, and supported by long shafts, ending in pinnacles. The inscription, placed beneath the figure, in the space occupied by that which has been torn away, runs thus :—

“ Of yo’ charite pray for the soule of Johān ffenner late wyf of Joĥn ffenner gent’ which Johān deceased the ij day of Juley in the yere of our Lord m’ v ‘xvj on whose soule Jĥu have mercy. amen.”

It is not worth while to discuss the propriety of this affiliation to a monument a century earlier, unless we consider it in the light of an appropriation, and, therefore, belonging to the class of *palimpsests*. But it is far more probable that, the original inscription being lost, and the other loose in the church, it was found nearly to fit, and so ignorantly applied. Thus we are unfortunate in not being able to assign either of these monuments to the persons they were intended to commemorate.

The brass of a gentleman in the civilian costume of the end of the fifteenth century, viz., a long furred dress, girt at the waist, is too common to call for notice, especially as here again we want the inscription to identify it.

The other memorials are worth only a record. They are here given.

On a small stone let into the south side of the nave is the following in capital letters :—

“ HERE LYETH ALYCE THELDEST DAUGHTER OF GILMYN GENT: LATE WIFE OF THOMAS TAYLOR OF HORLY THE YOVNGER. BVRIED THE 18 DAY OF JANVARY: 1615: AND THOMAS THE SONNE OF HER AND OF THOMAS TAYLOR ABOVE WRITEN HER HUSBAND BVRIED THE 1 DAY OF FEBRVA: 1615.”

On a stone on the north wall of the interior of the chancel:—

“GVLIELMꝰ BROWNꝰ PASTOR HVꝰ ĒCLÆ P. SPACIVM QVNQVAGNT. ANNORVM OBIIT 14^o NOVEMB: 1613: MAGDALENÆ VXOR EIVS PRIMA EXPIRAVIT SEPTIMO SEPTEMB: 1604: ET MARGARETA SPONSA VLTIMA CECIDIT: 17^o FEBR: 1611.”

E LVMBIS GVLIELM ET MAGDALENÆ ORIVNTVR	FILII	IOSEPH ET EIVS	NATI	GVIELMꝰ STEPHꝰ
				IOSEPHꝰ ET IÔHS
	BENIAMN ET AB IL'Ō	MARES	IOSEPH BENIAM	
			GVIELMꝰ IOHN BARNABAS THO.	
FILLE	PHCEBE SARA	FEMNÆ	SARA	
			MARIA ELIZABETHA.	