NOTES

A FOURTEENTH-CENTURY EFFIGY FROM ST MICHAEL'S CHURCH, THORNTON

St Michael's Church, Thornton: the fourteenth-century effigy.

This note describes the discovery of a late medieval stone effigy, believed to be that of Elias de Tingewick or John de Chastillon, at Thornton Church. Although notice of the discovery has already been published (Stewart 1994), we feel that the discovery is of sufficient interest to merit publication in the *Records*.

The oldest fabric of St Michael's Church is in the nave, south aisle and tower, which are fourteenth century. A north aisle had evidently been demolished by the time of the Bishop of Lincoln's visitation in 1637 (Gibbs 1889, 255). A major remodelling took place during the late eighteenth century when the chancel and north chapel were demolished; many of the internal furnishings date to this period, or to a further restoration in 1850

(Pevsner and Williamson 1994; Tricker 1966). It passed into the care of the Redundant Churches Fund (now the Churches Conservation Trust) in 1993. Amongst the principal points of interest are two late medieval funerary monuments: the alabaster effigies of John and Isobel Barton (mid-C15), and the tomb chest of Robert Ingylton (d. 1472) and his three wives (Lamborn 1947; Rouse 1947).

During restoration work at the church in 1994, the floorboards were partially lifted in order to treat them for woodworm. This action revealed a medieval stone effigy, virtually intact, beneath the North Aisle. After initial inspection of the discovery, the remaining boards in the region of the effigy were removed in order to enable it to be removed, and to search for further evidence. The effigy was taken to

the Cliveden Conservation Workshops for restoration, and the following description incorporates information from the conservation report (CCW 1994)

The figure, in Jurassic "forest marble" limestone, is that of a recumbent male in ecclesiastical attire, with the feet resting upon a lion, and traces of what appear to have been two "weepers" either side of the head, although these are not readily discernible. The lion had been mutilated at the time of the effigy's insertion beneath the floorboards, presumably in order to enable it to fit within the available space. Some damage to the lower part of the tunic had also taken place, apparently at the same time. Most of the damaged fragments were found among the debris beneath the floorboards. Some care had evidently been taken to minimise damage, for the joist supporting the floorboards above the effigy, itself a re-used timber (from the chancel roof?), had cut-outs in order to accommodate the head and hands, which protruded above the remainder of the figure. There were traces of paint in some of the crevices, particularly near the lower part of the effigy. Study of the pigments was undertaken at the History of Art Department, University College London, for the Cliveden Conservation Workshop. This showed that four colours were used:

Black (evidently not lamp black or any of the plant-derived black pigments), at the bottom of the tunic

Yellow Ochre (possibly Oxford Ochre, mined on Shotover Hill, near Wheatley), around the feet and lion

Bright Red (vermilion), in the folds of the tunic

Dark Red (also vermilion, but in a thinner layer and with an admixture of carbon black), between the tunic and the surface on which the figure lies.

Green (verdigris in its "common" form, scraped from copper plates exposed to acetic acid fumes, mixed with a little yellow ochre and chalk), in a single small area between the tunic sleeve and the forearm.

The appearance of the effigy was generally worn, as if it had been exposed to the elements for some time.

Other fragments of decorated masonry were also found beneath the floorboards, and the floor joists themselves were observed in some instances to have been made from re-used moulded timbers, perhaps salvaged from an earlier roof. The decorated masonry fragments were from an elaborate corbel, in a "Forest Marble" type Jurassic limestone similar to that used for the effigy, with oak leaves and acorns and a dentilated cornice. Traces of coloured decoration were visible, using the same suite of pigments as the effigy, with the addition of a cream pigment consisting of a simple limewash with small quantities of ochre. This would have supported an image, or possibly the rood beam.

The effigy is likely to be that of either Elias de Tingwick, rector from 1315 to 1347, or his successor John de Chastillon, rector 1347–77, who founded a chantry at Thornton. The basis of this identification is Browne Willis, who wrote a detailed description of the church *c* 1755 and identified an effigy which was then in the chancel as that of John de Chastillon, and another in the south aisle as that of Elias de Tingwick:

> At the lower end of the South Isle next the tower, lay a Free stone Effigy of a Man, seemingly an Ecclesiastick by the Tonsure of his Head and Fold of the Garment; at his Feet, a Lion: This I take to have been for John de Chastillon, a younger Son of the Patron, and Lord of this Place, who was Rector here from Anno 1347, 22 Edw. III, to 1377, 51 Edw. III. It is now removed into the Chancel.

> In the uppermost Window of the said South Isle, lies another like Effigy, of a Priest seemingly; which I take to have been for Elias de Tingwick, Rector here from Anno 1315, 8 Edw. II, to 1347, 21 Edw.III, who gave the first Bell as before-mentioned.

The effigy of John de Chastillon may quite possibly have still been in the chancel at the time of its demolition in the late eighteenth century. The fate of the de Tingwick effigy is less certain, but it is equally likely to have been moved at the time of the remodelling.

It is highly likely therefore that the effigy, along

with the corbel, was placed beneath the floor when the chancel was demolished. The roof timbers of the chancel may have been reused as joists for the new floor. The elaborate Ingylton tomb was also removed from the church at that time and inserted into a nearby grotto, whence it was recovered earlier this century. Many of the crevices of the effigy contained quantities of dirt and traces of some form of limewash or weak mortar; this and the generally "worn" appearance of the stone may indicate that the effigy had lain outside for some time, either at the time of the chancel demolition or earlier, perhaps prior to the refounding of the chantry in the fifteenth century, or after the demolition of the north aisle in the early seventeenth century.

After what may have been a long history of neglect, it is satisfying to report that the effigy has now been restored to the nave of St Michael's, to join the splendid Ingylton and Barton monuments. The corbel has been set into the west wall of the south aisle.

Elias de Tingewick

The available evidence does not allow us to suggest, even by conjecture, which of the two effigies described by Browne Willis this one is. If this is the tomb of Elias de Tingewick we have some indication of how contemporaries saw one who could not have been remembered as a model citizen.

In 1302 he was indicted with stealing the seal of Bittlesden Abbey and using it to forge a number of bonds and to steal wool (PRO KB 27/242/ 74d). A curious feature of this case is that at about the same time the Abbey had been in financial difficulties and had petitioned the king to appoint a *custos* to take charge of its possessions, and the *custos* appointed was John de Tingewick (Cat. Pat. Ed I, iv, 28 .), who was the royal forester south of the Trent. (Cal Close. EdII I, 403) The Abbey's seal would of course have been in the care of its *custos*, and if this had been a cousin of Elias it would no doubt have made the misappropriation much easier.

In 1318, together with his predecessor at Thornton, and a relation of his successor, he was again preying on a monastery, stealing wheat and beans from the Abbot of Oseney (CP40/225/473)

J.Parkhouse and J. Chenevix Trench

REFERENCES

CCW 1994 *Conservation Report: St Michael's Church, Thornton, Bucks* (Cliveden Conservation Workshops, Job 89/94)

Gibbs R. 1889 "State of the Buckinghamshire Parish Churches in the 16th and 17th centuries" *Recs. Bucks.* **6**, 154–167; 245–258

Lambom E.A.G. 1947 "A discovery at Thornton" *Recs. Bucks.* **15**, 46–50

Pevsner N. and Williamson E. 1994 *The Buildings of England: Buckinghamshire* (2nd edition)

Rouse E.C.1947 "Restoration of the Ingylton Tomb at Thornton, Bucks" *Recs. Bucks.* **15**, 216–218

Stewart I. 1994 "Resurrection at St Michael's Church Thornton, Buckinghamshire"*Trans. Assoc. Stud. Cons. Hist. Build.* **19**, 16–18

Tricker R. 1966 *The Church of St Michael and All Angels, Thornton Buckinghamshire*

Browne Willis 1755 *History and Antiquities of the Town, Hundred and Deanery of Buckingham*

In the drawing room of Brudenell House, Quainton, the hall of the former rectory, is an oak screen. It would seem reasonable to assume that such a feature of the house remains in the position where it was first installed unless there is evidence to indicate otherwise. This writer knows of none although it is accepted that screens and wall panelling were sometimes moved to new locations.

Lipscomb appears to have started the debate by suggesting that this screen might have been moved to the rectory from the manor house in the 17th century when Richard Winwood partly demolished the house to build his new mansion on the site. However, he gives no authority for making that suggestion and on closer study it does not really stand up. Later writers seem to have accepted Lipscomb's comment at face value, as the Quainton-born county historian, even to the extent of compounding his errors with some of their own. None gives any justification for the screen having been anywhere other than in its present position.

The screen, which Pevsner[1] dates as 16th century and the RCHM[2] as about 1500, sits very nicely in the rectory in the proper position for such a feature, at the lower (North) end of the hall. It is of dark oak with the linenfold pattern so popular in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and contains two doors which would presumably have led in earlier times to the kitchen and buttery.

The Heraldry

A key feature is the rebus of George Brudenell in the centre of the frieze, with three shields of Brudenell arms to the left, and four of Iwardby to the right. Brudenell was rector of Quainton from 1506 to 1522, having been presented to the benefice by his aunt Joan Iwardby, formerly Brudenell. She lived at the manor house and held the advowson of the church and rectory from the death of her husband, John Iwardby, in 1485 until her own death in 1525.

A rebus is a kind of intellectual puzzle intended to display the name of the subject by picture and letters. This one spells out 'G (Bru) de nell' in rather fanciful letters, with the syllable 'Bru' indicated by a bird (the meaning of which is not clear to the writer although Joan could well have been addressed as 'Bru' by her father-in-law, Nicholas Iwardby, the word being both a pun on her name and the French for daughter-in-law). Resting on the neck of the bird is a small shield, or escutcheon, of Brudenell arms, significantly differenced by a crescent to indicate a second son. George Brudenell was the second son of Drew or Drugo Brudenell, Sheriff of Bucks. in 1474 and 1483.

The seven individual shields are impaled in the normal manner to indicate husband on the left and wife on the right. The orientation of a shield is always given with the blazon as dexter or sinister from the point of view of the holder.

The blazonry of the arms is as follows:

Shield 1. Brudenell/Croke

Dexter: Argent a chevron gules three morions azure turned up ermine *Brudenell*.

Sinister: Gules a fess between six martlets argent *Croke*.

This shield indicates the union of a male member of the family of Brudenell of Stoke Mandeville and a female from the family of Croke of Chilton, Bucks. (and of Studley after the purchase of the Priory from Henry VII in 1539). The name Studley came into being on the change from Blount in 1404. The writer has not been able to identify the specific Brudenell and Croke indicated by this shield.

Shield 2. Brudenell/Englefield

Dexter: *Brudenell*.

Sinister: Barry of six gules and argent on a chief or a lion passant azure *Englefield*.

These are the arms of Edmund Brudenell of Raans and Philippa Englefield, the parents of Joan Iwardby/Brudenell.

Shield 3. Brudenell/unidentified female

Dexter: *Brudenell*.

Sinister: Argent three mullets pierced gules.

George Brudenell's arms surmounting a black bird to represent the syllable 'Bru' in his rebus. Note that there is no arrow piercing the bird, as erroneously stated by the V.C.H.

These are arms yet to be identified by the writer.

Shield 4. Iwardby/Brudenell

Dexter: Argent a saltire engrailed sable on a chief sable two mullets argent *Iwardby.*

Sinister: *Brudenell.*

These are the arms of John Iwardby, lord of the manor of Quainton, and his wife Joan, daughter of Edmund Brudenell of Raans.

Shield 5. Pigott/Iwardby

Dexter: Sable three pickaxes argent *Pigott.*

Sinister: *Iwardby.*

The arms of Thomas Pigott, serjeant at law and founder of the Doddershall estate in Quainton and Elizabeth, eldest daughter and co-heiress of John and Joan Iwardby.

Shield 6. Verney/Iwardby

Dexter: (upper quarter) Azure on a cross argent five mullets pierced gules *Verney,* (lower quarter) Party per fess argent and or, a fess vert, surtout a lion rampant *Whytingham.*

Sinister: *Iwardby.*

The arms of Sir Ralph Verney of Middle Claydon, son of Sir John Verney and Margaret, daughter of Sir Robert Whytingham of Pendley, and Margery, daughter and co-heiress of John and Joan Iwardby.

Shield 7. Clifford/Iwardby

Dexter: Checky or and azure in a fess gules an annulet or *Clifford.*

Sinister: *Iwardby.*

The arms of Thomas Clifford of Brackenbury and Ellen, youngest daughter and co-heiress of John and Joan Iwardby.

168

If Lipscomb was correct in his supposition that the screen had been erected in the manor house in the 16th century and remained there for over one hundred years, then one would have expected the central feature to be the rebus of the occupier, not of the parish priest at the rectory. Similarly, one would have expected the three shields on the left to indicate the manorial family of Iwardby, not Brudenell whose only connection with Quainton was through the marriage of Joan to John Iwardby.

Many changes have taken place to the church house over the centuries. There is reference to Quainton rectory at the Ecclesiastical Taxation of Pope Nicholas IV in 1291[3] although this probably refers to the living rather than the house. The un-named author of a leaflet on the house[4] mentions surviving medieval stonework in the cellars and an earlier fireplace behind the present one of the Tudor period. He also describes how the medieval hall was replaced during the incumbency of George Brudenell by what he calls 'one of half-timber', by which he no doubt means the timber-framed building now on the site, with a beamed ceiling and a screens passage along the north end. Further altera-tions and additions have been made since that time and the house, now encased in Georgian brickwork, was finally sold by the church to the family of the present owner in 1962.

Lipscomb's History of Buckinghamshire, 1847.

Lipscomb wrote,[5] probably during the eight-een-thirties, *"On the wainscot of the hall, which seems to have been brought from some more an-cient mansion, and most probably from the house of the Winwood's at Denham, are the following coats of arms ..."* (Richard Winwood of Ditton Park in Stoke Poges succeeded his father to the manor of Quainton at the age of eight in 1617 and, in adult-hood, partly demolished the manor house in order to build his mansion on the site). Lipscomb then lists the eight coats of arms on the screen (counting the escutcheon on the rebus as number 4), although he fails to identify number 2 as being the parents of Joan Brudenell; he transposes Iwardby and Verney on number 6, and he refers to Clifford as Verney or possibly Ingoldsby on number 8.

Surprisingly, Lipscomb simply refers to George Brudenell's rebus as *"Brudenell, impaling (sic) a*

falcon and escutcheon" This really deserves a greater explanation if he understood its signifi-cance! Note that he states nothing more conclusive than that the screen *"seems to"* have been brought from elsewhere. He does not say why he feels this might be so. He also refers to a description of the rectory-house in a 'terrier' of 1803 but he does not quote any reference to the screen.

Lipscomb is the source used by many historians as a starting point for a study of Buckinghamshire, particularly in reference to Quainton where he was born, although a number of errors do inevitably occur throughout his work. Later writers seem sim-ply to have been repeating his words when suggest-ing that the screen might have been moved from elsewnere. Certainly some of them do not appear to have carried out their own research or examined the screen at first-hand.

Other Accounts

Magna Britannia, (1813) was a major work of reference on the history of Buckinghamshire[6] which would have been known to Lipscomb. It makes no reference to the screen, simply stating in the section on Quainton that *"Denham* [the local hamlet], to *which the advowson of the rectory was formerly annexed, is now the principal manor"* .

Lipscomb did not get any ideas about the screen being moved from this source.

Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, Bucks 1913,

This inventory report states *"The hall screen, of* c. *1500, possibly brought from elsewhere, is espe-cially noteworthy'* and later *"In the drawing room, formerly the hall, is a moulded oak screen of* c. *1500, apparently in the usual position at the N end of the hall, but it is said to have been brought from the old manor house of Quainton"* .

The report does not state by whom 'it is said' but it obviously relies on the entry in Lipscomb. It does downgrade Lipscomb's 'probably' to 'possibly', thereby indicating some doubt.

The description of the rebus is some improve-ment on Lipscomb's entry, noting that it included 'fantastic letters', with the last syllable being given

as 'NEIL'. Close inspection shows that this is in fact 'NELL', as would be expected, with the horizontals of the 'double-L' intertwined, and it is surprising that the author did not check this anomaly.

Victoria County History, Buckinghamshire, 1927

The V.C.H.[7] was published for the University of London Institute of Historical Research in 1927. It relies heavily on 'Lipscomb' but was produced by numbers of academic historians with access to more and later material and so should be more accurate.

However, the reference to the provenance of the screen is no more conclusive than Lipscomb's. It states, "*At the north end of the hall is a moulded oak screen with linen-fold panels, dating from the 16th century and said to have been brought here from the old manor-house*". It also states that other rooms have panelling of the 16th and 17th centuries without suggesting that this might also have been moved.

Although the heraldry of the armorial shields is correctly recorded, if not fully identified, once again the significance of the rebus is completely missed! The text continues, "*Above the panels is the inscription 'G de Neil' in fanciful characters ... while between the first two letters of the inscription is a shield carried by a bird pierced with an arrow*" Again the syllable 'Nell' is given as Neil (obviously taken from the earlier RCHM report) and describes the characters as 'fanciful' whereas the RCHM uses 'fantastic'. There is no arrow piercing the bird; Lipscomb used the word 'impaling' rather inaccurately in its heraldic sense, not in the sense of transfixing.

One should not expect to find these errors in such an authoritative work but, even so, the VCH makes no stronger claim than that the screen is 'said to' have been moved from elsewhere!

The Buildings of England, Bucks.
Nikolaus Pevsner, 1960,

Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, who died in 1983, was one of the most learned writers on historical architecture of the twentieth century. He prided himself on seeing everything for himself before including it in his series on historic buildings.

His comment on the screen is extremely brief and, as with the others, not at all positive about its provenance. He states simply, in parenthesis, so distancing himself from the opinion, "*(inside C16 linenfold panelling, said to come from Denham Lodge)*".

Even Pevsner, in his idiosyncratic style of writing, does not suggest by whom it was 'said', or whether he accepted the suggestion.

Conclusion

If the screen was constructed between 1485 and 1525, as would appear to be the case, whether for installation at the manor house or in the rectory, then it was during the period when the widow Joan Iwardby, formerly Brudenell, was both lady of the manor and patron of the rectory.

The manor house was the family home of the Iwardbys and therefore one would expect those shields to the left of the one signifying the union of John Iwardby and Joan Brudenell to commemorate Iwardby ancestors, not solely Brudenells.

The rectory was the home of the batchelor priest George Brudenell from 1506 and so one can fully appreciate his desire to incorporate the shields of his Brudenell forbears on to his screen, and his lack of interest in the local Iwardby line which had died out with John's death in 1485.

If the screen had been erected initially in the manor house it is hardly likely that the main feature would have been the rebus ot the parish priest living in the rectory. If Lipscomb's suggestion is correct, that the screen was moved at the time Richard Winwood partly demolished the manor house to build his mansion, then this was more than a century after Brudenell's death and the presence of the rebus appears to refute this suggestion.

Joan Iwardby/Brudenell had been a wealthy widow for twenty years according to the taxation records of 1522 (in which she is listed as 'Mistris Eversbye widdowe')[8] when she presented George

The Royal Bucks Hussars in action at El Mughar, near Beersheba, in November 1917. (*From a painting in the National Museum*)

Brudenell to the rectory, a favourite nephew but perhaps an impoverished second son. It seems entirely conceivable that having married off her three daughters and co-heiresses to Pigott, Verney and Clifford, she elected to modernise the facilities of the possibly neglected rectory on the installation of a favoured nephew by updating the earlier medieval hall and installing the fashionable new screen.

This writer remains to be convinced that the screen was ever in the manor house as suggested by George Lipscomb! He would, however, be grateful for any information concerning the individuals represented by shields 1 and 3, and also why a falcon or other black bird should represent the syllable 'Bru' on the rebus.

References

1. Pevsner N, 1960 ed. 'The Buildings of England, Buckinghamshire', p.228.
2. RCHM, 1912, *Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, Bucks. North.* **Vol II**, p.245
3. VCH, 1927 (Bucks.) iv, p.98, Lipscomb G, 1847, I, p.419
4. Anon. after 1962. *Brudenell House*, privately printed leaflet at the house
5. Lipscomb G. 1847, *The History & Antiquities of the County of Buckingham*, i, p.419
6. Lysons D. & S. 1813, *Magna Britannia*, **Vol I**, part III, *Bucks.* p.622
7. VCH, 1927, *Victoria History of the Counties of England, Buckinghamshire*, **iv** p.92
8. Chibnall A. C, 1973, 'The Certificate of Musters for Buckinghamshire in 1522', *Buckinghamshire Record Society* **17** p.123

Laurie Cooper

AN UNSUNG VICTORY FOR BUCKS CAVALRY

In the summer of 1917 what Jan Morris has desribed as "probably the greatest cavalry force ever assembled" went into action against the Turks and Germans in Palestine. The Palestinian offensives became (in her words) "irresistible demonstrations of mobile warfare, recognisable predecessors of *Blitzkrieg*". Two of the divisions were from Australia and New Zealand, but the third was the 4th (Yeomanry) Cavalry Division, whose 6th brigade included the Royal Bucks Hussars. The divisional commander, General Sir George de Symons Barrow, spent the last 20 years of his retirement at The Lee, near Wendover.

On November 13 Barrow ordered his 6th Brigade to undertake a mounted attack on the El Mughar ridge in the Beersheba sector. The attack was highly successful, and was described by the Marquess of Anglesey in his *History of the Brtitish Cavalry* as "a model of what can be achieved by cavalry charging in open formation".

The casualties were relatively light but, sadly, included Major Evelyn de Rothschild (the younger son of Leopold) who died of wounds later, on the same day that his cousin Captain Neil Primrose (son of Lord Rosebery) was killed in a similar charge at Gaza. Both were officers in the Royal Bucks Hussars.

George de Symons Barrow was a scion of an ancient Anglo-Sephardi family. They came to England from Holland in the seventeenth century, when they anglicised their name from the Hebrew Baruch. His grandfather, Simon Barrow, was the father of 13 children, of whom three sons became major generals in the Indian Army, and two grandsons became full generals. It is doubtful whether this record can be equalled, let alone surpassed by the history of any other British family.

General Barrow was proud, if not boastful, of his ancestry, and claimed to be a direct descendant of Isaac Abravahel, the great seventeenth-century Sephardi philosopher, through whom he believed in turn that he was in the direct line from King David. He made a careful study of David's battles and noted in particular his strategy of the indirect approach. His final verdict on his Palestine campaign was that "in all probability it was the last example of the employment of cavalry on a large scale."

In 1925 he was promoted full general. At the age of 77 he joined the local Home Guard, exchanging, as he put it, the rank of full general for the rank of full private. He died at the age of 95 in 1955

His son David, the holder of the Military Cross, died in France in 1944 and his name is inscribed on the War Memorial on the Green at the Lee. This note is based on an article in the *Jewish Chronicle* of December 8 1995.

David Kessler