



The Howards and the Tudors. Studies in Science and Heritage

James A. Cameron

To cite this article: James A. Cameron (2017) The Howards and the Tudors. Studies in Science and Heritage, Journal of the British Archaeological Association, 170:1, 229-230, DOI: [10.1080/00681288.2017.1366746](https://doi.org/10.1080/00681288.2017.1366746)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00681288.2017.1366746>



Published online: 20 Nov 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

audits were invariably annual: identifying fraud or mistake some years after the fact risked locking the stable door. Commemoration or legal or financial issues regarding the fulfilment of Henry's will are also plausible reasons. Stanford notes that no masons' lodge is mentioned, so could there have been parallel accounts kept for some masonic work? A critical clue here might be the graph showing that transport formed a surely impossible 3.4 per cent of the total cost of materials (fig. 15). Are the missing sums in separate accounts and, if so, whose and with what else? A final question: what are the origins of the bookkeeping techniques employed — particularly the unusual graphical portrayal of days worked?

Secondly, Stanford describes the project as 'generally well-run' (p. 13), but what precisely does this mean, how can we judge this based on financial accounts and, for that matter, how was it run? One challenge is explaining the division of labour between the master of the hospital, the clerk of the works and the teams of masons and carpenters which each had their own masters and, unusually, wardens. This is not to mention the king (who had contributed a 'plat', that is, a plan) and his executors. Future scholars have now the raw materials to attempt an answer to these difficult questions thanks to this important addition to the canon of published medieval building accounts.

GABRIEL BYNG

© 2017 Gabriel Byng

DOI 10.1080/00681288.2017.1366745



The Howards and the Tudors. Studies in Science and Heritage. Edited by PHILLIP LINDLEY. Donington, Shaun Tyas, 2015. 64 pp., 64 colour illus. ISBN 978-1907730-44-3. £14.95 (pb)

This book is an output of a major multi-institutional project, funded jointly by the Arts and Humanities Research Council and Physical Sciences Research Council. Consequently, it represents an important collaboration between two wings of academia that are often seen more as rivals for government funding than allies. Its subject is the tombs of Thomas Howard, 3rd duke of Norfolk (d. 1554), part of a noble family who were great allies of the Tudors since Bosworth and eventually produced Katherine, fifth wife of Henry VIII, and Henry Fitzroy, duke of Richmond and Somerset (d. 1536), the king's only recognised illegitimate son. The Howard tombs now reside in Framlingham parish church, but were originally made for the Cluniac priory of Thetford. The centrepiece of this book is undoubtedly the essay by its editor Phillip Lindley, which concentrates on unravelling the material history of the two Tudor tombs at Framlingham.

Lindley is known for his enlightening and distinctive research on sculpture during the tumult of the English Reformation, showing the continuing tradition of craftsmanship and the incorporation of novel antique forms in monuments of the Old Faith, and this essay is no exception. Through a combination of a virtual disassemblage of the monuments, and the careful examination, restoration and scrutiny of excavated fragments from Thetford, Lindley proposes an exciting reconstruction of how they could have functioned in the space of the priory church. Building on the work of previous scholars, he suggests that they were intended to stand on the north and south side of the Lady Chapel, and that they both originally incorporated Old and New Testaments reliefs,

some of which were discovered buried in the sacristy of the priory in the 1930s. Overall, he demonstrates that the tombs formed a carefully designed pair that both represented the forging of the houses of the Tudors and the Howards, and — ironically in the face of the priory's impending dissolution — the vibrancy of late medieval aristocratic piety.

Characteristically, Lindley shows a keen understanding of sculptural practice in his enquiry, for instance, the discovery of incised construction marks on several of the fragments. The other chapters, also by participants in the project, include a survey of the remains of Thetford priory by Jackie Hall, and the placement of the monuments in a European context by Rebecca Constabel. These have a tendency to buttress Lindley's chapter rather than stand on their own, by providing context for the central material investigation. The short chapter on the scientific methods behind the investigation, co-authored by the late George Fraser with his doctoral student Nishad Karim, is an especially welcome addition, not least because of the sad circumstance of Professor Fraser's death shortly after the conclusion of the project in March 2014.

Despite the exciting subject matter, the novel approach through technology and the high level of academic expertise, one could, nevertheless, be rather critical of this book's presentation of the material. The images, although in full colour throughout, are not incorporated into the text but collected as centrally bound plates. They are also of variable quality. Considering the complexity of the material at hand — a ruined priory, reassembled tombs and family ties — the book can be a difficult read. One has to be prepared not only to flip between the plates, but between the essays: the intricacies of the Howard family presented in the opening chapter by Stephen Gunn and Kirsten Claiden-Yardley really requires a secondary reading once one has read the other essays in order to appreciate their significance.

However, as mentioned by Lindley in the introduction, there are a wealth of outputs that have allowed diverse audiences to engage with the findings of this project: a website, an exhibition at the Ancient House Museum in Thetford and an Apple iPad app. The last is a laudable piece of outreach, cleverly designed to be used during a visit to the Thetford ruins. It is popular rather than scholarly in its tone, but is nevertheless difficult to access for people who do not own the requisite brand of expensive tablet computer. A thirty-page pamphlet, *Thetford's Lost Tudor Sculptures*, replicates the essentials of the arguments in Lindley's chapter in the book here under review without the scholarly apparatus. This slim book is perfectly serviceable for those who wish to understand the history of these monuments without engaging with the text on a concentrated scholarly level, and has an attractive design, including fully integrated pictures. It concludes with a promise of a fully illustrated exhibition catalogue, pointing towards the website at representingreformation.net, but unfortunately this site has not been updated since 2013. It is a shame as, given the innovation and expertise in this project, the website could have been developed as a pioneering digital publication, and not abandoned at the cease of the project funding period. The ability to break free of linear presentation, to present raw data — such as the digitally scanned models of the Framlingham monuments — would have been of much benefit of scholars for many generations to come.

JAMES ALEXANDER CAMERON

© 2017 James Alexander Cameron
DOI 10.1080/00681288.2017.1366746

