

THE LIVING AND THE DEAD: FUNERARY COMMEMORATION IN HEREFORD CATHEDRAL IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

As we gather today, very close to St Thomas Cantilupe's feast day (2 October), we are reminded of the saint's place in Hereford's history by his magnificent tomb-shrine, not far from us, over in the north transept. It is a remarkable monument, without direct parallel in English medieval funerary sculpture. Picture in your mind's eye what it looks like. It consists of a coffin-shaped tapering chest, made of local sandstone, and carved with the figures of seated soldiers, under arcading decorated with naturalistic foliage, on top of which is a Purbeck marble slab containing the indent for a full-length, canopied brass of the bishop, now lost. And over this again is a flat-topped arcaded canopy, likewise decorated with foliage. The monument is known to have been in existence by 1287 – that is to say, just five years after the bishop's death – because in that year John Tregoz, a local man, kept a night's vigil at the tomb and claimed to have seen a vision of the bishop, who, he said, 'came out from under the image of brass which was spread on top of the sarcophagus' (an interesting documentary reference to a brass).¹

The tomb/shrine has generated much scholarly discussion because of its unique character, neither wholly tomb monument nor wholly shrine, and I want to return to it at the end. I mention it now, at the beginning, simply to make the point that among the medieval monuments in Hereford Cathedral are some of the finest and most interesting in England. And my theme this afternoon is the role of commemoration in the Middle Ages and the varied forms that it took. I am able to take my examples exclusively from the collection of tombs and brasses in this Cathedral. I would not be able to do that if I were speaking in Norwich or Lincoln, Durham or Lichfield, some of these much grander cathedrals than Hereford. So the first theme I want to talk about immediately suggests itself; why *are* there so many medieval tomb monuments at Hereford? Was Hereford typical - exceptional only to the extent that so many have survived? Or were there circumstances which made Hereford unusual? That will lead me onto my second theme, which is the function of commemoration in the Middle Ages. Why *did* people seek commemoration, and what factors influenced *whereabouts* in a church they were commemorated? Then, thirdly and finally, I want to explore the meaning of medieval church monuments, taking these around me here in the Lady Chapel as my examples, asking how we are to interpret them, how we are to understand them as they were understood at the time.

So, to begin with my first theme: the matter of numbers. Why are there so many medieval monuments in Hereford Cathedral? Let us, for a moment, recall just how many there are. Hereford preserves nearly two dozen high-status sculpted medieval monuments, most of them effigial, and to these should be added the fragments of cross slab grave covers which have also come down to us. Among our medieval cathedrals, this is a total exceeded only by Canterbury, and closely matched elsewhere only by Salisbury. It is when we go on to consider the massive collection of brasses, however, that Hereford really stands out. According to the recent listing by Heseltine and Stuchfield in their book *Monumental Brasses of Hereford Cathedral*, there are no fewer than 33 pre-Reformation brasses in the cathedral today, a figure approached only at St Albans, an abbey in the Middle Ages of course, where there are about a dozen-and-half.² On top of the extant monuments, moreover, we need to add the tally of lost monuments – monuments now vanished, but whose existence is attested by heralds and antiquaries. It is when we consider these that we can really begin to appreciate the scale of commemoration at medieval Hereford. At the beginning of the eighteenth century Richard Rawlinson recorded a total of no fewer than 170 indents of lost

brasses. Most of the brasses had probably been ripped out in the 1640s, at the time of the Civil War, when precisely that same number of brasses is said to have been removed for the making of cannon.³ Further losses were to occur in the eighteenth century following the fall of the west tower in 1786. We are told that in that year no fewer than two tons of metal were removed from the cathedral and sold to a local brazier. A notable casualty at this time was probably the important fifteenth-century brass of Canon Lochard, recorded by Dingley in 1684, and known to have been sited at the west end of the nave near the canon's chantry.⁴ Further losses still were to occur as a result of the heavy-handed restorations of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, some of the brasses being removed by antiquaries for safe-keeping and only returned later. Bearing in mind the cathedral's unhappy history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it is a wonder that as many brasses have survived as there actually have.

The question then arises: is the large number of monuments and brasses known to have been commissioned in Hereford Cathedral in the Middle Ages exceptional? Or was it fairly standard? The answer to these questions is, in each case, both yes and no. Certainly, most other cathedrals had lots of tombs and brasses before they were struck by the disasters of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and later - the combined attentions of the two Cromwells, Thomas and Oliver, the havoc wrought by the restorers, and the effects of general wear and-tear. We can get a sense of the scale of medieval commemoration if we walk the aisles of such cathedrals as Lincoln or Rochester, Ely or St Albans. The floors of these buildings are lined with the indents of despoiled slabs of once magnificent brasses of bishops, priors or cathedral dignitaries.⁵ Often, the outlines of these brasses are still so clear that we can reconstruct in our mind's eye exactly what they looked like. Lincoln has a particularly magnificent collection and that at Rochester is hardly inferior.

So we have to recognise that the density of medieval commemoration at Hereford was far from unique. The tombs and brasses of the officiating clergy were a feature of every medieval cathedral or collegiate church. However - and this is a big 'however' - there were a couple of factors that lent a distinctive colouring to the commemorative pattern in Hereford Cathedral in the Middle Ages. The first was the burial monopoly enjoyed by the cathedral in the immediate locality; and the second, the close relations between the chapter and the local nobility and gentry. Both of these are factors which were touched on by David Lepine in last year's lecture.

First, the history of the cathedral's burial monopoly. This is a subject which has recently been written up very well.⁶ The chapter had a right to claim the burial within the cathedral precincts of all the faithful who died within the five city parishes and the rural hinterland around them. This was a monopoly which had originated in the pre-Conquest period when the cathedral had the status of a minster church, and the dean and chapter clung onto it tenaciously in the Middle Ages because of the income from burial dues which it brought. It is the burial monopoly which accounts for the many brasses, incised slabs and sculpted effigies of Hereford citizens which we find here - notably the little fourteenth-century brass civilian in the south-east transept and the magnificent incised slab of the vintner or cider-maker, Andrew Jones, below in the crypt. The local people did not much like this monopoly but they evidently felt that, if they were going to be buried in the cathedral, they were going to be commemorated with appropriate splendour.

The second factor, the close relations between the chapter and the local nobility, is one to which Lepine and Swanson drew attention in their chapter in the big Cathedral history book.⁷

No fewer than 30% of the chapter whose geographical origins are known came from within the diocese, nearly half of them from the Severn and Wye valleys. And the proportion rises to as high as 61%, nearly two-thirds, if we confine ourselves to the canon residentiaries. So the canons of Hereford were predominantly local men, not carpet-baggers, as they sometimes were elsewhere. A handful of them were scions of noble families – the Charltons, Mortimers and Talbots. The majority, however, hailed from the ranks of the gentry: the knights and esquires – the Barres, Baskervilles, Burleys, Caples, Chandoses, de la Beres, Pembridges, Rudhalls, Vaughans, Whitneys and Walwayns. These men's membership of the chapter strengthened the local roots of the cathedral governing body and reinforced its standing in the diocese. And the effects on the pattern of commemoration were twofold: first, the canons would naturally be inclined to seek burial in the cathedral; and, second, their relatives, particularly if they were benefactors of the cathedral, would be inclined to seek burial within its walls too. The evidence of that is all around us, with the monuments of the de Bohuns, the Grandisons, the Swinfields and de la Beres.

Now, as we think about these monuments, may I turn to my second theme? What was the function of commemoration by monuments in the Middle Ages? And what factors influenced the geography of commemoration within the medieval cathedral? I ask these questions because the commissioning of monuments in the Middle Ages took place to the background of very different views about the transition to the afterlife from those with which we are familiar today. Let me explain. In medieval religious thought the dead were seen as involved in a relationship of close dependence on the living. It was all to do with what historians call, in their pompous language, strategies of salvation. The starting-point for medieval thinking on the afterlife was that, while the souls of the virtuous might well go straight to heaven and those of the damned straight to hell, the souls of most of us, neither wholly good nor wholly bad, were likely to go to a half-way house – purgatory – there to be tried and tested. And in the process of trying and testing, the Almighty would be swayed by the intercessory prayers of the living, most of all by the prayers of the clergy offered every day in the liturgy. Accordingly, in the world of pre-Reformation religion the tomb monument occupied a position of some importance. It was not to be, as it is today, merely a passive object, a witness to a past life or a record of the achievements of someone deceased. Its function was actively to engage the onlooker – be it priest or passer-by – involving him in the deceased's fate, appealing to him to intercede for the deceased's soul, and reminding him of the dependence of the dead on the living. From this basic idea derive two of the main characteristics of the medieval monument – first, the praying hands, the fingers touching one another, reminding us to pray for the deceased; and, second, the epitaph so often beginning 'orate pro anima...', 'pray for the soul of ...' making the message explicit to those who were literate. In medieval thought, the living and the dead were linked in a relationship of close mutual dependence – the living praying for the dead because they knew that in due course they would be dependent on the living for prayer. Some medieval testators wanted to make sure that the living never forgot this. So Canon Lexham, in his will of 1382, said that the Hereford choristers were to recite their obits – that is to say, their prayers – actually standing on his tombstone – for he would be listening to ensure that they did their job properly.⁸ (He had been the cathedral choirmaster.) Others contented themselves with arranging, rather pointedly, for burial in parts of the fabric that they had built, to prompt recollection of good works. Thus Bishop John Trefnant, around 1400, incorporated his beautiful monument in the south wall of the south transept, which he had largely rebuilt.⁹

This, then, was the basic belief underlying and informing medieval commemoration – the idea that the monument acted as a stimulus to, and a focal-point for, intercessory prayer for

the deceased. Monuments and intercession went together in the Middle Ages. With this went another link in turn - a link between monuments and altars. Those commissioning monuments wanted them placed as close as possible to altars, because it was before altars that the regular round of intercession would be offered. It is the linkage between burials and altars which explains something immediately apparent from any ground plan of the medieval monuments in the cathedral - namely the concentration of monuments in the eastern parts of the cathedral, in the eastern chapels and the transepts. This arose for the obvious reason that the great majority of the altars were located in these parts of the building. And remember just how many altars there were in the cathedral before the Reformation. Today, as I understand, there are just seven. In the period that I am talking about there were no fewer than thirty. Where the altars were, there you would find most of the tomb monuments and brasses. That is the first and most essential point to bear in mind when making sense of the geography of commemoration in any medieval cathedral – Hereford or anywhere.

But there is one other point we need to bear in mind in accounting for the distribution of burials in medieval cathedrals, and that is the location of saints' shrines – which, in the case of Hereford, means principally the shrine of St Thomas Cantilupe, the man whose memory we are honouring this afternoon. If, in general terms, medieval people wanted to be buried close to where intercessory prayer would be offered, most of all they wanted to be buried close to where a saint would intercede for them – which naturally meant close to the saint's shrine. There was a degree of snob value in being buried in such a position: of course there was; it was prestigious. The greatest attraction, however, was that of benefiting from the saint's intercession. In our cathedrals today we can still see the concentration of high-status monuments around the shrines – or, rather, former shrines – at Ely, Winchester and St Albans. So too it once was at Hereford. At the end of the thirteenth century, when Thomas Cantilupe was still buried in the north transept, high status burials tended to be made there. Later, as the case for canonisation proceeded and, as the prospects improved for his translation to the retrochoir, so high status burials tended to shift to this area – those of the Swinfields (uncle and nephew), for example, Bishop Swinfield being the prime mover of canonisation. In the 1340s, in the wake of canonisation, but before the move of the relics to the retrochoir, burials tended to shift back to the north transept, as worries developed over whether translation would ever actually happen. Bishop Thomas Charlton was buried in the north transept in 1344. After 1349, however, when translation finally took place, there was a definite shift in the centre of gravity eastwards. Bishop Lewis Charlton was buried on the south side of the Lady Chapel vestibule, Sir Peter Grandison on the north side of that Chapel and large numbers of the cathedral clergy in the vestibule, retrochoir and aisles, as is evident from the presence of their brasses today. The eastern part of the cathedral had become a mighty power-house of intercessory prayer. All this was in accordance with the cathedral's aims, as set down by Bishop Thomas Charlton in 1330. In his preamble to a confirmation of an endowment, he said the cathedral's aims were to increase the honour of the church of Hereford, to promote divine worship, and to help the living and to aid the salvation of the souls of the faithful dead.

Those words bring me neatly to my third and final theme, what we might describe as 'monuments as an aspect of performance': that is to say, the character and design of monuments as dictated by the functions which I have described. Monuments underwent a complex process of evolution and development in the Middle Ages, as the client market expanded, leading to a diversity of monument types all aimed at satisfying the wide spectrum of demand. By the late thirteenth century we find that there were both very grand monuments, such as those around us now that I'll be talking about in a moment and, also,

much smaller, more modest examples, such as those of the lesser gentry and burgesses in the aisles.

Let us begin by considering perhaps the grandest of all the medieval monuments in the cathedral, one of the most eye-catching of its day, that of Bishop Pierre d'Aigueblanche, who died in 1268, in the north transept. D'Aigueblanche was a Savoyard – one of the throng of hangers-on who came over in the 1240s with Henry III's young bride, Eleanor of Provence. He was buried in the dramatic, state-of-the-art transept that he had begun, and he probably commissioned his hardly less dramatic monument in his lifetime, even though its completion was probably overseen by his nephew, John, who is buried next to him. The rich architecture of the monument directly reflects that of the transept, both making use of the Westminster-derived motif of the oculus with a quatrefoil within it. Even if the same body of masons were not employed on both tomb and transept, it is clear that the same stylesheet or pattern book was used for both. D'Aigueblanche's monument stands in the tradition of great shrine-like monuments, represented for us today most forcefully by the monuments of Archbishop Walter de Gray (d. 1255) in York Minster and Bishop Giles de Bridport (d. 1262) at Salisbury, but probably inaugurated by the now lost monument of Bishop Grosseteste (d. 1253) at Lincoln.¹⁰ The sheer magnificence of these monuments bears witness to a notable characteristic of episcopal commemoration at the time, namely a desire to elevate and dignify the episcopacy through the medium of the monuments of those who had died in the episcopal office. The elaborate structures raised over the burial places of d'Aigueblanche and the other bishops were seen not merely as commemorating individual bishops, however distinguished, but as honouring the episcopal caste as a whole. Through their combination of elaborate architecture and rich decoration they attested the distinction of the episcopal elite as pastors of their flocks, leaders of the Church and mediators between God and man.

The grandeur and magnificence of the d'Aigueblanche monument, however, was not to be repeated at Hereford; it was a one-off for a very rich, well connected, cosmopolitan bishop who enjoyed close connections with the court. What was to become the norm in medieval Hereford was the wall recess tomb, a type represented for us here in the Lady Chapel by Lady de Bohun's tomb and along the aisles by the retrospective tombs of the early bishops. The attraction of the recess tomb was its sheer convenience. It did not obstruct processional routes along the aisles, as a projecting tomb chest would have done, an important consideration in a church such as this in which a high premium was placed on the seemly celebration of the liturgy. Nor, equally significant, did it impede the flow of pilgrim traffic, the bulk of which would have been on the north side of the building, as pilgrims were admitted through the north porch and then, after 1349, channelled down the north choir aisle to the shrine here at the east end.

Let us now look in a little detail at Lady Joanna de Bohun's tomb, which dates from 1327. It is a good example of the Hereford type, set low into the wall, with a recumbent effigy under a moulded arch, in this case an arch with a mitred top. In architectural terms the tomb offers very little out of the ordinary. It is slightly more elaborate than most others of its type, with an attractive row of fleurons and heads in front, but otherwise fairly typical. In one respect, however, the monument marked a new departure in the history of physical commemoration in the cathedral: it afforded the first instance of the commemoration of a member of the laity in the prestigious eastern parts of the building. In every medieval cathedral there were rules or more-or-less formal conventions governing who could and who could not be buried within the building. Matters of decorum – of good manners - were involved. Originally, the privilege of burial inside was conceded only to those of blemished life: the very holiest – that

is to say, saints; everyone else was outside. Gradually, however, from the late eleventh century the privilege was extended to the senior clergy and, later on, to senior members of the laity and to benefactors. Once these people were allowed in, then it followed that there had to be rules governing whereabouts in the building they could be interred. A free-for-all could hardly be allowed, otherwise all sense of seemliness and decorum would be lost. So, a kind of hierarchy emerged. Bishops and other members of the clergy were accorded burial in the transepts and eastern parts of the building, while the laity were consigned to the nave. (So Sir Richard Pembridge, for example, however distinguished – he was a Knight of the Garter - is down there in the nave.) Lady de Bohun's monument is significant for being first to break through these conventions in a big way. The monument is here in the Lady Chapel, right next to the altar, and on the north side, the honorific position. And the reason for the privilege accorded to her is well known. Lady de Bohun was a benefactor of the cathedral: she granted the chapter the advowson of the church of Lugwardine along with the three chapels pertaining to it, so that eight chaplains and two deacons could celebrate the Mass of the Virgin for the good estate of the king and queen and for Joan's soul – a form of chantry, in other words.¹¹ Her gift to the chapter was commemorated by a painting which was once visible on the back panel, now largely lost, showing her kneeling and offering up a model of the church to the Virgin. Benefactors, like Lady Joan, could buy their way in: money could allow you to queue-jump in the Middle Ages, just as it can today.

Immediately to the west of Joan's tomb is that of another local grandee, Sir Peter Grandison (d. 1358), a monument which again, by virtue of its position, illustrates the pattern of lay intrusion into the eastern parts of high-status churches in the late Middle Ages. Grandison's tomb follows Lady Joan's in belonging to the wall recess type, the type so highly favoured at Hereford. However, it is bigger and is of a completely different design, as befits its later date. Instead of the moulded arch over the effigy, as on Joan's monument, we have an arcaded screen, inhabited by figures of saints, surmounted by a horizontal top with cresting. The canopy is of a striking design, notable for incorporating and making use of the window behind. Mid fourteenth-century monuments took a delight in playing tricks with windows, sometimes rising up and framing them, sometimes, as here, using them to illuminate the monument from behind, but always seeking to break down the distinction between architecture and fittings. An explanation for the exceptional character of the Grandison monument is that it is probably the work of Exeter sculptors. Peter de Grandison's brother was John de Grandison, bishop of Exeter, and some of the sculptors employed on the Exeter west front seem to have migrated to Herefordshire and worked on tombs here.¹² They were a very talented group. Their most famous product is probably the celebrated monument of Peter's wife Blanche (born Blanche Mortimer) at Much Marcle, showing her with the hem of her dress spilling over the side – a delightful touch of realism.

There is one other point that I want to make about the Grandison tomb before we leave it, and it is this. You will notice that it exhibits a feature that was to become very common in English funerary sculpture in the late Middle Ages, and that is an array of saintly imagery. Along the top, in the sculpted screen, brightly picked out in colour, is a row of saints. A liturgical element is introduced into the monument. The heavenly company – the Virgin and the others - are collectively seen as patrons and intercessors for the commemorated, people who are involving themselves on his behalf. Their presence indicates a more active conception of the monument, what I suggested earlier was a view of the monument as 'performance art' – there is a lot going on in it. And we see the same point still more clearly when we turn from these sculpted monuments to look at some of the many brasses in the cathedral, in particular the brasses of the cathedral's clergy. The two that I want to take as

my examples are the brasses of Archdeacon Rudhall (1476), now on the west wall of the south-east transept, and the even bigger, even grander one of Dean Frocester (1529) in the north transept.

These are brasses of quite exceptional splendour, even by the standards of the late medieval clergy. They are not only large, they are absolutely over the top. What immediately strikes one – as we have just noticed on Peter de Grandison’s monument – is the extensive use made of religious imagery. On both of these brasses, and perhaps originally too on others in the cathedral, a notable characteristic is the tiers of saints stacked up in the side buttresses of the canopies, typically four or five on each side. The designer fitted in saintly figures here and there, wherever space allowed, alongside a variety of other religious imagery, for example the symbols of the evangelists. On Canon Porter’s brass of 1524, now on the east wall of the south-east transept, a beautiful Annunciation Scene is fitted into the gable of the canopy. I suppose religious imagery on brasses of the clergy is only to be expected. People in the Middle Ages saw the religious landscape as filled with saints. Saints were friends, helpers, patrons, intercessors - mediators between man and God. Here, on these brasses, they were out in full force. What we should note, however, is that they were not chosen entirely at random; they were chosen – or some, at least, were chosen - for their associations with the cathedral church of Hereford. So, on the brasses of Rudhall, Porter and Frocester we see, in addition to all the usual saints (the Baptist, St Katherine, St Michael and so on) St Ethelbert and St Thomas Cantilupe. We are back with a theme I touched on earlier in relation to Bishop Pierre d’Aigueblanche’s monument – the celebration not just of an individual but of a whole community. On Bishop d’Aigueblanche’s monument it was a celebration of the episcopacy, while on these canons’ brasses it was a celebration of the cathedral church of Hereford. The rich prebendaries identified with the cathedral they served and that identity was written into their brasses.

We can perhaps approach this matter of the imagery on ecclesiastical brasses from another angle. Instead of seeing all this enrichment as attesting personal piety and preferences among the saints, we can see it in terms of brasses and monuments telling a story – telling a story about the offices, appointments, affiliations and loyalties of those they commemorate. Let me illustrate the point by taking as an example another brass – a brass now lost, but known to us from the antiquarian record, that of Canon Lochard, the canon precentor, who died in 1438. Dingley made a rough drawing of the brass in *c.* 1680, and both he and Gough, in the next century, recorded the epitaph.¹³ The brass was a big one showing the commemorated under a tall single canopy, with shields of arms. It stood near the west end of the nave. (That is why it is there no longer: it was a casualty of the fall of the west tower in 1786.) Lochard himself was shown attired in a cope with the figures of saints in the orphreys (the borders). The selection of saints was carefully made, with, on the one side, St Mary, St George, St Katherine and St Thomas of Canterbury; and, on the other, St Ethelbert, St Buryan, St Mary Magdalen and St Thomas Cantilupe. St Mary and Ethelbert, the saints at the top on each side, were chosen in recognition of Lochard’s positions in the church of Hereford. St George is a reference to an earlier dignity he had held, a canonry in St George’s Chapel, Windsor, while the less familiar figure of St Buryan is accounted for by his dignity, mentioned in the epitaph, of dean of St Buryan in Cornwall. Two of these dignities were alluded to in the shields of arms which decorated the brass. One shield bore the familiar device of the three crowns for St Ethelbert of Hereford, and another England and France quarterly for Lochard’s connection with Windsor and his service to the crown: he was a king’s clerk.

In one sense, therefore, the whole brass can be read as a glorified CV, a visual presentation of a well rewarded pluralist's climb up the ladder of clerical promotion. So much is clear. In another sense, however, the brass was a firmly traditional memorial, driven by essentially liturgical imperatives. The aim of the entire composition was to secure intercessory prayer. Accordingly, in the inscription mention was made of the deceased's gift of the west window in the nave – one 'among many other benefactions he made to the church', as the text put it. The deceased's gift was cited as a good work, mentioned so as to prompt a flow of prayers of thanksgiving from the grateful clergy. It provides an immediate explanation for the unusual position of the brass, right at the west end of the nave, far from Cantilupe's shrine, but immediately next to the window which Lochard had paid for. It is quite likely that the brass formed the centrepiece of a cage chantry. In his will Lochard left the sum of no less than £1000 to endow a chantry for the benefit of his soul, a sum easily large to allow for the possibility of a screened-off structure of some sort. George Marshall suggested that such a structure may have stood on the site of the later staircase up to the bishop's consistory court in the triforium. We are reminded that for all the status-consciousness of the brass, all the allusions to the deceased's career, it was securing the salvation of his soul that weighed most with Lochard.¹⁴

To conclude, may I return to where I began, to the tomb/shrine of the saint bishop himself. As I said at the beginning, it is a curious monument because it has no obvious parallels among monuments of the day, fitting the conventions for neither a shrine nor an ordinary tomb monument. Particularly odd is the flat horizontal top, supported on its arcade, which would have obscured sight of the brass underneath. How on earth were you to see the brass? How are we to understand the function of this strange commission? A number of suggestions have been made. One is that the monument has been tampered with, and so is no longer seen in its original form. Another is that it is the product of several phases of construction, the upper section – the arcade and the top – being later additions. Neither, I think (even if right), entirely resolves all the problems. My own hunch is that Pevsner was probably right, back in the 1960s, in his volume in the Buildings of England series, when he said that the monument, as we have it, was not a shrine, but a shrine base – that is to say, that the actual reliquary containing the bones stood on top, and that the function of the flat-topped canopy was to support it.¹⁵ This immediately provides an explanation for something otherwise odd, which is that there is no evidence that there was ever a body inside. If we accept Pevsner's theory, we can then go further and suggest that the purpose of the open arcade separating the flat top and the chest itself could have been to allow the sick and infirm who came to the shrine to thrust their arms in, and to touch the bishop's brass effigy, in hope of being healed. In other words, the curious arcade served much the same function as was served on other more normal shrine monuments by recesses cut into other sides.

A little anti-climactic, I am afraid, but I can do no better in explaining the anomalies of Bishop Cantilupe's monument. It is a monument which retains its secrets. But then perhaps you would not expect anything too run-of-the-mill for a tomb honouring a saint who achieved the very rare distinction of dying excommunicated by his own archbishop of Canterbury. You cannot say that of many would-be saints.

So, to conclude, Hereford has the capacity to spring a surprise or two on the student of monuments. Like Rochester, a cathedral which I studied a few years ago, and which is sometimes written off somewhat dismissively as one of the poorer cathedrals, it houses an exceedingly rich collection of medieval monuments. Those monuments bear witness to two characteristics which I know remain true today. One is the close ties between the cathedral

and its diocese and the other, the strong identity with the cathedral of those who take such pride in serving it and worshipping in it today.

¹ P. Heseltine and H.M. Stuchfield, *The Monumental Brasses of Hereford Cathedral* (London, 2005), p. 10.

² Heseltine and Stuchfield, *Monumental Brasses of Hereford Cathedral*, pp. 9-43.

³ M.H. Bloxam, 'On Certain Sepulchral Effigies in Hereford Cathedral', *Archaeological Journal*, 34 (1877), p. 409.

⁴ T. Dingley, *History from Marble*, ed. J.G. Nichols (Camden Society, 1857), a record of journeying made in 1684, is a fundamental source for the study of the tombs and brasses in the cathedral.

⁵ Hereford unfortunately has very few indents, a consequence of the nineteenth-century tiling of the cathedral.

⁶ See I. Forrest, 'The Politics of Burial in Late Medieval Hereford', *English Historical Review*, 125 (2010), pp. 1110-1138.

⁷ R. Swanson and D. Lepine, 'The Later Middle Ages, 1268-1535', in *Hereford Cathedral. A History*, ed. G. Aylmer and J. Tiller (London, 2000), pp. 48-86.

⁸ Lambeth Palace Library, register of Archbishop Courtenay, fos. 203v-204r.

⁹ By the same reasoning, Bishop Booth (d. 1535) had his monument placed in the north aisle of the nave, near the projecting porch which he had built.

¹⁰ Nigel Saul, *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages. History and Representation* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 156-7, 176-7.

¹¹ D.A.L. Maclean, 'Some Observations on the Family of Lady Joan de Bohun', *Transactions of the Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club*, 37 (1961-2), pp. 9-20.

¹² L. Gee noticed the similarity to the statuary of the Exeter west front in 'Fourteenth-Century Tombs for Women in Herefordshire', in *Hereford. Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology*, ed. D. Whitehead (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 15, 1995), pp. 132-7.

¹³ Dingley's drawing of the brass is reproduced in Heseltine and Stuchfield, *Monumental Brasses of Hereford Cathedral*, p. 58, and the inscription is on p. 59.

¹⁴ G. Marshall, *Hereford cathedral. Its Evolution and Growth* (Worcester, 1951).

¹⁵ N. Pevsner, *Herefordshire* (Harmondsworth, 1963), p. 167. It goes without saying, therefore, that I think the recent reconstruction of the shrine over the monument is absolutely correct in its reading of the evidence.