In the late seventeenth century, less idyllic constructions of marriage, and therefore of gender relations, began to appear on Wiltshire tombs. An epitaph at Charlton on the grave of Hester, wife of Henry Martyn, who died in 1667 aged thirty-seven ends with the remarkable verse: ‘If women all would live like thee, I then Men with Wives might happy be.’ The ideal of marital harmony, requiring women to be quiet and submissive, is contrasted here with the supposed experience of marriage. An even more disparaging attitude toward wives is displayed in another inscription from the same period in the churchyard at Nettleton:

Here lies a traveller old madam Besse,  
Honest Charles Hales his wife I guess she was his dear one, we'll not belie her,  
And so's mine too: wou'd shee lay by her.

Although these dark sentiments undoubtedly had longer traditions, prior to 1660 marriage remained a cornerstone of commemorative culture and its representation was expressed in more positive terms.

Patriarchal values were expressed in a different way on the tombs of unmarried women and men, wherein reference could not be made to spousal duties or children. These monuments indicate the possibility of difference between representations of the marital unit of husband, wife, and children, and specific depictions of gender difference. In 1627 Bartholomew Parsons, the pastor of Collingbourne Kingston, erected a memorial in his church to his eleven-year-old daughter Elizabeth. The inscription emphasizes her ‘good name’ and good death, despite her youth. On her deathbed,

by fervent & frequent Prayers, penitency, faith, Willingness to leave the world, Care for the Poor, disposing of hir worldly goods, & Chois of hir Funerall Text, [she] expressed such Piety, Charity, & understandinge, as is Rare to be founde in mature Age.

The list of qualities is very similar to those of married women described above: piety, charity, and duty. This child had learned her social responsibilities well. Alice Hawkins, a clothier’s daughter from Chippenham, also died unmarried, in 1657, but at twenty-nine was rather older than Elizabeth Parsons. Her epitaph concludes in Latin with the phrase ‘Marriage replenishes the earth, virginity

replenishes paradise’. This is a quotation from St Jerome, who advocated marriage primarily as the necessary means by which more virgins might be produced for heaven. Alice’s celibacy gained her entry to heaven, while marriage was a necessity for most other earthly folk. Nevertheless the epitaph casts a shadow over sex and marriage altogether and is reminiscent of Jesus’s statement that there is no marriage in heaven.

A final example is the tomb to Lydia Ivye’s 1674 at Hullavington. Her epitaph sums up the typical themes of mortal decay, the soul’s ascension to heaven, and the imitation of her virtue expected from the living as they engaged in the act of memory:

Stay, gentle passenger, and cast thine eye,  
Upon this spectacle of mortality;  
Here doth the Body of a virgin rest,  
Whose soul in Heaven is with her Saviour blest.  
She blessed was with nature’s graces, but shin’d,  
Far more with gifts and graces of the minde:  
Meek, Hymble, chast, religious, and Devout.  
She holy was, and happy is, no doubt,  
We all must follow her in mortal state,  
O that we could her virtues imitate!  
Deserved praises might, perhaps, have mist her,  
Had not these lines been first here by her Sister.

Notwithstanding the somewhat strained attempt to create rhyming couplets, the text presents Ivye’s piety and mental agility, not her body, as the key elements of her character. In the absence of marriage and reproduction, these three examples reduce identity, in each case feminine identity, to religious qualities. Despite the young age of those commemorated, the tombs did not mourn their premature loss and unfulfilled hopes, but celebrated their virginity as a sign of that religion. As we shall see, the same cannot necessarily be said for tombs of young men.

If the tombs of some women might be distinguished by references to child-bearing, virginity, or wifery, men’s monuments were often coded masculine by the use of military images and chivalric metaphors. For centuries, aristocratic
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men were shown in death in suits of armour, reflecting knightly rank but not necessarily actual experience of combat. Such imagery took on new intensity in the 1640s and 1650s as families commemorated their sons who had lost their lives in Britain's civil wars. Two such tombs in Wiltshire are distinctive in depicting their subjects standing upright, ready to march out to battle to defend family, land, and honour, while bearing inscriptions mourning the young life cut short in terms not so different to those used for young women.

At Broad Hinton is the monument to Colonel Francis Glanville (d. 1645), a Royalist soldier killed at the siege of Bridgewater, Somerset. The tomb, erected by his father, is a remarkable combination of grief and triumph, particularly in its imagery. The soldier's effigy is shown standing in a niche, helmet and gloves by his feet, and a standard banner (of renewable cloth, not stone) in his hand. Panels depicting allegories of victory — all the figures male — were placed in the panels around the inner wall of the niche. In contrast to these images of victorious, virtuous masculinity is the carving in relief of a grieving woman immediately underneath the monument, whose features show an unusual degree of agony. The lengthy Latin epitaph focuses on victory, assuring the reader that Glanville had endured a manly death, 'mortem virilem', sacrificing himself to the parliamentary army in defence of the town. He had ascended to the clouds to join the heroic cohort, 'heroum coetum', leaving behind such a legacy, declares the epitaph, that England never gave, neither will she give, a greater man to young Mars; it would be enough for her having brought forth an equal. Despite their personal loss the Glanville family as a whole could take comfort from the fact that at least their eldest son and heir had survived, and that one of their number had died honourably in royal service.

The last of the St John series of tombs at Lydiard Tregoze commemorates Edward St John, killed at the second battle of Newbury in 1645 whilst fighting for the Royalist cause. The armoured effigy is shown standing, emerging from a canopy, and, due to the gilding, the whole was known colloquially as 'the Golden cavalier'. The complex Latin epitaph contrasts with this image of the glorious martyr, praising his apparently great qualities, and bemoaning his life cut short by war. Yet it goes on to explain the effigy's posture, symbolizing the righteousness and faithfulness of the St Johns in opposing the 'incivil wars':

How great a man is left behind in this raised marble made for burial, you see him who living you used to honour, him who will live on your used to lament, and you also may miss him who discharged life. Thus he stood formerly, as now he is depicted erect, against the assaults of the unceasing wars, and he took the stern threats of a death in arms with an honest face and faithful breast. For in this manner he fell inasmuch as you might think him standing, and with your mind merely immobile.

These monuments say little directly about gender, beyond the obvious fact that it was almost always men and not women who died in battle. Standing firm and upright in the face of chaos and the overthrow of the order of government was a political duty for men. The Glanville and St John tombs were therefore protests against the disintegration of patriarchal, monarchical rule, and highlight the gendered nature of power. For men, premature death in battle represented a challenge to the whole organization of social relations in a way that neither the death of unmarried women or women in childbirth could.

Political differences were registered in a more specific way on the tombs of a number of Wiltshire men who died during the 1650s. The monument to Gyles Eyre (d. 1655) and his wife in the south aisle of Whiteparish Church survived the Restoration despite its strong parliamentary emphasis. Eyre was said to be a man much oppressed by publick power for his laudable opposition to the measures taken in the reigns of James and Charles the first who was later 'plundered by the King's Soldiers of £2000 value, and imprisoned for refusing to pay the sum of £400' demanded by the King at Oxford. The epitaph concludes with Eyre's legacy, his '7 sons (3 of whom were likewise members of Parliament) and 4 daughters'.

William Jones's monument at the east end of the chancel at South Wraxall was erected after the Restoration, following his death in August 1660. The epitaph contrasts his crown in heaven with the chaos of fanaticies on earth, simultaneously describing the superfluity of grief in a confident proclamation of the deceased's fate:

Laugh not, Fanatikies, though he be gone,
He have Fought his fight, and hath wonne a Crowne;
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Though from we he is gone, in Heaven he takes his rest,
Singing Alleluia, and is for ever blest:
In life he taught to dye, and he did give
In Death a great example how to live:
If wisdom, learning, and knowledge cannot dwell
Secure from change, vain bubble Earth, Farewell.\footnote{Phillips, \textit{Monumental Inscriptions}, p. 283.}

Another tomb erected after the Restoration was that of Henry Hyde in Salisbury Cathedral. Hyde had been executed in 1650 for his militant adherence to the Royalist cause, and, according to his monument, went to the scaffold singing the 'Gloria in excelsis'. This martyr was apparently privileged to suffer the envied martyrdom ('invidendo Martyrlo') of Charles I, and to act as a prophet ('vates') for the return of Charles II.\footnote{Richard Rawlinson, \textit{History and Antiquities of the Cathedral-church of Salisbury and the Abbey-church of Bath} (London: n. pub., 1719), pp. 34–35, 126–27.}

These examples illustrate the central concern of monuments with the expression of hierarchical power relations, real and desired. Power was expressed in gendered terms, though power did not belong absolutely to men. Three Wiltshire tombs from this period stand out, as they highlight the dominance of women over some lineages. These monuments reversed the expected order of male before female in order to reinforce patriarchy, but it was done to illustrate a family's claim to power through distaff descents. Such cases in fact demonstrate the resilience of patriarchy.

The earliest case of a 'woman on top' was the elaborate painted triptych erected by Sir John St John at Lydiard Tregoze in 1615 as a memorial to Sir John St John (d. 1594) and his wife Lucy Hungerford (d. 1598) and in commemoration of his own acquisition of the title of baronet. The inside shows life-sizes portraits of John and Lucy St John kneeling at prayer, their six daughters to the right and their son and heir, John, with his wife, Ann, to the left, this second couple appearing rather larger than the first. On either end of the triptych's interior are portraits of two Virtues, Fortitude and Faith, with death's heads above. When closed, the outside panels show the St John family pedigree as prepared by the herald Richard St George (Sir John's uncle by marriage).\footnote{Aubrey, \textit{Topographical Collections}, pp. 173–75.} This traces the family descent to Oliver St John, then through his heiress-bride, Margaret Beauchamp, right back to the Norman Conquest. A portrait of Margaret in the tympanum

presides over the whole triptych. She is robed as a duchess, referring to her second marriage to the Duke of Somerset by which she had become mother of Margaret Beauchamp and grandmother of Henry VII.\footnote{Lydiard Park, p. 27.} Beauchamp was therefore prized as the family's matriarch, not because she was necessarily a strong character or dominant actor in the family history, but because it was she who brought the manor into the St John line together with a priceless connection to royalty.

One of the largest tombs in Wiltshire is the monument of Edward Seymour, the Earl of Hertford (d. 1621), over his family vault at Salisbury Cathedral. His grandson and heir was probably responsible for the commission, and the design has been attributed to the London mason William Wright.\footnote{Adam White, \textit{A Biographical Dictionary of London Tomb Sculptors c.1560–c.1660, The Sixty-First Volume of the Walpole Society} (London: Walpole Society, 1999), pp. 1–162 (pp. 149, 153).} The massive columns, obelisks, arches, epitaphs, and heraldic shields all draw attention to the tomb's most striking feature — the elevation of the effigy of Hertford's wife above his own. The monument offers no explicit justification for this marriage turned upside down. Most memorials placed the husband above the wife, or in the senior, 'dexter' position on the right (where there was more than one marriage, he would take the centre).

The most obvious reason for the alteration was to draw attention to the status of Hertford's wife. Born Catherine Grey, she was the sister of the unfortunate Lady Jane Grey, daughter of Frances Brandon and granddaughter of Mary Tudor. Some argued in Elizabeth's reign that she was the heir to England's throne, ranking higher in the royal succession than Mary Stuart, the Catholic queen of Scotland. But Catherine Grey had died in 1567 after seven years of marriage, most spent under house arrest as the Seymour wedding was a private affair undertaken without the Queen's knowledge. Hertford had been heavily fined in 1562 when an ecclesiastical commission found the marriage was invalid. He went on to marry twice more and was survived by his third wife, though no reference was made to either of these women on his tomb.

The point of the effigy, then, was not to overturn patriarchal authority, but to emphasize it. Hertford's tomb excluded the complications of his second and third marriages (he had lived with his second wife for ten years before the Queen allowed them to marry) in favour of emphasizing his first. By reducing the messy reality of the institution of marriage in Elizabethan England, the monument promoted the legitimacy and conformity of his first union, and therefore the
claims of his sons and grandsons to the inheritance of his titles and estates and their mother’s place in the royal succession. Two effigies kneeling on either side of the tomb stood for Hertford’s sons by Katherine, although they both predeceased him. Their masculinity, evidenced in their military costume, the weapons emblazoned on the obelisks, and the details given of their own marriages and families in additional inscriptions, further strengthened the image of order, continuity, and authority. From 1621, if this version of history were accepted, then the Seymour family could claim to be the second family of the kingdom. Hertford’s grandson William, the new earl of Hertford, was surpassed in lineage by no one except the King himself.

The technique of exalting a woman above a man was replicated in Edington Church on the tomb of Anne, Lady Beaufort (d. 1664), widow of Hertford’s son, Edward Seymour, and later wife of Sir Edward Lewys (d. 1630). Anne commissioned the tomb herself, but her reasons for elevating her effigy above her husband’s is less clear; perhaps she was inspired by the example of her grandmother-in-law at Salisbury. Certainly she was of higher birth, as the epitaph reflects, being the daughter of an earl and the granddaughter of a duke, but her second husband was a knight and, as the inscription also points out, had been a gentleman of the privy chamber to Prince Henry and King Charles. Effigies of their four sons and one daughter are included on the tomb, sorted by age, not by gender. Nevertheless, these variations from the normal pattern are resolved in an epitaph on marriage, childbearing, and memory:

\[
\text{Since Children are the living Corner-Stone}
\text{Where marriage built on both sides meetes in one,}
\text{Whilst they survive, our life’s shall have extent}
\text{Upon record in them, our Monument.}^{37}
\]

Women did not have to be placed on top of men or monuments in order to make particular points about genealogical relationships, the descent of manors, or the acquisition of honour and access to power. The tomb of Mary Shaa (d. 1613) in the chapel at Farleigh Hungerford Castle, Somerset, just over the Wiltshire border, depicts her kneeling alone surrounded by her children, daughters to the left and sons to the right. Shaa, born a Hungerford, had married twice but was buried in the chapel of her birth family owing to their higher status and the advantages that a permanent reminder of the connection would accord to her Shaa descendants. Her monument represented her claim and that of her children to the Hungerford inheritance, at least in theory, and to their patronage. The latter point is most evident in her will, which asked her great-nephew Sir Edward Hungerford to continue leasing the Hungerford property of Hinton Abbey to her Shaa descendants. The inscription, engraved on a brass plate attached to the wall above the monument, spells out Shaa’s kinship to the Hungerfords, providing her son with a connection to his most powerful relations. She was ‘daughter to ye right ho’ble Walter Lord Hungerford, sister & heyre generall to ye right noble Sir Ed Hungerf’r Knit deceased & wife unto Thomas Shaa Esq, leaving behind Robert Shaa her on only sonne’.

The epitaph goes on to praise her noble birth, womanly virtues, and heavenly destiny in rhyming couplets. Greater than these was her inheritance of the name Hungerford itself. Shaa is presented as the last surviving bearer of the name born into the senior, male line of descent, the ‘heir general’:

\[
\text{If Birth or worth might ad to Rareness life}
\text{Or teares in Man renue a Vertuous wife}
\text{Lock’t in this Cabinet, bereau’d of breath}
\text{Here lies ye Parel inclos’d She wept by Death}
\text{Sterne Death subdu’d, slighting Vaine worldly vice}
\text{Activing Heau’n with thoughts of Paradise}
\text{She was her Sexes wonder great in Bloud}
\text{But what is far more Rare both great and goodie}
\text{Shee was with all Celestial Vertues storee}
\text{The life of Shaa & soule of Hungerford.}^{38}
\]

The intrusion of the Shaa family into the burial chapel of the Hungerfords was achieved uneasily. The imagery and heraldry of Mary Shaa’s tomb provided no indication as to the status or even names of her two husbands. Yet the Hungerford lineage itself was in danger of running out of male heirs altogether. When Sir Edward Hungerford died in 1648, he left no children, and the estates passed to his half-brothers based at Down Ampney before leaving the family altogether in the late seventeenth century. Conscious of her failure to provide the family with more sons, Edward’s widow Margaret erected a large, complex tomb in the small chapel at Farleigh Hungerford. Simultaneously, she renovated the

---
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entire church, placing inscriptions in several windows to recall her deed and establish her husband's relationship to the other persons there interred. Lady Margaret's action was quite deliberate, for her entire married life had been lived not at Farleigh but at Corsham, where her monument might have been better placed. She ensured that Hungerford authority was established at Corsham, however, by founding an almshouse there. Both Edward and Margaret were patrons of monuments in Corsham Church, he for the 'praysworthy service' of Thomas Hulbert in 1632, she for 'ye affection' of Winifred Jewks in 1671.40

Edward and Margaret's tomb is a large chest of black-and-white marble, probably executed by the sculptor Thomas Burman.41 It is thought to have cost 1100 pounds, the upper limit of monumental expenditure, and particularly unusual for one erected during the Commonwealth period (although Edward had aligned himself prominently with Parliament). The top slab bears finely carved effigies of the husband and wife, he in armour. Below, the western (and most visible) side displays an enormous achievement of fifteen quarterings, while the southern side contains long Latin inscriptions.

The monument's texts all point toward a triumphant conclusion to the family line: the epitaph begins 'Laid on this tomb you see the effigy of a worthy pair', turns to their names, relations, and achievements, before concluding 'we shall rise again'. The inscription is keen to record the couple's parents. Margaret's father was a wealthy London alderman, but her mother Susan Halliday had, through remarriage, become the Countess of Warwick. Edward's maternal descent from the family's senior line is recalled, while his father, Anthony, merely a knight seated at an obscure Oxfordshire manor, is described as 'illustriissimi viri', establishing his branch of the Hungerford family as reputable enough to inherit the estates.42

The junior line of Hungerfords at Down Ampney struggled and failed to produce the requisite male heir in the seventeenth century. When Sir John Hungerford died in 1634, he left three sons and only one surviving granddaughter, Bridget. His heir, Sir Anthony, knew that when he himself died the Down Ampney estates would pass to Bridget and her descendants, the Dunch family. Despite having held the manor of Down Ampney for some two hundred and fifty years, the Hungerfords had no monuments in the church. Sir Anthony

and his generation resolved to fix this omission, to ensure that their name would not be forgotten.

First, a Latin inscription in brass was erected for Sir Anthony's mother, Lady Mary Hungerford (d. 1628), at the cost of her son-in-law William Platt. This recalls her ancestry at length, for, born into the prestigious Berkeley family, she was daughter of a knight, granddaughter of a baron, great-granddaughter of an earl, and a descendant of King John. Her wisely virtues are praised — she and Sir John were married forty-four years — as well as her good works and literary pursuits.43

The main monument, however, was that of Sir John himself, erected by Sir Anthony in 1637 'for the Honour of his dear Father, and in Remembrance of his own Mortality'. This shows two armoured, kneeling men facing each other under two arches, designed to represent father and son in a display of filial affection, although Sir Anthony was to live until 1653. The epitaph skims over Sir John's achievements — 'Honourable in his Life, serviceable to his King and Country, liberal to his Friends, charitable to the Poor' — to focus on his lineage, both his long ancestry, and his failure to produce a male heir.44

When lineages such as the Hungerfords failed in the male line, there was cause to erect monuments to preserve the memory of their hopes and achievements. Such objects also provided the chance for distaff lines to press a claim, like the Shaa tomb at Farleigh or William Platt's tomb for Mary Hungerford at Down Ampney. Yet neither grief nor even disappointment were expressed as the family name succumbed to the genetic lottery. Instead patriarchal social order was reaffirmed, and the survival of existing structures of authority across the breach opened by death.

So what difference does gender make as a category of analysis in the study of commemoration? Clearly, the social fabric of power was represented in highly gendered terms in early-modern England. Institutional identities such as knighthood or marriage were not necessarily reflective of reality, but were effective means of reinscribing social order and power. Feminine imagery such as the cardinal and theological virtues, and military, masculine metaphors could assign valued characteristics to individuals in a gendered framework. More significant, however, is the deep-seated nature of patriarchy as a system of social organization.
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While it clearly had profound implications for the lived experience of women and men in seventeenth-century England, it did allow women to exercise power over others, and, at times, even to become the chief agents of its operation.

These findings are borne out by a deeper study of our opening example. The Eyre monuments at Salisbury tell us a range of details about the sexual division of labour and the cultural assumptions about masculinity and femininity. The first tomb provides an epitaph only for the wife, as at the time of its construction Thomas Eyre, the husband and father, was still alive. Elizabeth Eyre died in 1612 aged 65, and is described as 'mother of these XV children, a virtuous matron, a good neighbour, charitable and an enemy to idolatry'. The model early-modern woman is here construct as mother, housewife, neighbour, philanthropist, and Protestant. The second tomb commemorates Thomas and Elizabeth's son Christopher, who was buried at St Stephen's Coleman Street, London, but whose will provided the impetus for the construction of the monuments in his home town. The inscription commends him to the visitor, noting his honourable background as the son of a Salisbury alderman, and describes how he 'lived virtuously, & gave Liberaily & Charitably to ye Cittie of London, & Also to this Cittie for ye erecting of an Almshouse [...] & for a weekly Lecture in this Parishe for ever'. Like his mother, Christopher 'departed this life [...] hating Idolatry'; religious belief was not limited by gender. Eyre's generosity, perhaps learned from his mother's example, was enabled by his good fortune as an early member of the East India Company and the Merchant Adventurers and by his and his wife's failure to have children. While the epitaphs appear to distinguish between mother and son there is in fact little to separate them. Protestant religion, generosity, charity, and neighbourliness are the values set forth by this urban family.

Despite their symmetrical, ordered appearance, the tombs do not present a balanced view of early-modern marital and gender relations nor of a patriarchy organized around a clear sexual division of labour. This is partly because the inscriptions only talk about one spouse in each case. Despite allowing space for further texts, the first monument was not amended following the death of Thomas Eyre in 1628. The second monument did not even mention the name of Christopher Eyre's wife Esther. She went on to marry a second time and was transported into a different lineage, one that would favour Royalist allegiance over the parliamentary leanings common to the Eyres.

The patronage that lies behind the monuments suggests male authority is less significant than one might think. While Christopher's will directed that eight pounds and sixty pounds be set aside for each tomb, and instructed that his parents were to appear in 'their scarlet robes' appropriate to an alderman and his wife, it was his widow, Esther, who carried out his wishes as his executrix. There was nothing unorthodox in this; in early-modern England it was commonplace for a widow to act as executrix and to commission tombs. The Eyre case was unusual as Christopher's death was not at all ideal. A memorandum appended to the will when it went to probate notes that on his deathbed Christopher had to be persuaded by those present to leave his possessions to anyone at all. In the end it was his wife, not the local parson or other gentlemen in attendance, who ensured that he did his civic duty, died a good death, and that the power he exercised on account of his birth, virtue, and industry was perpetuated through his memory.