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Edward VI: A Corpus Expanding Our Record of his Armorials
Dr Peter N. Lindfield, FSA

Edward VI (1537–53 (reigned 1547–53)), the son of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, was the first King of England to be raised Protestant. His reign is characterised by reforming zeal: this impacted not only Christian ceremony but also the decoration and appearance of churches. For example, church interiors were reworked by the removal of the rood—depictions of the crucified Christ—as well as images of saints: the former being replaced with the royal arms. Such a substitution is recorded and explained by Bishop Gilbert Burnett (1643–1715) in the second part of his History of the Reformation (1681):

But now they that were weary of the Popish Superstitions observing that Archbishop Cranmer had so great a share of the young Kings [sic] affection, and that the Protector and he were in the same Interests, began to call for a further Reformation of Religion; and some were so full of zeal for it, that they would not wait on the slow motions of the State. So the Curate and Church-wardens of St. Martins [sic] in Ironmonger-lane in London, took down the Images and Pictures of the Saints, and the Crucifix out of their Church, and painted many Texts of Scripture on the Walls; some of them according to a perverse Translation, as the Complaint has it; and in the place where the Crucifix was, they set up the Kings [sic] Arms with some Texts of Scripture about it. Upon this the Bishop and Lord-Major of London complained to the Council. And the Curate and Church-wardens being cited to appear, answered for themselves, That the Roof of their Church being bad, they had taken it down, and that the Crucifix and Images were so rotten, that when they removed them they fell to powder: That the charge they had been at in repairing their Church was such, that they could not buy new Images: That they had taken down the Images in the Chancel, because some had been guilty of Idolatry towards them. In conclusion, they said, what they had done was with a good intention; and if they had in any thing done amiss, they asked pardon. and submitted themselves. Some were for punishing them severely; for all the Papists reckoned that this would be a leading Case to all the rest of this Reign.¹

As Munro records, the painting of the King’s arms at St Martin’s is representative of a broader trend, even if, as the passage quoted above indicates, the installation of the royal arms within the church was legal but the removal of the rood was neither customary nor legal.²

The reconceptualisation of St Martin’s decoration, however, was far from unique and a 1550 inventory of St Dunstan’s-in-the-East, London, records a ‘small

---

hangyng of red and blew sarsenet with the Kynges Armes'.³ Further examples from
Essex churches include that at Wix, where an inventory from 1552 details a `cloth
stayned and wrytte with the scripture, the Kings Majestys Arms in the middle, which
cloth is hanging upon the candell-beam’; at Paglesham £2 3s 4d was spent on
`paynting the King’s Arms and wrytting of the scriptures within the Church’; and at St
Mary’s, Maldon, 6s 8d was spent on `one hundred of gold for the Kyng’s Majesties
Arms, and 12d for one pottell of oyle for the same’.⁴ Churches in Edward VI’s reign
were being decorated with the King’s arms.

Official and legal instruments issued during Edward VI’s reign to remove roods
and replace them with royal arms do not appear to exist, however Cautley in Royal
Arms and Commandments in Our Churches (1974) concludes that this trend was
enacted at churches across the country:

In any case it is quite obvious that at the close of Edward’s reign a large number
of roods had been destroyed, and an equally large number of Arms put up in
their place, and yet of the latter, owing to the reversal of policy in the succeeding
reign, only one […] definitely established example of the Arms of Edward VI
survives.⁵ Diarmaid MacCulloch in Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant
Reformation (1999) deems the installation of Edward’s arms in lieu of the removed
roods to be an essential feature of the English Reformation:

The display of royal arms announced an essential feature of the Edwardian
Reformation: it was a revolution directed from above by the monarch, his council
and the Parliament at Westminster. Those who ruled the realm took it upon
themselves to decide the form in which the European Reformation would be
presented to the people of England.⁶ Consequently, the introduction of the royal arms into English churches appears to be
a visual and physical manifestation of the country’s break from Rome.

There is, as MacCulloch notes, one surviving example of a ‘genuine’ sixteenth-
century Edwardian coat of arms still preserved in an English church today: it is at
Westerham in Kent (Fig.1). As MacCulloch writes, ‘most sets of royal arms with initials
‘ER’ are clearly Elizabethan, but this is marked as the arms of a Tudor king [rather
than queen] by its inscription ‘Vivant Rex curat lex’, and it is the only definitively
surviving set from Edward’s reign’.⁷ A good example recording Elizabeth I’s arms can
be found in the Great High Chamber of Hardwick Hall, Derbyshire (Fig.2), Bess of
Hardwick’s exceptional and geometrically profound Elizabethan ‘prodigy house’ built
between 1590 and 1597; this achievement has numerous formal similarities with
Edward’s Westerham arms, but there are also certain differences, especially in terms

³ Quoted in ibid., p. 22: Kew, National Archives, Exchequer King’s Remembrancer Church Goods 4/98,
f. 5v.
⁴ As quoted in Cautley, Royal Arms, p. 22.
⁵ Ibid., p. 23.
⁶ Diarmaid MacCulloch, Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation (London:
Allen Lane, 1999), p. 163.
⁷ Ibid.
of the shield’s shape. The four horizontal boards of oak that make up the Westerham arms’ panel was analysed using dendrochronology (tree-ring growth pattern analysis) when the work was being restored in 2013. The top three boards returned dates using this investigation, however the lowest, identified as ‘board D’ during the analysis, did not return a date. Furthermore, none of the boards included sapwood (the outer, and, hence, newer and softer rings of the tree under the bark): this prevents dendrochronology from giving a precise felling date for these otherwise datable boards. To give terminus post quem for each spiece of wood, a minimum of eight sapwood rings was added to give the earliest possible felling date: the boards were thus found to date to after 1526 (board A); to after 1532 (board B); and to after 1541 (Board C). The conclusion is that the wood used to construct the panel upon which the arms were painted was assembled sometime between 1541 and 1573.8 This date range, of course supports, the assertion that the achievement refers to Edward VI.

The character of the royal achievement is important, even if the boards’ dendrochronological analysis cannot offer an exact date of production: VIVAT REX clearly indicates that the arms cannot belong to Elizabeth I. It therefore shows the characteristics of Edward’s arms: the escutcheon is of a teardrop shape surrounded by an English Renaissance-style strapwork border encircled by the garter. The lion and dragon supporters are especially important and curious, as will become evident later in this essay. Like the arms of Edward’s father, Henry VIII, the lion supporter is crowned and looks out and confronts the viewer; the dragon remains in profile. Other notable characteristics include the cartouche: it contains the motto but it also acts as a compartment where a lion’s foot at each end extends up in acanthus scrollwork and strapwork to support one foot from each supporter. There are notable similarities linking this achievement with the royal arms depicted on coins minted during Edward’s reign. In particular, the 1549–50 gold half sovereign depicts the uncrowned King in profile on the obverse, and the reverse is finished with the crowned royal arms set on a slightly teardrop shaped oval escutcheon garnished with strapwork and surrounded by ER (Fig.3).9 The shape of the shield bears a strong relationship with that incorporated into the Westerham panel. A very similar but earlier coin minted 1547–49 (Fig.4), shares a similar bust of Edward on the obverse as depicted in Fig.3, albeit this time crowned, and the royal arms on the reverse is identical to that depicted in Fig.3.10 A shilling minted in 1549 (Fig.5), depicts a crowned Edward VI on the obverse and uncrowned version of the royal arms seen in Figs 3 and 4 on the reverse.11 Consequently, the application of the crown on coins minted during Edward’s short reign varied considerably. Another gold coin, this time dating to 1549–51, sets the royal arms on the reverse with the supporters—a crowned lion and dragon—with a
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strapwork compartment below (*Fig.6*). The escutcheon has, however, reverted from an oval-shape to the typical form with a rectangular section in chief, and it is no longer garnished. Despite the 1549–51 sovereign depicted in *Fig.6*, there is a clear precedent for Edward’s arms being applied to an oval or oval–teardrop-shaped escutcheon surrounded by strapwork. The application of the crown appears inconsistent, yet the examples depicting his achievement all include a crowned lion.

**An incomplete picture of Edward’s arms**

The Westerham achievement and these coins, the latter supposedly a good indicator of his arms’ appearance at specific dates, only appears to offer a partial account of the history and appearance of the King’s arms. Indeed, there is a corpus of Edward’s achievements, mostly carved in wood, that are noticeably alike and yet importantly differentiated from the examples already mentioned above and depicted in *Figs 1, 3–6*. This is an expanding corpus, and those discussed here are certainly not the only examples that were produced in the sixteenth century: other examples will perhaps emerge over time, and, like a number discussed below, they will possibly be misinterpreted as representations of Edward’s father, Henry VIII (when ER is absent), or, perhaps, Edward’s far more famous and longer-reigning sister, Elizabeth I, when ER (but not REX) is included: these misreadings result because of the similarity between the achievements of each of these monarchs. Details of some of Edward’s achievements examined here have been circulated recently by Stephanie Brooke, however the full extent of this corpus was not shared with her, and, consequently, the significance of these arms has not hitherto been addressed in print.

This essay gives a full account of my research on this corpus of Edwardian achievements.

Three examples of Edward VI’s arms from this corpus are installed directly onto the walls or into panelling set-up in country houses. The first and most significant is that seen on the staircase of Rolleston Hall in Staffordshire (*Fig.7*): the seat of the Mosleys. Sir Nicholas Mosley (c.1527–1612), Lord Mayor of London (*Fig.8*), was rewarded by gifts of furniture from Elizabeth I in 1599/1600 for his services to the city, including an elaborately carved bed. In his *Family Memoirs* (1849), Sir Oswald Mosley (1785–1871), 2nd Baronet, the patriarch of the family in Victorian Britain, wrote that,

> Before the termination of his year of office, the Queen [Elizabeth I] was graciously pleased to mark her high approbation of the services of the lord mayor by conferring upon him the honour of knighthood, and she gave him, at the same time, a handsomely-carved oak bedstead, together with some other articles of furniture, for the new house which he had recently erected at Hough End [Manchester], on the site of the old mansion which his ancestors had inhabited.

Whilst Elizabeth’s gift is not listed in the royal household accounts, these gifts had a well-established Mosley family tradition, and we can see at least one of these gifts, the bed, is mentioned in Sir Nicholas’ will as a present from the Queen: ‘Also I give and

---

bequeath to my said wief in lieu of her chamber two of my best beddes wth the ffurniture accordinglie, except the best tapestrie coverings, and the best bedstocke, the Queen’s gift, also excepted'.

When the Mosley family moved south to Rolleston in Staffordshire from various ancestral properties in Manchester, including Hough End Hall and Ancoats Hall, they transported some (but not all) of their royal gifts lavished upon the family’s illustrious ancestor.

As recorded in Memoirs, Sir Oswald at the turn of the nineteenth century re-acquired some of the family’s treasures left behind:

The residence of the Mosleys near Manchester was vacated and a portion turned into a farm house. At the beginning of the present century, the grandfather of Sir Oswald, the squire of to-day, visited the place at a period in its history when a sale was in progress, and was not a little astonished at discovering the oaken treasures mutilated and converted into various forms of domestic service. The worthy baronet secured all on which he could lay hands, and they were speedily transferred to Rolleston. Here, however, many specimens were allowed to remain stowed away—probably owing to the undignified process to which they had been subjected—for several pieces were disfigured by a daubing of white paint—and the remote chances of restitution to their former state. It was reserved for the present Sir Oswald to rescue them from their obscurity, and, piecing them together, restore them to something approaching their original magnificence. We find them in innumerable forms adorning various portions of the mansion. A large quantity of these valuable and interesting cuttings was in existence in Ancoats's Hall, the ancestral home of the Mosley’s.

Perhaps one of these heirlooms was the royal coat of arms installed above a settle marked N.M. 1596 (in reference to the year in which Sir Nicholas purchased the Manor of Manchester) set on the first landing of Rolleston’s principal staircase hall photographed in 1892 (Fig.7).

This arrangement of settle and heraldry on the house’s staircase was recorded in the description of a ball that took place in 1895 and published in The Derby Mercury as:

Half-way up the grand stair-case there is to be seen another piece of beautiful carving in a massive settee. This is noteworthy in a sense other than the artistic, inasmuch that it carries the reflection a century or two back, when an ancestor of the family—Sir Nicholas Mosley. Knt.—was Lord Mayor of London. Above are displayed the arms of the Clothiers’ Company, of which the original possessor was master in the year that he was also chief magistrate.

The photograph of Rolleston, including its staircase hall, comes from 1892, just three years before this description, and it is clearly obvious that the carved wooden panel set above the N.M. 1598 settle does not belong to the Clothier’s Company, but,

16 Anon. 1895, 2.
instead, it is the royal coat of arms, presumably included in the royal 1599/1600 gift to Sir Nicholas. Unlike the Westerham achievement and the coins mentioned earlier, the Rolleston example shows the lion and dragon both looking out from the panel, and the lion is also uncrowned. And the strapwork surrounding the escutcheons on the Westerham panel and coins is extended dramatically above the shield in the Rolleston example to be in line with the heads of the supporters, and they are also standing on a clearly undulating grassy compartment. This strapwork also forms a repetitive border framing the royal achievement’s panel. The Edwardian achievement recorded at Rolleston has more decorative pomp in certain regards.

If this carved panel came to Sir Nicholas Mosley (and, hence, passed to his descendants) via Elizabeth I, this achievement was almost certainly sourced from the royal collection, and, consequently, made for Edward VI during his reign. Quite why *The Derby Mercury* reported the achievement as that of the Clothiers’ Company is difficult to tell: perhaps it was an error on the part of the reporter or newspaper, or, perhaps, by 1895, a few years after the photograph reproduced here was taken, the panel had been replaced by another depicting the arms of the worshipful company. The formal characteristics exhibited by this achievement are representative (but with minor stylistic variations) to several other known achievements forming this *corpus*.

The second example from this *corpus* is installed at the centre of the chimney overmantel in the Library at Combermere Abbey, Cheshire (*Fig.9*). Of a more upright format, the characteristics of the supporters and strapwork are almost identical to that seen in the Rolleston example. Especially notable is the phrasing of the dragon’s wing, which appears akin to a scroll—mirroring the achievement’s strapwork decoration—tied directly into the beast’s flank. This is the same as seen in the Rolleston example, but quite unlike the more naturalistic wing depicted on the Westerham panel and on the coins already discussed. The compartment beneath the arms on the Combermere version remains the same as found on the Rolleston example, and so too does the strapwork border. There are, however, several notable differences in the phrasing and design of this panel when compared with the Rolleston example seen in the late-Victorian period. These differences include the addition of two scrollwork ‘rolls’ to the bottom of the shield and the extension of the two upper strapwork ‘rolls’ with forked and splayed streamers. This additional ornament appears to relate to the panel’s more upright format with the changes ‘filling’ in what would otherwise have been empty space. Despite the different format and strapwork decoration, the Combermere panel evidently shared a similar template with that at Rolleston, which, clearly did not directly influence the Westerham achievement.

Given that Combermere was a medieval foundation and that it had a strong royal connection, it is entirely possible that these arms preserved today at the house and installed in the room’s sixteenth-century panelling were introduced during Edward’s reign following the Abbey’s dissolution and came into the ownership of Sir George Cotton (1505–45). Cotton was granted the property in 1541, and he was described as the King’s ‘Vale Royal’, and ‘a man of singular account for wisdom,
integrity, godliness, gentleness, facility, and all generous dispositions'. It is highly likely that after Combermere’s abbey church had been demolished and the remainder of the monastic buildings converted into a Gothic country house that this royal achievement was installed in the house.

Another, even more upright—essentially square—version of this achievement preserving the same supporters, and very similar strapwork decoration around the escutcheon, albeit with modified lower scrollwork, is now installed in Plas Newydd ('New House') in Llangollen, Denbighshire (Fig.10). Installed on the entrance-hall face to the door leading into the Parlour, this decoration is part of an extensive building and refashioning programme undertaken by the ‘Ladies of Llangollen’, who acquired and deployed seemingly limitless quantities of carved oak spolia to decorate both the outside and inside of the house (Figs 11–12). Unlike the Mosleys at Rolleston Hall, almost all of the main ‘show’ rooms in this modest house have their walls and even ceilings decorated with antiquarian-style carved woodwork and clearly a manifestation of what Clive Wainwright deemed to by the Georgian ‘romantic interior’. This royal achievement incorporated within the door at Plas Newydd (Fig.10) is of notably poorer quality compared with the previous examples mentioned here in this article, however it nevertheless demonstrates a continuity of the corpus’ specific visual, decorative, and formal conventions, including the domed, hemispherical escutcheon, strapwork, supporters (the lion is uncrowned, and the dragon’s outward gaze and strap-work-like wing).

Another version of this achievement was sold by Christie’s, London, in January 2009 having come from The Roger Warner Collection, and it was listed as ‘a Henry VIII carved oak relief of the Tudor coat-of-arms’ c.1540 (Fig.13). This achievement is a subtle modification of the two examples from the corpus already discussed: extra strapwork scrolls are added to the sides of the escutcheon, this decorative programme is extended with the addition of forked flares at the bottom of the escutcheon, and this shield is now of a domed tear-drop, rather than hemispherical shape. Obviously, the uncrowned lion supporter is quite inconsistent with Henry VIII’s known arms from late in his reign (when Christie’s dated it to), and the whole composition of this achievement is instead consistent with the corpus under examination in this essay. The lot essay included in the Christie’s sale brochure does, however, obfuscate the exact monarch that the achievement could refer to: it notes that the arms were ‘used by Tudor monarchs from Henry VII to Elizabeth I. The lion and dragon supporters were used by all the sovereigns’. Christie’s also makes the point that this achievement relates to

22 Ibid.
one that was sold from the Peter Gwynn Collection by Sotheby’s, London, on 27 November 2001 (Fig.14). This achievement, whilst the lion supporter is uncrowned, is fundamentally different in formal stylistic terms to the corpus examined here, including the shape of the shield, character of the supporters and mantling, the nature of the compartment, and the form of the dragon’s wing that is far too naturalistic rather than echoing the form of the strapwork scroll seen on the Roger Warner Collection heraldic panel (Fig.13). Another panel that is claimed to be related to this achievement is included in Victor Chinnery’s landmark book, Oak Furniture: The British Tradition (1986) as Fig.2:176 (Fig.15) that is captioned ‘relief carved armorial panel. English. Oak, late sixteenth century. The Royal Arms of England, with the Tudor supporters, the Lion and Dragon’. This armorial, of course, is related to those in the corpus, but the exact characteristics are divorced from the remainder illustrated and discussed here. The supporters look towards each other, and the lion is uncrowned. Despite this difference, the escutcheon is flat rather than being domed, yet it is of a teardrop shape with the encircling strapwork scrolls to the top, sides, and bottom that create a barbed appearance. This is a more extreme, yet still related, modification of this corpus’ characteristics.

Another similar example passed through Christie’s, London, in 2008 (Fig.16), however it is a modification of this corpus’ typology by phrasing the shield with barbs at the top and an ogee point at the foot. Sold as a ‘a papier-maché armorial panel of the Tudor royal arms’, attempt is made to attribute it to a specific Tudor monarch. Another related example is found at Little Moreton Hall in Cheshire (Fig.17). This domed shield and strapwork border are related to the corpus already mentioned, and, perhaps, it can and should be associated with Edward VI: there is, however, no documentary evidence to link it to Edward. Brooke considered it to refer to the King because ‘the lion has no crown, which probably means that it dates instead from that of Edward VI’. Unfortunately, she did not realise that there is clear evidence that the lion supporter’s head once bore a crown, as there is the remains of what appears to be a torse, but surely must be the ermine register from the crown (Fig.18). Brooke similarly does not acknowledge that Edward’s lion supporter was crowned at times, as demonstrated above in reference to coinage, and as illustrated, for example, by the achievement attached to Guilford Grammar School (dated 1552), or Sherborne School in Dorset. Finally, a tester (‘four poster’) bed passed through Bonhams Skinner, Marlborough, Massachusetts, USA, in 2020 (Fig.19), with another clearly related panel incorporated within the headboard and initialled with E R. Whist certain characteristics are unlike those found throughout the corpus under examination here, such as the pared-back strapwork and form of the crown, the shape of the dragon’s wing and that both lion and dragon tilt their heads out to confront he viewer, we can see this as an integral part of the Edwardian group of achievements.

23 Ibid; Sothey’s, Peter Gwynn Collection (London: Sothey’s, 2001), lot. 28.
So how does this corpus exist when the otherwise established appearance of Edward VI’s arms includes a crowned lion supporter? In part, it relates to the variable application and evolution of heraldry in Tudor England: Henry VII sets of supporters, Henry VIII, upon accession to the throne, continued to use his father’s supporters (dragon gules and greyhound argent collared gules) before they were modified around 1529 (lion crowned or and dragon gules). The corpus of Edward’s arms examined here may seem to be just a footnote to a monarch who reigned briefly and one who has been cast into the shadows by his far more famous, and, perhaps, notorious father and sister. This corpus nevertheless helps reinforce the variable characteristics of monarchs’ arms in Tudor England. These achievements also show that there was a coherent and consistent phrasing of Edward’s arms at some point in his reign. We can, for example, see how this corpus’ visual phrasing and characteristics relate directly to the armorials incorporated within upper and lower borders of The Book of Common Prayer published in 1549 (Fig.20): the upper border (Fig.21) depicts the royal arms with an uncrowned lion supporter, which offers a competing presentation of Edward’s arms compared with the crowned lion supporter on the coin depicted in Fig.6 above. The dragon supporter, however, remains in profile and its wing does not adopt the very distinct strapwork-like scrolled appearance seen in this corpus. The lower border’s achievement (Fig.22) is similarly of relevance given the disposition of the strapwork that is clearly en suite with the style of the decoration essayed by this corpus. The Book of Common Prayer may not be the corpus’ model, but, nevertheless, it illustrates how the royal achievements discussed in this essay are not entirely unprecedented in comparison with the heraldy found on coins minted during his kingship. Hopefully this essay will bring more examples from this corpus to light in the future.
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