

the other *rich* Norman, without thinking much of any difference of date. The contrary is the case with the window at Iver; it does not strike one as particularly plainer or ruder than the Norman which displaces it, but simply as *different in style*. Most supposed Anglo-Saxon remains unite both distinctions; they are both ruder in work and different in character from Norman. No one could for a moment suppose that the doorway at Barton-on-Humber was merely an earlier and ruder variety of Norman. It looks essentially different, and is much more like debased Roman than rude Norman work."

---

ON SOME MARKS OF CADENCY BORNE BY THE SONS OF  
KING EDWARD III., AND BY OTHERS OF THE FAMILY OF  
PLANTAGENET.

ARMORIAL devices had hardly become hereditary, before the need of some means of distinguishing the coat armour of members of the same family began to be felt; especially where younger sons had attained the rank of bannerets, or had become heads of new families, and acquired honours or possessions that might devolve to their issue. Various modes of accomplishing this were resorted to, such as changing the tinctures, or adding, omitting, or substituting some charge or charges, or the like; and as heraldry became more and more systematic, several methods were suggested for general adoption, but no one came into extensive use. In order that the connexion with the chief of the family might be manifest, it was a great object to vary the paternal coat no further than was necessary to effect a distinction; and hence the differences became very early too minute to be readily recognized.

The rules for the application of the marks of cadency or distinctions of houses found in the Treatises on Heraldry, are comparatively modern, though the first six of those marks appear to have been in early use for such purposes. Thus, in Dugdale's *Warwickshire*, vol. ii., pp. 398 and 404, 2nd edit., are prints from engravings by Hollar, of the seven sons of Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, who died in 1369, taken from windows formerly in St. Mary's Church, Warwick,

all having names attached to them, and the arms of Beauchamp, a fess between six crosslets on their jupons, but each with a difference, viz., the eldest having a label, the second an annulet, another a crescent, another a martlet, another a fleur-de-lis, and another a mullet; all of which, except the label, are placed on the fess: the other son appears with a label on his breast and an annulet on the fess; but I apprehend there is some error in the print, for the label is faint, as if it had been imperfectly erased; and what looks like an annulet was probably some other charge, as that is the difference on the fess of the second son. I hardly think a double difference was intended, for there is reason to believe that this was either the third or fourth son, since the name attached to it is William, which the fourth son is said to have borne; but there are, unfortunately, two Williams in these engravings, and the other bears a crescent for his difference. One of them should have been Reynburn, as that name does not appear, though there was a son so named, who is said to have been the third. I question, however, whether the order of birth ascribed to these sons can be relied on after the second, who was Thomas, and succeeded his father in the earldom, Guy, the eldest, having died in his father's lifetime. There is, nevertheless, sufficient to show that the modern order was not observed in regard to these differences, nor, with the exception of the label, were they placed on the same part of the coat which the modern rules prescribe.<sup>1</sup> It is highly probable that it was to these figures that Spelman referred in his *Aspilogia*, p. 141, when he stated that the first six of the modern differences were exemplified in a window of St. Mary's Church, Warwick, upon the arms of the six sons of Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick; though, in fact, there were *seven* figures, and these were in *two* windows, viz., the great North Window of the Church, and a South Window of the choir. Something must be said of the date of these figures, for they may otherwise be supposed to have been executed many years after the deaths of those whom they represent. This, I think, the costume sufficiently determines; for, though evidently much misinterpreted by the artist, it shows them to belong to the latter part of the 14th or the beginning of the 15th century, as they are all in

<sup>1</sup> Wriothlesley, a herald temp. Edw. IV., claimed the credit of devising the present usage of placing all the marks of cadency in chief. See Spelman's *Aspilogia*, p. 140.

bascinet and camails with rich belts round the hips. Guy, Reynburn, and probably Jerome and John, died in their father's lifetime ; still I do not suppose these windows were executed till after his death in 1369 : indeed it was he who, by his will in that year, ordered his executors to new-build the choir of this church. It is observable, that this mode of differencing is essentially unlike that given by Upton, who, writing in the first half of the 15th century, assigns to the eldest son a crescent, to the second son a label of three points, to the third son a label of four points, and so forth ; in which, as in many other matters, he is followed by the Book of St. Alban's.

An acquaintance with the various modes of differencing coats, which have been in use from time to time, is not only important to the genealogist, but of great service to the antiquary ; for, besides being thereby enabled to identify the branch or member of the family indicated by a particular shield, he can often by such means ascertain, within very narrow limits, the date of the monument or building on which the coat occurs. This, it is obvious, is most practicable in regard to the arms of those families whose pedigrees and heraldic differences are best known or most easily traced ; and, therefore, the shields of the several members of the Royal House of Plantagenet have a peculiar interest and value in this respect. The marks of cadency by which the heirs apparent and the junior members of it were distinguished, are to a great extent known ; and many original examples of their arms so differenced remain ; some on seals and tombs, and others in illuminations, painted glass, mural paintings, carvings, and the like. The label and bordure, either plain or charged, were chiefly, though not exclusively, used by this family. Thus Edward I., Edward II., and Edward III., before they respectively came to the crown, bore England (*i. e.*, *gules* three lions passant guardant in pale *or*) with a label *azure* :<sup>2</sup> Edmund Crouchback, Earl of Lancaster, second son of Henry III., bore England with a label of France (*i. e.*, *azure*, charged with fleurs-de-lis *or*) ; his second son Henry, in the lifetime of his father and elder brother, whom he succeeded, bore England with a bendlet

<sup>2</sup> I have stated this label to be *azure*, which in all probability was the fact ; for though I am not able to adduce any deci-

sive evidence of this as to Edward I., the siege of Carlaverock and examples in glass show Edward II. and III. bore it *azure*.

*azure*; Thomas of Brotherton, Earl of Norfolk, second surviving son of Edward I., bore England with a label *argent*; Edmund of Woodstock, Earl of Kent, third surviving son of Edward I., bore England within a bordure *argent*; John of Eltham, Earl of Cornwall, second son of Edward II., bore England within a bordure of France;<sup>3</sup> Edward III. having quartered France and England, his eldest son the Black Prince bore France and England quarterly with a label *argent*; the label of the heir-apparent having, in all probability, been changed from *azure* to *argent* in consequence of the *azure* of the shield of France having required a different tincture for it;<sup>4</sup> Lionel of Antwerp, Duke of Clarence, the third son of Edward III., bore France and England quarterly with a label *argent*, having each point charged with a canton *gules*; John of Ghent, Duke of Lancaster, the fourth son, bore France and England quarterly with a label *ermine*, while his son, afterwards Henry IV., bore in his father's lifetime England with a label of France; Edmund of Langley, Duke of York, the fifth son of Edward III., bore France and England quarterly with a label *argent*, having each point charged with *torteaux*, while his two sons in his lifetime bore as follows, *viz.*, Edward, France, and England, quarterly, with a label *gules*, having each point charged with castles *or*; and Richard, the arms of his father within a bordure *argent*, charged with lions *purpure*; and Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, the seventh son of Edward III., bore France and England quarterly within a bordure *argent*. This series of examples might be easily extended, but it will suffice to illustrate the nature of the differences used in the Royal Family during the 13th and 14th centuries. I have not specified the number of points of which the labels

<sup>3</sup> He died, without issue, in 1334, and this coat is afterwards found borne by the Hollands, Dukes of Exeter. Some have erroneously attributed to John of Eltham the arms of Richard and Edmund, Earls of Cornwall, the brother and nephew of Henry III.; which were *argent*, a lion rampant, *gules* crowned, or within a bordure, *sable bezanty*.

<sup>4</sup> An incautious reader of Mr. Boutell's work on Brasses may be led to suppose, that under the House of Lancaster the label of the heir-apparent was again changed, as the arms of the Earls and first Duke of Lancaster, *viz.*, England with

a label of France, on the brass of Sir John Leventhorpe, are there inadvertently ascribed to Henry V. when Prince of Wales. That prince first reduced the fleurs-de-lis of France in the quarterly coat of Plantagenet to three, and bore France (so reduced) and England quarterly, with a label *argent*. The arms of Lancaster on the above-mentioned Brass, probably had reference to the fact of Sir John Leventhorpe having held lands under the Duchy of Lancaster, (see Wright's Essex, v. ii., p. 202,) which was then vested in the Crown.

consisted, for at that period they were of three or five indifferently, according to the fancy of the artist, or the space that he had to occupy; and in like manner, as may be supposed, the number of the fleurs-de-lis, ermine spots, and torteaux, on the respective labels, was not fixed, though in general there were three on each point. These marks of cadency, we may feel assured, were not adopted without there being something significant or suitable in them, which led to their selection, though we may not now be able in every case to discover what it was. Some of them can be satisfactorily explained. Thus the label of France, borne by Edmund Crouchback, Earl of Lancaster, is with much apparent reason thought to have been taken on his marriage with his second wife, who was a French princess; which implies that he had previously used some other difference, though what it was does not appear. However this may have been, there can surely be no doubt that the bordure of France borne by John of Eltham, had reference to his mother, Queen Isabel of France; or that the differences borne by the two sons of Edmund of Langley, were derived from the arms of their mother, Isabel, one of the co-heirs of Castile and Leon; or that the label of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, which had on each point the ancient, or, at least, traditional coat of Clare, anterior to the well-known chevronels, *viz.*, *argent*, a canton *gules*, is to be attributed, as well as the designation of his dukedom, to his alliance with an heiress of that family, and the large possessions that he so acquired; and in like manner the ermine label of John of Ghent, who was Earl of Richmond before he was Duke of Lancaster, was taken from the arms of the former Earls of Richmond.<sup>5</sup>

In the preceding enumeration of the sons of Edward III.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Willement, in his *Heraldic Notices of Canterbury Cathedral*, pp. 41, 58, and 90, has attributed a coat very similar to that of John of Ghent, differing only in the fleurs-de-lis in France being reduced to three, to his grandson Thomas, Duke of Clarence, second son of Henry IV. So correct an observer was not likely to overlook a charge on the label; and Brooke, uncorrected by Vincent, assigns him the same. Yet Sandford, on the authority of his stall plate as a Knight of the Garter, states that the points of the label *ermine* were each charged with a canton *gules*; and York had previously given his label in this manner, though without any obser-

vation in support of it. Lionel, Duke of Clarence, we have seen, bore his label *argent* so charged, and I would suggest for inquiry, whether Thomas, Duke of Clarence, did not add that charge when advanced to the dukedom in 1411, which was ten years before his death. In two of the instances mentioned by Mr. Willement, if they were meant for his arms, they may have been those that he previously bore; while in the third instance, which is over the tomb of himself and his wife who survived him, the cantons may have been expressed in colour only, and have become no longer visible.

it will be observed that I have omitted two, viz., the second, who was William of Hatfield, and is said to have died at the age of eight years; and the sixth, who was William of Windsor, and died in his infancy. I am not aware of any arms having been appropriated to either of these Princes. It is by no means clear at what age or on what occasions arms were usually assigned to a young prince, unless he was advanced to some title or honour to which armorial bearings were incident. We read of Richard of Bourdeaux, afterwards Richard II., having borne, in the lifetime of his father, the arms of the Black Prince with the cross of St. George on the middle point of the label, though he was only ten years of age at his father's death, and had not had any title conferred on him. After the death of his father, he removed the cross of St. George, and bore the same arms as his father till the death of Edward III.

Nothing has been said of the daughters of the before-mentioned Kings; for, in general, unless in the case of an heiress, females till they married had no armorial bearings. After marriage the arms of the lady's father were at first used to show the alliance, but they were not *her* arms. In course of time the paternal coat came to be associated with that of the husband, first by dimidiation, and afterwards by the impalement of the entire coats; and this union of the two was considered as the armorial bearing of the wife. A few instances occur of arms being specially assigned to females, and perhaps one of the earliest was in the case of Antigone, an illegitimate daughter of Humphry, Duke of Gloucester, son of Henry IV. The reason probably was, that she would not otherwise have had any arms to impale on her marriage. The coat assigned her was that of her father with a baton *azure* over all; which was impaled with the arms of her husband, Henry Grey, Earl of Tanquerville, whom she married in 11th Henry VI. See Sandford, p. 319.

Seeing how definitely the arms of the junior members of the family of Plantagenet mark out certain periods, it will be easily imagined that great must be the pleasure with which an archaeologist, curious to ascertain the date of a tomb, window, or building, recognises one of these differenced coats. Any extension, therefore, of our information on this branch of heraldry must, I think, be acceptable to the members of the Institute; and it is to be hoped that in the course

of the minute examination now bestowed on the remains of medieval art, some valuable additions may be made to it of examples, which, if they have not hitherto escaped observation, have not yet been brought before that portion of the public that takes an interest in such matters.

On a visit to Lincoln Cathedral in October last, my attention was arrested by the interesting sculptured heraldry displayed on the Burghersh tombs.<sup>6</sup> A series of six shields, of different members of the Plantagenet family, especially attracted me. They are on the north side of Bishop Burghersh's monument, in the spandrils above the niches, in which are figures in ecclesiastical habits. The shields are all of the same form and size, about 3 inches long, and now without colour; but some traces of their having been coloured still remain. They are as follows, and, reckoning from the west, in the following order:—

1. France and England quarterly.
2. France and England quarterly, a label of five points, plain.
3. France and England quarterly, a label of five points, each charged with a cross.
4. France and England quarterly, a label of five points, each charged with two ermine spots.
5. France and England quarterly, a label of five points, each counter compony.
6. England with a label of five points, each charged with two fleurs de lis.

The arms of France are in each case semée of fleurs-de-lis; and the general character of all these shields is shown by the annexed illustrations.

I immediately recognised Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 6 as the arms respectively of King Edward III., the Black Prince, John of Ghent, and Henry, Duke of Lancaster; but Nos. 3 and 5 were new to me, and I have failed to discover them among the differenced coats attributed to this family, or elsewhere; but I hope I shall be able to show whose they were, and why those particular labels were used. I will here notice a seeming anachronism arising from the fact, that Bishop Burghersh died in December, 1340, the year in which John

<sup>6</sup> I have since been informed that these tombs were the subject of a paper read at the Meeting of the Institute at Lincoln,

but that the particulars about to be mentioned were not noticed in it.

MARKS OF CADENCY, BORNE BY THE PLANTAGENET FAMILY.



3. Lionel, Earl of Ulster.



2. Edward, Prince of Wales.



1. King Edward III.



6. Henry, Duke of Lancaster.



5. Edmund of Langley.



4. John, Earl of Richmond.

Heraldic Escutcheons, on the North side of the tomb of Bishop Burghersh, in Lincoln Minster.

(The escutcheons are numbered in the order in which they appear on the tomb, commencing from the West or head of the monument.)



of Ghent was born ; but, as the coat of this Prince is beyond dispute, it is manifest the tomb was erected some few years after the Bishop's death, which will be further apparent from what follows.

Now, first as to No. 3. As this shield occurs between those of the Black Prince and John of Ghent, it may be fairly assumed to have been that of Richard of Bourdeaux, William of Hatfield, or Lionel of Antwerp. Richard of Bourdeaux, we have seen, bore a label with the middle point (only) charged with the cross of St. George, and he was not born till 1366, and therefore it can hardly be his coat. William of Hatfield is not known to have had any arms assigned to him, and as he died when not more than eight years of age, and had no title or honour conferred on him, it is most likely that he had none ; besides which, if these were his arms, then those of Lionel of Antwerp are omitted, which seems improbable. It would therefore rather appear that these were intended for the arms of Lionel ; but he, we find, bore a different label, viz., a label *argent*, having each point charged with a *canton gules* ; and this he certainly did bear when Duke of Clarence, to which title he was advanced in 1362. The inference, then, is, that he had previously borne these arms, and this is highly probable ; for though he married one of the heiresses of Clare, to whom he was affianced in his childhood, she was also the heiress of De Burgh, Earl of Ulster, and before he was Duke of Clarence he was Earl of Ulster, and the arms of De Burgh were *or, a cross gules*. There is therefore good reason to believe he may have borne a label having each point charged with the cross of De Burgh after his marriage in 1352 or 1353, or his advancement to the earldom in 1355, until, having been created Duke of Clarence, he changed it for a label *argent*, having each point charged with a *canton gules* ; which, we have seen, was reputed to be the ancient bearing of the family of Clare.

To come to No. 5. If these be the arms of a son of Edward III., and of this, I think, there can be no doubt, they were, in all probability, those of the son born next after John of Ghent, and that was Edmund of Langley. But certainly, when Duke of York, he bore a label *argent*, having each point charged with *torteaux*. Thus, as in the preceding case, we are constrained to suppose he had previously used

a different label, namely, one having the points counter compony. The points of the label in No. 5 are clearly counter compony, and of eight pieces each. This differs, as is well known, from chequy, in having laterally only two squares in a row, while the latter has three or more; but in medieval heraldry it was no uncommon thing for the former to be put for the latter, especially where the space hardly admitted of three squares laterally with effect; which was peculiarly the case with the points of this label. It is, therefore, by no means improbable that this label may have been intended for chequy. Taking it otherwise, I am not able to account for it; but as chequy, I have no difficulty in doing so. Edmund of Langley was born in 1341, and was consequently about six years of age in 1347, when the last John de Warenne, Earl of Surrey, of the family of Plantagenet, died without lawful issue. On which event, in consequence of an arrangement between that Earl and King Edward II., the large possessions of the Warennes, except a part which had been settled, fell to the Crown; and out of them Edward III. took the opportunity of providing for this son by a grant to him of the honours and lordships which they had held north of the Trent.<sup>7</sup> It had been an object with the Earl, as appears by an agreement between him and the King in 20th Edward III., to have his distinguished name and arms continued in one of the royal family, should he die without lawful issue male.<sup>8</sup> That agreement failed of effect for reasons which I need not specify; but the desire expressed in it, and the high rank which the Warennes had long held, and their connexion both by blood and marriage with the house of Plantagenet, may have induced the King to difference the coat of this son, who thus succeeded them in the north, by a label of their well-known arms. Surely, therefore, it is not unreasonable to conclude that such was the fact, and that this label was in reality intended for chequy. When, however, Edmund altered his label to one of *argent*, having each point charged with *torteaux*, I have not been able to ascertain; but presume it was either on his being created Earl of Cambridge in 1362, or on his marriage in 1372 with the younger of the two coheiresses of

<sup>7</sup> See Dugd., Baron., vol. i., p. 81; Watson's History of the Earls of Warren, vol. ii., p. 10, *et seq.*; and Dugd., Baron., vol. ii., p. 154.

<sup>8</sup> Dugd., Baron., vol. i., p. 81.

Peter, King of Castile, or else on being created Duke of York in 1385. An eminent French writer on heraldry (Menestrier), but who was not very well informed as to English affairs, attributed the *torteaux* to alliances contracted with the house of Courtenay, which appears to be a mistake; and Nisbet referred them to the ancient Earldom of Cornwall, which seems equally erroneous. *Torteaux* were a highly honourable bearing in Spain, and it is possible they may have been somehow derived from the Castilian alliance. Further than this I cannot carry the matter at present: perhaps some member of the Institute may be able to conduct it to a more satisfactory issue, and, by showing when the change of label took place, add one more to these useful data for determining when works of medieval art in this country were executed.

In the preceding observations I trust I have shown that Lionel, Duke of Clarence, and Edmund, Duke of York, had previously used other labels than those commonly ascribed to them; and if so, it follows that any genuine work, in which the later label of either of them occurs, cannot be earlier than when it was assumed, which was hardly before 1362; and that, as regards the Duke of Clarence, where his earlier label occurs, the work may safely be assumed to have been executed in or before the year 1362, and not earlier than 1352, in which, or the following year, he appears to have married the heiress of De Burgh.

Upon the frieze of the monument, which is opposite to that of Bishop Burghersh, and has been attributed to his brother Sir Bartholomew Burghersh, is also a series of five shields of the quarterly coat of Plantagenet; but as the labels are now unfortunately all plain, the charges that were upon any of them having been expressed in colours only, which have entirely disappeared, they afford neither evidence nor argument for or against the conclusions at which I have arrived in regard to the shields Nos. 3 and 5 on the Bishop's monument.