

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Graham Parry, 'John Weever: Antiquary and Medievalist', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 9, (1977), 84-96

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=121817&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

JOHN WEEVER: ANTIQUARY AND MEDIEVALIST

By GRAHAM PARRY

The intense consciousness of mortality that is so pervasive in late Elizabethan and Jacobean literature must have been partly a cultural fashion, but it had one evident historical source: the dissolution of the monasteries. The change in religion and the desecration of thousands of religious buildings in all parts of the country was a revolution of time that must have struck all men with a profound sense of the perishable nature of even the most solid and sacred fabrics, and must have created an unprecedented awareness of the difference between the present and the past. The hulks of monasteries, bare ruined choirs, dilapidated hospitals and devastated shrines lay everywhere across the kingdom. Great ruins were generally the mark of a vanished civilisation, and were customarily associated with Ancient Rome, which had left its grand debris all over Europe, debris which had inspired laments of an *ubi sunt* variety and provoked thoughts of *memento mori* all through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Spenser's "Ruines of Time" is a fair example of the tradition in the period we are concerned with. But now, by the end of the sixteenth century, England had its own ruins on the grand scale, medieval ones, and the knowledge that a civilisation or at least a whole way of life had recently perished produced a strong and melancholy awareness of mortality in the sensitive minds of the next few generations.

The old Catholic Church had been destroyed, but nevertheless it was an institution that the ancestors of the Elizabethans had believed in and upheld. Moreover, the Church had been the preserver of the records and the memorials of all the important families of England through the centuries; the cathedrals, abbeys and parish churches contained the records in brass and stone of the major families of the kingdom. Now it was one thing for the Catholic religion to be suppressed, but to obliterate the memorials of ancient families was quite a different affair. Amongst Elizabethan and Jacobean families of note, the cult of ancestor worship was extremely strong, as it generally is in traditional aristocratic societies, and it was strengthened and animated in these times by two factors: the rise of many new families to eminence and gentility as a result of Henry VIII's largesse, and, later, the ennobling of large numbers of wealthy men that James I rashly undertook for cash. These two waves of new gentry not unnaturally caused the older well-established families to fall back on their ancestry as proof of their superior estate. Concomitantly, the new gentry were anxious to discover any traces of eminent ancestry that might give some depth to their recently

acquired status. No wonder that the College of Heralds enjoyed a century-long boom from Henry's reign on.¹

Since the chief tokens of illustrious ancestry were often the monuments and memorials that packed the churches of every shire, there was a good deal of distress at the wanton destruction of these evidences from the time of the Dissolution onwards. Very probably the most active and iconoclastic reformers were plebeians and upstarts unmoved by any notion of family. Much valuable genealogical testimony perished at the Dissolution and during the reign of Edward VI, and innumerable memorials to family piety were mutilated or destroyed, especially if the deceased person had the misfortune to be comforted by stone angels on his tomb, or consoled by pious inscriptions that invoked Mary or the Saints.

Tomb-smashing remained a popular occupation with fanatic Protestants until Elizabeth tried to put a stop to it with her "Proclamation against breaking or defacing of Monuments of Antiquitie" (1560), wherein it was specifically objected that as a result of such ignorant and malicious defacings

not onely the churches, and places, remaine, at this present day, spoiled, broken, and ruinated, to the offence of all noble and gentle hearts, and the extinguishing of the honourable and good memory of sundrie vertuous and noble persons deceased; but also the true understanding of divers families in this realme (who have descended of the blood of the same persons deceased) is thereby so darkened, as the true course of their inheritance may be hereafter interrupted, contrary to justice.²

In spite of the penalties this proclamation contained, it was not altogether effective, for many Puritans found their conscience stronger than the law, and kept up the good work in the name of reform:

There sprung up a contagious broode of schismatickes; who, if they might have had their wills, would not only have robbed our Churches of all their ornaments and riches, but also would have laid them level with the ground; choosing rather to exercise their devotions and publish erroneous doctrines, in some emptie barne, or in the woods or common fields, then in those Churches, which they held to be polluted with the abominations of the whore of Babylon.³

It was against this background that John Weever brought out his volume *Ancient Funerall Monuments* in 1631. Weever, who was born in 1576 and died in 1632, had led an ineffectual literary life after getting his education at Queen's College, Cambridge. He published some civil and religious squibs before determining to become an antiquarian and settling down to the long regime of voluminous reading and scholarly travel that the avocation demanded.

We know little about him, and little needs to be known; his book is a sufficient monument to his existence. His purpose was to record the monuments and inscriptions surviving in English churches from before the change in religion; but although a perambulation of the shires in pursuit of inscriptions is the central activity of *Ancient Funerall Monuments*, the search touches on so many other subjects that the author is virtually drawn into compiling a social and religious history of the Middle Ages. His inexhaustible curiosity makes digression almost his most natural form of expression, so that his ambition of tidily recording inscriptions diocese by diocese is constantly frustrated as he is seduced into some tempting by-way of historical research.⁴ Funeral customs, *vitae virorum illustrium*, heraldry, the early Church history of England, the monastic orders and their rules, the history of the Reformation are all topics of his more notable excursions.

The intellectual support for the work came from his antiquarian friends John Selden, Sir Henry Spelman and Sir Simon d'Ewes, who were all suppliers and critics of information, and also from Weever's good friend Augustine Vincent, Windsor Herald and Keeper of the Records in the Tower, who had begun to compile a similar collection of funerary inscriptions because of their value to genealogical studies, and who seems to have made all his findings available to Weever. Principally, however, Sir Robert Cotton provided the work with its solid backing of scholarly material by giving Weever the run of his remarkable library of books, charters and manuscripts. The perfume of gratitude that permeates the book indicates how rare and serviceable a well-stocked, well-ordered library was in those days.

The dominant presence behind the book is William Camden, whose *Britannia* (1586) and *Remains Concerning Britain* (1605) are frequently and reverently invoked. Indeed, the section in the *Remains* dealing with epitaphs quite possibly provided Weever with the impetus to direct his own work the way he did; certainly the shire-by-shire approach to the subject, as well as the tendency to dwell on local worthies, are habits contracted from the *Britannia*. Beyond Camden lies John Leland, who is frequently mentioned as the founder of antiquarian studies in England, and who is particularly envied by Weever because he had been granted a royal commission by Henry VIII to enquire wherever he would into whatever he pleased. Weever remarks that he encountered a good deal of reluctance on the part of local authorities to let him pursue his researches, and was sometimes refused permission to see monuments or take inscriptions because he had no license. If antiquarian research were to prosper in England, he felt, some sort of official passport would be needed to enable a scholar to reach his material, so much of which was under private control.

Anyone writing on medieval church remains and extolling the ardent piety of the past at this time ran the risk of being considered a Catholic sympathiser, and Weever, like Camden before him, goes to some length to defend himself on this point. Our forefathers were all Christians, he reminds his readers, and the monasteries propagated religion and good literature throughout the

island. The old order perished principally for two reasons: "the delinquencies of the religious orders themselves were the sole cause of their own utter subversion",⁵ and the meddling of the Pope in English affairs became intolerable to national pride. Of theological differences Weever says nothing. He himself appears to have been a high Anglican, judging by the dedication of the book to King Charles, "The most royall Patron, Preserver and Fosterer of the undoubted religion of Jesus Christ". Throughout his book are scattered malicious portraits of Puritans, the more zealous of whom he naturally hated for their fanatic destructiveness, their aversion to the medieval background to the English Church, and for their indifference to traditional sanctities. He declares his own strong love for the order and beauty of religious services, and admires Laud as Bishop of London for his spiritual and architectural care for the Church.

We become aware in reading Weever of the desolate condition of the English churches in the early seventeenth century. Although to us it now appears as a period of great piety because we are so conscious of the religious literature of that time, to Weever and his contemporaries it seemed that public places of worship were strikingly neglected and that a casual impiety marked public behaviour. The condition of St Paul's was a national scandal, as well as a national symptom, until Laud took its restoration in hand. Laud's reforms of the character of the service in the 1630's were also in some measure an attempt to combat the slovenliness of church behaviour as well as to provide a doctrinal stiffening.⁶ Weever, when visiting Rochester, exclaims at the discovery of a well-kept church in a way that shows the rarity of the event: "The whole fabric of this church is upholden in wondrous good repair: her inside is neatly polished: and the monuments of the dead (which are antient and many) very fair and carefully preserved".⁷

A particular bugbear of Weever's is the use of churches as public conveniences. In particular, the habit of using monuments as "pissing-places" provokes him to some of his most wrathful prose against the "Atheisticall uncleannesse" of the age. He recognises that monuments had always invited use as urinals, but declares that only a barbarous age would tolerate such practices. In other times, piety was backed by law. He cites some monitory verses from ancient Roman tombs to show the antiquity of the custom, and remarks: "Indeed, such as had their graves, tombs, statues, or representations thus stained and defiled, were thought to have passed out of this world with shame and ignominie".⁸ Strict laws were then enforced against offenders, and thereafter in all countries where piety reigned; the laxness of the present times clearly showed their degeneracy. Later, while perambulating St Paul's, Weever inveighs against those "Beastly and unclean persons" who "pollute and bedaube the doores and walls of the place where God is to be worshipped, with pisse or some other nastie excrements".⁹ Behind the outraged piety one suspects there is also a protest at the working conditions of the church antiquary.

There is a strong sense of the degeneracy of the times running through the book. Weever is especially dismayed not only by the decay of piety but also by the obscuring of the clear-cut divisions

of rank in his society. On several occasions he digresses into wistful accounts of certain medieval titles or stations, niceties of the social hierarchy that have now become obscured or ignored. The conservative Weever finds the recently created nobility of his own times distressing, but this is only to be expected since one of his avowed reasons for writing *Ancient Funerall Monuments* was to enable honourable families of ancient standing to identify their lineage and fortify themselves genealogically against parvenus.

Piety co-existed with a clear respect for rank in those earlier, more admirable days, he assures us. Echoing Camden in his *Remains*, he urges that "Sepulchres should be according to the quality and degree of the person deceased, that by his tomb everyone might be discerned of what rank he was living . . . It was the use and custome of Reverend Antiquitie to interre persons of the rusticke or plebeian sort without any further remembrance of them";¹⁰ the meaner sort of gentry had flat gravestones with dates and particulars; "gentlemen of more eminency" were remembered by effigies on pillars or pedestals; while noblemen, princes and kings were commemorated by full sepulchres and effigies, life-sized in precious stone or metal. Signs of the breakdown of the social scale (a frequent topic of commentary in Jacobean England)¹¹ are visible in what might be called the sepulchral revolution. Now lofty inscriptions are lavished on base men:

More honour is attributed to a rich quondam tradesman, or griping usurer, than is given to the great potentate entombed in Westminster; and their tombes are made so huge great, that they take up the Church, and hinder the people from divine Service. Besides, if one shall seriously survey the Tombes erected in these our dayes, and examine the particulars of the personages wrought upon their Tombes, hee may easily discerne the vanity of our mindes, veiled under our fantasticke habits and attires, which, in times to come will be rather provocations to vice, than incitations to virtue; and so the Temple of God shall become a school-house of the monstrous habits and attires of our present age, wherein Taylors may find out new fashions. And, what is worse, they garnish their Tombes nowadays with the pictures of naked men and women, raising out of the dust and bringing into the Church the memories of the heathen gods and goddesses, with all their whirligigs.¹²

We might bear in mind Weever's objections when we stare appreciatively at those large Jacobean tombs that encumber the aisles of so many English churches. One man's aesthetic pleasure is another's moral scorn.

Weever laments too the "general neglect of funerals" in his time: they are no longer sombre pageants of mortality and visual demonstrations of a family's proud estate; they tend on the whole to be cut-price affairs, inexpensive inhumations. In particular, he complains that heralds are rarely employed at great funerals and that the rituals of proclaiming titles are lapsing. The old nobility

are simply not leaving this world as splendidly as they used to, and are in effect failing to enact their social roles. Weever's gloom at these spectacles of decline was widely shared by his conservative contemporaries, but he was seemingly the only one who observed the collapse of the social hierarchy in its posthumous manifestations.

Weever clearly shared the nostalgia for the chivalric past that was so widespread in the later Elizabethan and Stuart periods. The causes of this nostalgia were numerous and complicated, although a principal one must have been the frustration of the aristocracy and the gentry in having so few occasions to engage in the military life which was still regarded as the natural and proper testing-ground for the well-born man. So much of their education was connected with the martial arts, and chivalric ethics had such a powerful currency, that the peaceful condition of sixteenth-century England must have been exasperating to a degree to many a valiant Englishman marooned in the shires. Only the Low Countries were open for campaigning, and the number of young men who went over is a sign of the attraction that the wars exerted; otherwise one had to settle for the serious play of tilts and tournaments. At home, the increasing venality of James's court encouraged a belief that the nobility of older England had been, in contrast, truly noble, valorous and tough. Moving away from ancestral tombs, Weever stops from time to time to recount the exploits of some almost forgotten man that he has picked out of a chronicle or knows of by repute. Most often these are military exploits, with a chivalric tinge, and there is an evident pleasure for him in recalling the nobler spirit of earlier days.

But although this nostalgia for medieval chivalry is characteristic of the time, there is also, rather unexpectedly, a considerable respect for the literature of the Middle Ages. Weever shares Camden's conviction, expressed in the *Remains*, that disapproval of monastic culture on the grounds of its Romist errors, vices and superstitions should be tempered with admiration for its steady propagation of Christianity and good literature over the island. The Jacobean antiquary has exhumed a considerable quantity of that "good literature" and constantly quotes from medieval poems and chronicles, using them both as specimens of literary worth and also as what we nowadays would call sociological evidence to establish the attitude towards various issues in earlier ages. One senses that he has a mission to familiarize his audience with a body of neglected literature, as when he cajolingly remarks "my Reader might palliate his taste with an Essay of our Ancestor's old English, as well in the curte composition of their prose, as in the neatness of their holy meeters, which howsoever abounding with libertie, and the character of their times, yet have, I confesse, my admiration".¹³ Chaucer, whom he calls "our most learned English poet" (and therefore a proper study for antiquarians), he admires intensely, and recommends a perusal of "his life, written at large, by Thomas Speght (who, by old copies, reformed his workes) which the Reader may see a little before the beginning of his books".¹⁴ Most of the citations that Weever makes from Chaucer's works deal with the unregenerate behaviour of the clergy and with the lamentable state of the Church;

his pungent quotations come most frequently from the *Summoner's Tale*, the *Friar's Tale* and the *General Prologue*. It is with Protestant satisfaction that Weever reminds his readers that "Chaucer writes . . . much against the pride, covetousnesse, unsatiabie luxuries, hypocrisie, blind ignorance, and variable discord amongst the Churchmen and all other votaries".¹⁵ When he arrives before Chaucer's grave in his funerary perambulation of Westminster Abbey, Weever is able to quote the poetical tributes of a number of Chaucer's followers: Thomas Occleve, John Lydgate ("his Prologue of Bocchas") and "that excellent and learned Scottish Poet, Gawayne Dowglas, in his Preface of Virgil's Aeneid".¹⁶

Piers Plowman is also frequently quoted as evidence of the corruption of the medieval clergy or in illustration of social conditions. Weever introduces him thus: "In this King's raigne (Edward III) Robert Longland a secular Priest, borne in Shropshire, at Mortimers Cliberie, writ bitter invective against the Prelates, and all religious orders in those dayes".¹⁷ In spite of the harsh matter that Weever extracts from Langland, he appears very appreciative of the quality of the verse, and responds warmly to the personality of the poet. He speaks of him with a friendly intimacy, as if he regarded the poem as a private communication from the author, which suggests that he may have been working from a manuscript, rather than from Robert Crowley's printed edition of 1550 [STC 19906]. This supposition is borne out by Weever's extensive use of the Middle English metrical chronicle of Robert of Gloucester, the manuscript of which in Cotton's library was bound up with a manuscript of *Piers Plowman*.¹⁸ This chronicle of English history up to 1270 (based on William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon) evidently appealed strongly to Weever both as vivid history and as sturdy verse, and he finds frequent occasion to cite it in connection with the old English worthies whose epitaphs he encounters. Whenever an opportunity occurs to revivify the memory of some ancient stalwart lying beneath a meagre inscription, Weever seizes it, and Robert often provides the cue for praising men of near-forgotten fame.¹⁹

Another medieval author that Weever finds helpful for the amplification of ancient merit is John Hardyng (1378-1465), whose chronicle, written in English verse, was printed by Richard Grafton in 1543 [STC 12767]; there are more historical vignettes drawn from Hardyng than from any other source in *Ancient Funerall Monuments*. The cross-referencing of tombs and chronicles is almost inevitable in a work of this kind, but the patriotic ardour of Weever in demonstrating that England has always been the scene of heroic enterprise and high-astounding feats gives a special relish to his quotations. He also uses Robert Fabian's *New Chronicles of England and France* (first printed by Pynson in 1516 [STC 10659]) to illustrate the early history of London with pertinent specimens of "Rime Doggerel". Rather unusually for his time, the sources in English that Weever refers to outnumber his Latin sources, and although there is frequent quotation of Bede, Henry of Huntingdon, Matthew Paris, William of Malmesbury and Ralph Higden, it would seem as if English verse had for him a native merit that Latin lacked. He presumes that the Middle English that he prints will be comprehensible to the

contemporary reader, for only very rarely does he gloss a hard word in the margin.

Predictably for a man whose subject is part of ecclesiastical history, Weever is an avid Saxonist. Since the foundation of the great majority of English churches occurred in Saxon times, a competent acquaintance with pre-Conquest history is essential. Like most seventeenth-century Church historians, he portrays the Anglo-Saxon Church as an institution of primitive purity that was the true and lineal antecedent of the reformed Church of England. His primary source in Anglo-Saxon matters was naturally Bede, (whom he read in latin), backed up by modern antiquaries, principally Stow, Camden and Verstegan, but he also did extensive work on the monastic cartularies that had come into the hands of Cotton, and on the State records in the Tower, and he had a wide knowledge of Old English history, secular and religious. It seems as if he was able to read Anglo-Saxon, for he occasionally translates from a Saxon monastic charter. Going further back into the mists of early British history, Weever is less reliable, and declares himself willing to accept the story of Britain's foundation by Brutus, as relayed by Gildas and Giraldus Cambrensis.

From each of his various digressions Weever returns to the central business of transcribing inscriptions, hoping all the time that his reader is not overcharged with "dull, heavie and uncomfortable epitaphs". He is aware that the task is too vast for a man of modest resources, and once he plaintively solicits audience participation, asking sympathetic readers to scour their neighbourhood for memorials and send him the results of their researches.

Although the great majority of inscriptions that he records are those from family tombs, he also notes many other varieties of inscription that once filled a medieval church, but which had almost totally vanished after the Reformation. We are reminded that all parts and furnishings of a church carried verses, prayers or invocations expressive of their significance in the whole symbolic structure of the medieval church, a church whose architecture, from the cruciform shape of the whole down to the carvings of the portals, served to glorify God, to proclaim doctrine visually, and to save mankind. Inscriptions everywhere within the church, on organs and bells, on pulpit, portals and font, on crucifixes, candlesticks and roods, filled the whole edifice with silent declarations of faith and purpose, a verbal harmony that George Herbert was to recreate in the Anglican mode in *The Temple* of 1633. Weever preserves the old Catholic harmony that had almost been lost in the clamour of Protestantism.

Weever must have inspected thousands of tombs in his researches, but for all that he shows no particular interest in the monuments themselves. Occasionally he will describe something as "handsome", but for the most part there is no aesthetic response to the many remarkable works of medieval sculpture that he studied. Characteristically, too, for a man of his time, he appears to have no awareness of the various styles of Gothic architecture. When he is faced with a group of monuments where the dates have been erased, it never occurs to him to try to establish the oldest by reference to the

style of the tomb. This blindness to architectural and sculptural styles was common amongst antiquarians up to the mid-seventeenth century; their interests were conditioned by the preoccupations of classical scholarship, which held inscriptions and coins to be the principal objects of study, not the buildings they were found in. (Even the architect Inigo Jones, who had studied the ancient buildings of Italy, thought Stonehenge was a Roman ruin.) A consciousness of the importance of architectural detail in antiquarian studies is perhaps first apparent in Dugdale's *A History of St Paul's* (1658) and his three-volume *Monasticon Anglicanum* (Vol. I, 1655; Vol. II, 1661; Vol. III, 1673), where he insisted on the inclusion of numerous engravings that described the varieties of Gothic architecture with some accuracy.²⁰

The whole pot-pourri of antiquarian learning that is *Ancient Funerall Monuments* was evidently an attempt to follow up a number of lines of enquiry suggested by Camden, but Weever tried to accommodate so many diverse subjects that he never accomplished his ambition to produce a complete survey of funeral inscriptions. The book ends without having covered half the country. For all its incompleteness, however, the range of its learned curiosity made it a quarry and a source book for the next generation of antiquaries. Its lengthy account of the tombs in old St Paul's looks forward to Dugdale's *History*, and the detailed digressions on the history of the various religious orders again provided Dugdale with the pattern of his presentation of the same subject in the *Monasticon*. In the tradition of the books of worthies, *Ancient Funerall Monuments* is a halfway house between Camden and Fuller. In its eloquent discourse on the funerary customs of the ancients, it is a prefiguration of *Urn-Burial* (1658). Weever several times mentions the discovery of funerary urns in the environs of London, and speculates on the identity of their contents. It is possible indeed that the preliminary essay in his book, entitled "A Discourse on Funeral Monuments", with its elaborate account of comparative burial customs, coupled with his accounts of the unearthing of urns (some of which he acquired), may have sparked off the idea for Sir Thomas Browne's work. Browne, too, at the end of his life collected the memorial inscriptions and anecdotes of the worthies of Norwich, in his "Repertorium, or some account of the tombs and monuments in the Cathedrall Church of Norwich in 1680", an essay that reads rather like a missing chapter from Weever's book. Then again, the long digression on heralds, their origin, functions and privileges, along with the history of the Order of the Garter, looks forward to Elias Ashmole's sumptuous book, *The Institution, Laws, and Ceremonies of the Order of the Garter* (1672).

The intellectual route through the seventeenth century, as plotted by most scholars, now by-passes Weever, but in his age he stood clearly by the highway. His monument deserves the attention, and the respect, of more visitors. *Siste, viator.*

NOTES

- 1 For a discussion of the causes of the intense preoccupation with heraldry at this time, see Michael Maclagen, "Genealogy and Heraldry in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", in *English Historical Scholarship in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Levi Fox (Oxford, 1956); J.H. Plumb, *The Death of the Past* (London, 1969), pp. 30-41.
- 2 Cited in John Weever, *Ancient Funerall Monuments of Great Britain, Ireland, and the islands adjacent, with the Dissolved Monasteries Therein contained; their founders, and what eminent persons have beene in the same interred* (London, 1631), p. 52. A second edition of the book was published in 1661; reprinted 1767.
- 3 *Ibid.*, p. 54.
- 4 The book as it was published surveyed only the dioceses of Canterbury, Rochester, London and Norwich.
- 5 Weever, p. 9.
- 6 For a useful brief account of Laud's reforms of the service, see Austin Warren, *Richard Crashaw* (Ann Arbor, 1957), pp. 3-17, "The Laudian Movement".
- 7 Weever, p. 313.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 373.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- 11 See, for example, Bacon, *Essays*, "Of Envy"; H. Peacham, *The Compleat Gentleman* (1622), pp. 14-18; Ben Jonson, "An Epistle to a Friend, to Perswade him to the Warres"; J. Earle, *Microcosmographie* (1628), "An upstart Country Knight".
- 12 Weever, p. 11.
- 13 *Ibid.*, p. 154.
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 489.
- 15 *Ibid.*, p. 73.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 489.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 73.
- 18 This is now British Library MS Cotton Caligula A XI; it was originally acquired by John Stow, and contains many annotations by John Selden.

- ¹⁹ Here, for example, are the deeds of Sir Robert de Turnham revived. Weever incidentally, uses black letter type whenever he cites medieval verse, whether it be from printed book or manuscript.

A valiant knight, who flourished in the raigne of
King Richard the first, and went with him to the warres
in the holy land, as these old rimes do testifie:

King Richard wyth gud entent
To yat cite of Jafes went
On morne he sent aftur Sir Robart Sakevil
Sir William Watervile
Sir Hubart and Sir Robart of Turnham.
Robart of Turnham with his fauchion
Gan to crake many a croun.

- Weever describes the chronicler as "Robert the Monke of Gloucester, who writes the language of our fathers about four hundred years since . . . His lines you will say are neither strong nor smooth, yet perhaps they may give your palate variety, and as you like them, you shall have more hereafter". (p. 60)
- ²⁰ The first person to try to describe the development of Gothic architecture was apparently John Aubrey; see H.M. Colvin, "Aubrey's Chronologia Architectonica", in *Concerning Architecture*, ed. John Summerson (London, 1968), pp. 1-12.

APPENDIX

One hears not infrequently of the "medieval inheritance" of the Elizabethans. In an attempt to give some substance to this somewhat vague statement, I append a brief account of the medieval references in Weever's *Ancient Funerall Monuments*. I list only the principal quotations from medieval authors writing in English, with the page numbers in Weever, 1631 edition.

Richard Rolle. *English Psalter*, pp. 151-2; *Psalms of David*, p. 153.

Anonymous. *Metrical translations of the Psalms*, p. 154; *English verses* (c. 1490) on the foundation of Clare Friary, pp. 737-9.

Chaucer. *Friar's Prologue* and *The Friar's Tale*: alleged behaviour of devils in occupying dead bodies, p. 45; *General Prologue*: the Parson, "the character of a religious and learned priest", pp. 64-5; *Friar's Tale*: wantonness of priests, p. 131; *Summoner's Tale*: greed of friars, p. 159; *General Prologue*: absolution and easy penance, pp. 159-60; *Nun's Priest's Tale*: praise of Thomas Bradwardine, p. 223.

Chaucer Apocrypha. *Plowman's Tale*: difficulty of accusing priests, p. 76; irregular behaviour of priests, pp. 129-30.

Langland. *Piers Plowman*: invective against prelates, p. 73; pride of priests, p. 130; greed of priests, p. 131; loose behaviour of nuns, pp. 155-6; masses sung for money, p. 160.

Gower. *Vox Clamantis*: church abuses, p. 73; A ballade on Henry IV, p. 209.

Lydgate. Prologue to the *Storie of Thebes*: self-portrait of Lydgate, pp. 728-9; Prologue to *Bocchas*: Chaucer, p. 489.

Gavin Douglas. Preface to *Virgil's Aeneid*, p. 489.

Robert of Gloucester. *Chronicle*: early history of Britain, pp. 60-61; coming of the Friars preacher, p. 134; privileges of churches, p. 181; a prophecy of Merlin, p. 197; Henry II, p. 207; Richard Fitzroy, p. 214; death of King Stephen ("who died of an Iliack Passion mixed with his old disease, the Emrods"), p. 277; Robert of Turnham, pp. 318-19; London, p. 351; Danish attacks on London, p. 357; Brutus, pp. 376-7; King Lud, pp. 386-7; Gog-Magog, p. 397; Lucius, pp. 414-5; Nennius, brother of Cassivellaunus, p. 420; Edward the Confessor, pp. 452-56; Edward III, pp. 468, 473; Vortimer, p. 519, St Alban, p. 552; Piers Gaveston, p. 589; King Coel, p. 612.

Hardyng. *Metrical Chronicle*: origins of England, pp. 58-9; exile of Thomas Becket, pp. 191, 201; Henry IV, pp. 207, 210-1; Stephen Langton, p. 219; Duke of Clarence, pp. 212-13; Ethelbert, p. 243; Richard II, p. 472; Bladud, p. 518.

Fabian. *New Chronicles of England and France*: London, pp. 352-5; "A Balladde Royall" on Edward I, p. 463.