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Editorial

This year marks the centenary of the outbreak of the First World War. When the members of the Monumental Brass Society met at the Police Institute, Adam Street, Adelphi, for the Annual General Meeting on 30 April 1914 they can have had no idea, despite a worrying deficit of £7 1s. 7d., that the Society was about to go into abeyance for twenty years. Antiquarian researches gave place to more dangerous pursuits: E. Bertram Smith served with the Friends Ambulance Unit in France; J.L. Myres commanded raiding operations on the Turkish coast; and Philip Walter Kerr, the future Rouge Croix Pursuivant, saw action in German South-West Africa and on the Western Front. At least one member was killed in action: Captain John Richard Webster died on the Somme on 9 September 1916 and is one of some 72,000 commemorated on the Thiepval Memorial.

Although there was not such an extensive loss of monuments as in the Second World War, brasses and incised slabs were casualties of the bombardments in Northern France and Belgium, most notably as a result of the destruction of the churches at Nieuwpoort and Ieper. A fragment of one of the Nieuwpoort brasses was picked up by an English soldier returning on leave and spent the next decade in use as a fire screen in a cottage, before being identified and returned to Flanders.

At the war’s end many of the thousands of individual and communal memorials took the form of monumental brasses. Those in Great Britain are being recorded for the County Series. Others remain to be discovered in the dominions and colonies and on the Continent, such as the remarkable series of Bavarian regimental brasses in the St. Johannis Friedhof, Nürnberg. Much useful information about war memorials can be gathered from websites, most notably the War Memorials Archive of the Imperial War Museum and, for Germany and Austria, the Onlineprojekt Gefallenendenkmäler.

Over the next few years some of these memorials will be featured in the Transactions and the Bulletin.
The Tomb and Seal of John Trillek, Bishop of Hereford: some comparative thoughts

Fig. 1. John Trillek, bishop of Hereford, Hereford Cathedral
(photo.: Hereford Cathedral Library and Archives)
(reproduced by permission of the Dean and Chapter of Hereford Cathedral)
This essay seeks to consider the relationship between the monumental brass of John Trillek\(^1\) and his episcopal seal of dignity. More broadly, using Trillek (and, to a lesser extent, the memorial and seal of another bishop of Hereford, Thomas Cantilupe) as a case-study, the following discussion will demonstrate that a consideration of sigillographic material can add substantially to our understanding and contextualization of medieval brasses, particularly in relation to their manufacture and purpose.

The magnificent brass commemorating John Trillek (d. 1360), bishop of Hereford, is well known, not least because it is one of the earliest extant full-length figures from the London B workshop (Fig. 1).\(^2\) The restored inscription lauds Trillek as a ‘pleasing, wise and pious man’, \((\text{vir gratus prudens pius})\) while Malcolm Norris described the image on the brass as a ‘dignified figure’.\(^3\) Above all, the figure of a bishop in full pontificals, holding a pastoral staff and blessing, clearly identifies the individual commemorated by the effigy as a member of the episcopate, which may be read in the context of creating a corporate lineage within the cathedral.\(^4\) In life, Trillek had been represented by his seal, which contained an image that was just as striking as that on his tomb, and which, through a combination of motif and words similar to those displayed on his memorial, identified Trillek as an individual and as a member of a specific group.\(^5\) This close relationship between Trillek’s seal and brass will form the core of this essay.

While the stylistic and iconographic similarities between the two objects will be considered in some detail, the meaning and purpose behind them will be a central theme. Furthermore, although this essay will focus on Trillek, a principal aim is to demonstrate the crucial importance of other media that were available to convey self-representation, and in particular to include sigillographic material when considering monumental brasses.

\(^1\) The spelling of Bishop John’s family name employed in this article is that used by the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography and the most recent history of Hereford Cathedral.

\(^2\) P. Heseltine and H.M. Stuchfield, The Monumental Brasses of Hereford Cathedral (London, 2005), pp. 11-12; S. Badham, ‘The Brasses, and Other Minor Monuments’ in Hereford Cathedral: A History, ed. G. Aylmer and J. Tiller (London, 2000), pp. 331-5, at p. 333, fig. 100. As can been seen from Fig. 1 in the present essay, Badham’s assertion that ‘only the figure is original medieval work’ is inaccurate since fragments of the original canopy and shafts also survive. Trillek’s brass was the model for Pugin’s design for the memorial to Bishop John Milner (d. 1826) in Oscott College Chapel; see MBS Bulletin, 99 (May 2005), cover illustration and p. 786.


\(^5\) The origin, use and form of the episcopal seal of dignity (the principal seal of a bishop) and subsidiary seals are discussed in W.St.J. Hope, ‘The Seals of English Bishops’, Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries, 2nd series, II (1885-87), pp. 271-306. From the late eleventh until the mid-later fourteenth century the standard image on episcopal seals was the representation of a bishop in full pontificals, holding a pastoral staff and blessing.
The relationship between such brasses and other media is a subject which has attracted much interest. The influence of low-relief metal effigies and incised slabs on the development of early brasses has long been established. In broader terms, since Norris identified connections between glaziers and the craftsmen who produced monumental brasses, the ‘brass and glass’ discussion has dominated the debate about cross-media interaction. Following on from Norris’s seminal work, a number of case-studies have further elucidated the cross-over between brasses and glass. More recently, the idea of ‘multi-media workshops’ has received attention, with David King, for example, demonstrating that windows, monumental brasses and painted screens were in some cases all products of one workshop. Virtually absent from these discussions are seals. Scholars do, on occasion, note iconographical or stylistic similarities between seals and effigial monuments, including brasses, but this tends to be on a case-by-case basis and usually focuses on minor details. This is a matter of regret, for there are close connections between seals and sepulchral monuments, and particular synergies between brasses and seals.

A seal is a concept which is manifest through two principal physical forms: a matrix, a hard object into which a motif and wording is engraved or cast, and an impression made by the matrix into a soft material. The relationship between tombs and seals is explored at length in E.A. New, ‘Episcopal Embodiment: The tombs and seals of bishops in medieval England and Wales’ in The Prelate in Later Medieval England, ed. M. Heale, York Medieval Studies, (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 191-214. K. Nolan, Queens in Stone and Silver: The creation of a visual imagery of queenship in Capetian France (New York, 2009) is an interesting comparative study of seals and tombs, although it suffers from methodological problems and does not investigate the meanings behind the objects in any depth. T. Diederich, Siegelkunde: Beiträge zu ihrer Vertiefung und Weiterführung (Wien, 2012), pp. 178-220, also undertakes a useful comparative study, but does not investigate the connections between the patronage, fabrication and meaning of tombs and seals in any depth. I am grateful to Dr. Peter Lambert for a translation of the pertinent chapter. Paul Binski and T.A. Heslop have also made important observations about the connections between tombs and seals, although principally in relation to specific examples. See P. Binski, Becket’s Crown: Art and Imagination in Gothic England 1170-1300 (New Haven, 2004), esp. pp. 38, 105-6, 110. For a case-study, see J. Sayers, ‘A Once “Proud Prelate”: An Unidentified Episcopal Monument in Ely Cathedral’, JBAA, CLXII (2009), pp. 67–87, at p. 78 and fig. 15.


7 Norris, Craft, p.84.

8 Recent studies in this area include S. Badham, ‘Commemoration in brass and glass of the Blackburn family of York’, Ecclesiology Today, XLIII (2010), pp. 68-82.


10 A notable exception is Claude Blair’s discussion of John Domegode, a London latoner who also engraved seals, in which Blair notes that the engraving of seals is ‘an activity closely analogous to the engraving of monumental brasses’ (C. Blair, ‘An Early Fifteenth Century London Latoner’, MBS Bulletin, 38 (February 1985), p. 129).

11 For example, comparisons between the fleurs-de-lis that occur on the seal and brass of Robert Wyville, J. Boorman, ‘Bishop Wyville’s Brass’, MBS Trans., XVIII, pt. 2 (2010), pp. 97-118, at pp. 100, 103, figs. 6, 7.

England during the first half of the twelfth century, with bishops using seals to validate documents as early as the late eleventh century.\(^{14}\) Acquiring a seal matrix was one of the first acts of a new bishop (the legend identified the specific office – X bishop of Y – so a new matrix was required even when a cleric was translated from one see to another) and would have constituted a significant expense at the start of an episcopate.\(^{15}\)

Goldsmiths are known to have produced seal matrices, both in precious and base metals, while some goldsmiths specialized in making seals (although probably not to the exclusion of other objects).\(^{16}\) Hugh ‘le Seler’ of York, for example, made a silver matrix for Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham, in 1333.\(^{17}\) Matrices of the sort commissioned by bishops were generally engraved by hand but punches and drills were also used for elements of the design, while there is evidence that at least part of some high-quality matrices (perhaps the general shape or a central design) were cast.\(^{18}\) This technical skill is reflected in a number of instances where craftsmen known to have made seals can be associated with producing other objects. Master Hugo of Bury St. Edmunds (fl. 1148-56), artist of the Bury Bible, or his workshop is usually credited with making the second seal of the monastery at Bury, while William of Gloucester, who engraved the second Great Seal of Henry III, also worked on the shrine of Edward the Confessor.\(^{19}\)

Based on a stylistic analysis, Malcolm Norris suggested that goldsmiths may have been involved in the production of brasses.\(^{20}\) While expressing caution about this claim in general, Marian Campbell draws our attention to the brass of Cristine (d. 1470), widow of the London goldsmith Matthew Philip, in St. Martin’s, Herne, Kent, which Norris proposed as the work of a goldsmith.\(^{21}\) Most pertinently for the current discussion, Campbell further notes that, while his involvement in the monumental industry is unsubstantiated, Philip is known to have engraved seals.\(^{22}\) In addition to craftsmen who made seals and a range of other objects, we thus have a direct connection between a known seal-maker and goldsmith and a monumental brass.


\(^{20}\) Norris, Craft, p. 78.

\(^{21}\) Campbell, ‘Gold, Silver and Precious Stones’, p. 150 and n. 218; Norris, Memorials, p. 143, fig. 165.

\(^{22}\) In 1450 Philip was paid £7 13s. 4d. for engraving a new matrix for the earldom of Pembroke (Kingsford, ‘Some English Medieval Seal-Engravers’, p. 175).
That the craftsmen who made seals also worked in other media, including sepulchral monuments, is clear and unsurprising. Paul Binski has noted that cross-media fertilisation in terms of motifs, style and ideas should caution us against drawing too rigid distinctions between any manifestation of the visual and material culture of medieval England.23 Furthermore, there is clear evidence that seals provided the direct model for other objects. A presentation copy of Peter of Eboli’s verse epic in praise of Emperor Henry VI (d. 1197) contains miniatures that appear to have been copied directly from seals.24 In England, William Lenn, (d. 1373), in his will composed while he was bishop of Chichester, requested the execution of images of the resurrected Christ appearing to Mary Magdalene ‘in manner and resemblance just as [they are] engraved in my small seal’ (‘ad modum et similitudinem sicut sculpebantur in meo parvo sigillo’).25 Close similarities have been noted between the episcopal seal of Bishop Jocelin of Wells (d. 1242) and the retrospective tomb of Bishop Giso (d. 1088) which he almost certainly commissioned, while the tomb of Jocelin de Bohun (d. 1187), bishop of Salisbury, so closely resembles his seal that it seems almost inconceivable that it did not provide a model for the monument.26 In relation to brasses, it has been suggested by Nicholas Rogers that the image of the prelate within a castle on the fine monumental brass of Robert Wyville (d. 1375) in Salisbury Cathedral ‘is perhaps derived from a sigillographic motif of the church enshrining its patron saint or founder’, with the imagery on the obverse mid-thirteenth century seal of Norwich Cathedral perhaps providing a direct exemplar for Wyville’s monument.27

This is a good place to return to Hereford, although before considering the case of Trillek it is useful first to look at his saintly predecessor, Thomas Cantilupe (d. 1281). Only the indent and a small fragment are now extant from what was one of the earliest figural brasses to survive from medieval England, as it is known to have been in situ in the cathedral by 1287 (Fig. 2a).28 As a result of its importance in the chronology of English brasses, Cantilupe’s memorial has attracted considerable attention from scholars.29 In several cases, details of Cantilupe’s episcopal seal of dignity are cited as a means of identifying lost features of the brass, including fleurs-de-lis in reference to the family arms and the canting wolf beneath the figure’s feet (Fig. 2b).30 Beyond this, however, parallels between the seal and brass are not considered. Instead, discussion centres around the memorials which may have acted as influences on Cantilupe’s tomb, principally French models.31

23 Binski, Becket’s Crown, p. 111.
26 Binski, Becket’s Crown, pp. 105-6, fig. 93; New, ‘Episcopal Embodiment’, pp. 200-1, figs. 2a and 2b.
28 Heseltine and Stuchfield, Monumental Brasses of Hereford Cathedral, pp. 9-11; Badham and Norris, Early Incised Slabs and Brass, p. 32.
It is usually noted as part of this discussion that the brass formed part of an elaborate shrine-tomb erected under the auspices of Cantilupe’s successor Richard Swinfield (d. 1317). Swinfield travelled extensively with Cantilupe, and as a result he would have been aware of developments in tomb design and have had access to the London workshops.32

It may, however, be suggested that Cantilupe’s seal exerted at least some influence not only on the design of, but also on the thinking behind, Swinfield’s commissioning of his predecessor’s tomb. Seals were used in legal and administrative contexts as a means of authentication. But far from being merely a bureaucratic tool, seals represented, embodied and acted in place of their owners. Through their imagery, episcopal seals identified the owner as a member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and as part of a tradition of spiritual authority stretching back to Patristic times. Indeed, scholars have now started to look closely at seals as well as tombs in discussions of episcopal and diocesan ‘lineage’. Swinfield would have been conscious of the resonance of Cantilupe’s seal as an expression of his spiritual heritage as well as temporal authority. What better model for his tomb? By incorporating features of Cantilupe’s seal (impressions of which would have been available for consultation in the cathedral muniments) such as the fleurs-de-lis and wolf beneath the figure’s feet, his tomb had resonances with this most important means of representation in life. Furthermore, it may also have provided a visual connection between Cantilupe the man, part of the Church Militant, and Thomas the saint, an intercessory member of the Church Triumphant.

Born c. 1308, John Trillek is described in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* as being from an ‘armigerous though obscure’ family from Tryleg in Monmouthshire. John and his younger brother Thomas received assistance in their early careers from their uncle, Adam Orleton (d. 1345), for whom John acted as executor. John Trillek studied at Oxford and Paris, travelled to Beaumes-de-Venise on behalf of his uncle in 1328, and held a number of benefices in the dioceses of Hereford and Worcester between 1322 and his election as bishop of Hereford in 1344. The first year of Trillek’s episcopate was spent largely in the diocese of Winchester, looking after the dying Orleton and then becoming embroiled in a complex and fractious probate settlement. From late 1345 onwards Trillek proved to be an exemplary pastoral bishop: rarely away from his diocese, undertaking regular visitations and enforcing high clerical standards, leading his flock through the trials of the Great Pestilence, and officiating in the presence of the king at the translation of his predecessor St. Thomas Cantilupe to his new shrine in the Lady Chapel on 23 October 1349. While clearly involved in promoting his diocese’s new saint, Bishop Trillek is also thought to have encouraged a renewed devotion to St. Ethelbert, Hereford’s Anglo-Saxon patron, and it was probably Trillek himself who commissioned new fittings in the choir of the cathedral, including the impressive bishops’ throne.

---

34 These ideas are explored in some detail in New, ‘Episcopal Embodiment’.
36 Impressions of Cantilupe’s seal of dignity survive in Hereford Cathedral Archives, for example HCA 3158.
37 D.N. Lepine, ‘Trillek, John (c.1308–1360)’, *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/95146, accessed 1 February 2013]. Since he was thirty-six years old when elevated to the episcopate, his date of birth is reasonably secure.
38 Ibid.
All this makes Trillek an obvious patron for an effigial brass. He was a well-educated member of the higher clergy, had travelled quite extensively as a younger man and would therefore have been exposed to a variety of funerary monuments, and had already demonstrated his capacity for artistic patronage within his own cathedral. Furthermore, a monumental brass, flush with the floor, enabled him to be buried in the centre of the choir that he had helped embellish, connected him through the medium employed with St. Thomas Cantilupe whose translation he had overseen, and would have been suitably humble for a man who put pastoral care above political ambition. Except that we have a problem: there is absolutely no evidence that John Trillek commissioned the memorial himself, and there are strong reasons to suggest that it was commissioned and executed after his death.

From early 1358, Trillek’s register reveals a man in decline, rarely leaving his episcopal residences, and either later that year or early in 1359 Thomas Trillek, who had been dean of Hereford Cathedral since 1355, was appointed coadjutor of his brother. The reason for this unusual step was because of John Trillek’s illness, which was affecting his mind as well as his body, and which meant that he was therefore considered incapable of carrying out his duties as bishop. During 1359-60 there ensued a scandalous power-struggle between Thomas Trillek and Henry Shipton, archdeacon of Shropshire. In 1359 the latter removed the infirm bishop to the remote episcopal residence of Bishop’s Castle in the archdeaconry of Shropshire, outside the dean’s area of authority. Although Joseph Parry, the editor of Trillek’s register, asserted that Shipton ‘ruled the diocese’ in the bishop’s name, it was Thomas Trillek who was summoned by Simon Islip (d.1366), archbishop of Canterbury, for wasting episcopal assets. When John briefly recovered his faculties in early 1360 he appears to have blamed his brother for the mismanagement, but despite this Thomas Trillek remained coadjutor until John’s death on 30 November that year.

This unhappy end to an otherwise exemplary episcopate does however suggest who might have commissioned John Trillek’s memorial, why this was done, and what role Trillek’s seal may have played. As a result of his mental incapacity, John Trillek died intestate, and it was left to his brother Thomas to sort out his affairs. It is highly probable, therefore, that Thomas commissioned the tomb of his brother, perhaps guilt over his actions in 1359 going some way towards prompting the acquisition of so magnificent a monument. He would certainly have had ample opportunity to commission the brass in person, since he left Hereford for London soon after John’s funeral and was elected dean of St. Paul’s in late 1361.

43 The popularity of brasses as a means of commemoration for the higher clergy has been discussed by a number of scholars. See for example Saul, English Church Monuments, pp. 181-3.
44 Rogers, ‘English Episcopal Monuments’, p. 20, notes that early incised slabs and brasses could convey humility.
45 S. Badham, ‘Monumental Brasses and the Black Death – A Reappraisal’, Antiquaries Jnl, LXXX (2000), 207-247, p. 226, suggests that Trillek’s brass should be dated ‘closer to the middle than to the beginning’ of the 1360s.
48 Registrum Johannis de Trillek, p. x; Lepine, ‘Trillek, Thomas’, ODNB.
49 Lepine, ‘Trillek, John’, ODNB.
50 Lepine, ‘Trillek, Thomas’, ODNB.
or early 1362, putting him literally on the doorstep of the London workshops. Many of the early products of the London B workshop have similarities to the later Series A brasses, yet there was also a degree of individuality, and certainly not the ‘slavish conformity to patterns’ that was to be a feature of the workshop in later years. And, as William Lenn’s 1363 request demonstrates, seals were used as the model for other visual media. It therefore is not much of an imaginative leap to suggest that Thomas Trillek used his brother’s episcopal seal as a pattern for the craftsmen to follow when commissioning the tomb.

There are two further points that support this proposition. The first is that, as John Trillek’s coadjutor, Thomas would have had access to and probably custody of his brother’s episcopal seal matrix. Since he was blamed by both Bishop John and Archbishop Islip for wasting episcopal revenues, there must have been at least some evidence of financial mismanagement in the form of sealed documents. Such a misuse of a bishop’s seal matrix when he was incapacitated was not unknown, and was one of the reasons why the matrix was usually broken as soon as a bishop died or was translated. Thomas would therefore have been very familiar with his brother’s episcopal seal of dignity, and would have had ample opportunity to take an impression from it for reference. As the administrator of his late brother’s estate, he would also have had access to documents that bore an impression of the seal, which may have been a model for the design of the brass.

A close comparison of John Trillek’s seal and brass also suggests that the former provided a model for the latter. While the brass is clearly not a direct copy of the seal motif, the images bear a striking resemblance to one another (Figs. 1 and 3). The mitra pretiosa, very high amice, foliate motif within the loop of the pastoral staff, heavy folds of excess material at the foot of the alb, and the delicate quatrefoils on the pediment are all very similar (Figs. 4a, 4b, 5a, 5b). Both the seal and the brass also display two shields (replacements on the memorial), although in different positions in relation to the figure.

51 Ibid.; Norris, Craft, p. 81; Badham, ‘Monumental Brasses and the Black Death – A Reappraisal’, esp. p. 231. Badham notes that Henry Lakenham, who was strongly associated with the London B series in the 1370s, was a parishioner of St. Faith. The figure of a priest (probably Roger de Inkpen) in Stoke-in-Teignhead, Devon, also produced by the London B workshop, may be of the same date but is much smaller in scale; Badham, ‘Monumental Brasses and the Black Death’, pp. 224, 241, and N. Saul, ‘New Light on the brass at Stoke-in-Teignhead, Devon’, MBS Bulletin, 117 (2011), pp. 334-6. There are some similarities between the Inkpen and Trillek figures, (some of the folding in the centre of the chasuble being almost mirror-images from one to the other) but the differences between the figures (the Trillek figure’s much plainer face, the complex folding of long vestments at the Trillek figure’s feet – so similar to the image on the seal – compared to the plain, straight folds of the ankle-length surplice in the case of the Inkpen figure) are far greater.


53 As Richard Blund (d. 1257), bishop of Exeter, lay dying, several members of his household were busy fabricating documents in his name and authenticating them with his episcopal seal (P. Hoskin, ‘Authors of bureaucracy: developing and creating administrative systems in English Episcopal Chanceries in the second half of the thirteenth century’, in Patrons and Professionals, ed. Binski and New, pp. 61-78, at p. 66). John Trillek himself knew the dangers of seal matrices falling into the wrong hands, being forced to recover the matrix of the Official of Hereford from Thomas Charlton’s executors (Registrum Johannis de Trillek, p. 3).

54 The quatrefoils on the pediment are seen in other, later, Series B brasses such as that of Nicholas of Louth (de Luda) in Cottingham, Yorks. (Monumental Brasses: The Portfolio Plates of the Monumental Brass Society 1894-1984, ed. M.W. Norris (Woodbridge, 1988), pl. 62).
The shields lead to an exploration of why Thomas Trillek may have used his brother’s seal as a model for the monument. The Trillek arms were Bendy of six, on a chief three fleurs de lis, and appear on a tile in Bredon parish church, Worcestershire, where John Trillek was rector. It therefore is somewhat surprising to find that different versions of the arms were employed on both Trillek’s episcopal seal of dignity and on his brass. On Trillek’s episcopal seal, while both shields bear these arms, the dexter shield has a bordure (Fig. 3). It has been suggested that the bordure was sometimes adopted by leading ecclesiastics in the fourteenth century as a mark of difference upon elevation to the episcopate, such as the bordure wavy adopted by William Bateman (d. 1355) when he became bishop of Norwich, and Trillek may have employed it to emphasize his episcopal dignity. Perhaps even more intriguingly, not only did the dexter shield on the brass not display the bordure, but the charge in chief was changed to three leopards’ faces jessant de lis, the Cantilupe arms. Why was the bordure not included in the arms on Trillek’s memorial, and the family fleurs de lis replaced by the Cantilupe leopards’ faces jessant de lis? One explanation is a breakdown in communication between patron and craftsman, and in the case of the bordure that it was mistakenly not specified.


56 HCA 3158. The bordure clearly has charges, although they are, alas, illegible.


58 Both shields currently on the memorial are modern replacements, but a 19th-century pre-restoration rubbing by a member of the Cambridge University Association of Brass Collectors shows the original dexter shield with this charge; see Heseltine and Stuchfield, Monumental Brassee of Hereford Cathedral, p. 11, where Heseltine and Stuchfield assume that the modern shields with three fleurs-de-lis are a mistake.

If, as seems likely for such a prestigious commission, the omission of the bordure and replacement of the plain fleurs de lis with the Cantilupe variation was instead a deliberate decision, it not only points towards Thomas Trillek as the man behind the brass, but suggests further layers of meaning behind his patronage. Thomas left Hereford under something of a cloud, but his election as dean of St Paul’s indicates that he was a man on the way up in ecclesiastical circles. Thomas’s commissioning of such a magnificent memorial for his brother would therefore have been a suitable statement of contrition for his suspect behaviour as dean, perhaps a sign to the ecclesiastical hierarchy that he had changed his ways. More significantly in some ways, by emphasizing his fraternal link with John through this monument

60 Lepine, ‘Trillek, Thomas’, *ODNB*. 
Thomas may well have been co-opting his brother’s ecclesiastical status, connecting himself with a bishop of Hereford and through him to the episcopal lineage of the see. The use of Bishop John’s seal, which embodied his place in that lineage, as a model for the brass would have made this link even stronger. The choice of a brass to commemorate John Trillek, rather than following the example of the stone tombs of Bishops Richard Swinfield (d. 1317) and Thomas Charlton (d. 1344), can in this context be read as a deliberate reference back to that most prestigious of all Hereford’s previous prelates, St. Thomas Cantilupe. This would also explain why the Trillek family arms were adapted with the inclusion in chief of the Cantilupe arms. While the omission of the bordure from the arms may seem perplexing if Thomas wished to highlight his brother’s episcopal status, this may have served to reinforce the familial connection.

It is certainly the case that Thomas Trillek’s star continued to rise. He was provided to the see of Chichester in November 1363 but William Lenn, the incumbent, refused translation to London. Thomas’s provision to Rochester in 1364 was successful and he was consecrated by the pope at Avignon in March of that year.61 His conduct as bishop, if not exemplary, was at least appropriate for a member of the episcopate, and he made significant contributions for the provision of education and theological learning.62 Thomas died in office in 1372 and requested burial in Rochester Cathedral, where he was commemorated by a monumental brass.63 The brass itself has been lost, but the indent usually identified as

---

61 Ibid.
62 Lepine, ‘Trillek, Thomas’, ODNB.
Thomas’s memorial has been described as ‘very similar’ to John Trillek's extant monument (Fig. 6). It is tempting to speculate whether Thomas commissioned his own memorial at the same time as that for his brother, or was at least influenced by the design of the brass in Hereford Cathedral. That we cannot do more than raise these possibilities is a stark reminder of the great numbers of monumental brasses that have been lost since the Middle Ages.

Seal matrices and brasses used similar materials, techniques and motifs. The same craftsmen worked in both media. As a case-study, it has been demonstrated that John Trillek’s seal of dignity may very well have served as a model for his magnificent monumental brass in Hereford Cathedral. What is certainly clear is that it is time for scholars to integrate seals into the study and contextualization of monumental brasses, and for sigillographers to pay closer attention to funerary memorials. By doing so, we will undoubtedly gain clearer impressions of both media, and be in a better position to reflect more fully on the meanings behind them.
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‘Pause and pray with mournful heart’: Late Medieval Clerical Monuments in Lincoln Cathedral

David Lepine

Although there are virtually no surviving medieval brasses in Lincoln Cathedral, the drawings made by William Sedgwick in 1641 and the wealth of surviving indents, together with monuments in other media, enable an assessment of the range of commemoration of late medieval clergy. The mode of commemoration was largely determined by ecclesiastical rank. An analysis of the inscriptions and iconography of these tombs identifies manifestations of corporate identity as well as the more usual intercessory statements.

Until their destruction in 1644 there were over 200 monumental brasses in Lincoln Cathedral. Visiting in 1718 Browne Willis ‘counted about two hundred and seven gravestones that had been stripped of their brass’.1 John Evelyn, writing in 1654, recorded their destruction a decade earlier by the parliamentary troops who ‘shut themselves in, till they had rent & torne of some barges full of Mettal; not sparing the monuments of the dead, so hellish an avarice possess’d them’.2 Only two small heraldic fragments on Bishop Russell’s tomb survive. What is left is a large, splendid but hopelessly jumbled collection of indents, impressively but entirely anachronistically relaid in the choir aisles during the 1780s. The cathedral’s raised tombs are in better condition, largely in situ and with less damage. Fortunately Lincoln’s monuments have been exceptionally well documented, first by Robert Sanderson c. 1641 and William Dugdale and William Sedgwick in 1641 before their wholesale destruction, then by Browne Willis in 1730.3 The first modern scholarly record of the brasses was published by H.K. Sanderson in 1897-8 and of the incised slabs by F.A. Greenhill in 1986.4 More recently Liv Gibbs catalogued the surviving ledger slabs and monuments in 2001.5 However full these accounts are, they are not a complete survey. The 1897-8 survey lists seven brasses not recorded by Robert Sanderson and documentary evidence confirms that monuments had been lost before his time.6 Indeed, as Sedgwick’s drawings illustrate, the gradual process of decay had begun before the 1640s.

The Geography and Topography of Burial

The geography and topography of burial are essential starting points for any consideration of late medieval commemoration. The geography of burial can be summarized in a simple question, ‘Where were the cathedral clergy buried?’ In the cathedral as we might expect? This was certainly generally the case for the episcopate and the minor clergy. Almost all the medieval bishops of Lincoln from the Conquest to the Reformation were buried there. The few exceptions are mostly those translated to another see: Walter of Coutances (1183-4)

3 R. Sanderson, *Lincoln Cathedral: an Exact Copy of all the Ancient Monumental Inscriptions c. 1641* (London, 1851); BL Add. MS 71474 (Dugdale’s Book of Monuments), ff. 92-113.
6 Some wills refer to tombs not listed by Robert Sanderson, for example Dean John Constable (d. 1528) wished to be buried near a predecessor George Fitzhugh (d. 1505) (*North Country Wills*, ed. J.W. Clay, 2 vols., Surtees Soc., 116, 121 (Durham, 1908), II pp. 123-4).
was buried at Rouen, Thomas Rotherham (1472-80) at York and Thomas Wolsey (1514) at Leicester Abbey; John Buckingham (1363-99) resigned and was buried at Canterbury and the burial place of Marmaduke Lumley (1450) is unknown. The minor clergy were also usually buried at Lincoln either in the cathedral or its cemetery. The geography of burial for canons and dignitaries, however, is much more varied. As pluralists they had plenty of choice: most held prebends in other cathedrals and collegiate churches and more than one rectory. The pattern is complicated by the problem of space even in a cathedral as large as Lincoln. Lincoln was the largest secular chapter in England with fifty-eight prebends, five dignities and eight archdeacons. Even allowing for relatively high levels of pluralism, by the fifteenth century there was not enough space for all canons to be buried in the cathedral. With relatively few exceptions it was only resident canons who were buried within its walls. This was a clear expression of identity as a member of the chapter as well as a statement of loyalty and commitment to the church which gave them status and wealth. Burial was often accompanied by benefactions and extensive \textit{post mortem} provisions for their souls. Non-residents, the great majority of the chapter, many of whom had only a nominal connection with the cathedral and were at best infrequent visitors, were rarely buried in the cathedral. Instead they chose burial in a parish church, usually one they held, another cathedral, a collegiate church or a monastic house. For others their place of burial was unimportant. They left instructions to be buried ‘where God pleases’ or at the discretion of their executors.

The topography of burial can also be summarized by another question. Where precisely in the cathedral were its clergy buried? Burial in the cathedral was closely regulated by the chapter and largely confined to its senior clergy. Permission was required and a fee had to be paid; in the mid fifteenth century the standard fee was 20s.9 There was a rough hierarchy of burial place for their clergy in most English secular cathedrals. The high altar and the presbytery were generally reserved for bishops. Though many chose other locations, non-episcopal clerical burials in the choir are extremely rare. Canons and dignities were confined to the many side chapels and the nave. They also favoured the choir aisles, which were both close to the chancel and on an important route to the Lady Chapel which had its own sophisticated liturgy; the heavy liturgical footfall provided many opportunities for intercessory prayers. However, the increased wear and tear wore away inscriptions and thereby shortened the ‘life-span’ of the monument. Cemetery burial for canons was highly unusual but the norm for many of the minor clergy. By the fifteenth century, however, increasing numbers of vicars and chantry priests, especially the more senior and wealthy, were buried inside their cathedrals.

8 Lincolnshire Archives Office [hereafter LAO] D&C A/2/35 ff. 35, 47v-48, 84, 96, 106.
Lincoln broadly follows this topographical pattern for members of the chapter and its minor clergy but not the episcopate. Unlike at Salisbury, Exeter and Chichester, the presbytery at Lincoln was not used for episcopal burials. Only Remigius (1067-92), the cathedral’s founder, was buried there. This was not his personal choice but a posthumous decision by the chapter and did not set a trend. A new tomb and adjoining Easter sepulchre were built on the north side of the presbytery c. 1300 after the completion of the Angel choir and retrochoir.10 This was probably part of a larger and long running campaign to promote the cathedral’s episcopal cults. As well as the construction of a new shrine of St. Hugh behind the high altar completed in 1280 and its ongoing embellishment in subsequent decades, this included a renewed effort to secure sainthood for Bishop Grosseteste in 1308 and the campaign for Bishop Dalderby’s canonization in the later 1320s.11 St. Hugh’s new shrine became a popular burial location. It was chosen by three bishops, Oliver Sutton (d. 1299), Henry Burghersh (d. 1340) and John Chedworth (d. 1471), and at some point after 1280 the monument to Hugh of Wells (d. 1235) was moved east from its original position in the north choir aisle to the retrochoir.12 Two ‘holy’ bishops were buried where there was more space around which a cult might develop: Robert Grosseteste (1235-53) in the south cross aisle and John Dalderby (1300-20) in the south transept. Grosseteste attracted Richard Gravesend (1258-79) and Philip Repingdon (1405-19) who were also buried in the south cross aisle.

Thomas Bek (1341-7) was buried in the upper north transept.13 Hollar’s plan shows this was also the location of the tombs of four of Remigius’s successors: Robert Bloet (1094-1123), Alexander (1123-48), Robert Chesney (1148-66) and Walter of Coutances (1183-4). Robert Sanderson does not mention the tombs but does describe a wall painting commemorating them ‘over’ the tomb of Lucy Wray (d. 1600), wife of Sir William Wray.14 The Baroque reworking of this by the Venetian artist Damini in 1727 or 1728 still dominates the transept. Surviving traces of the medieval painting and Damini’s use of its original tracery suggest it can be dated to c. 1300, roughly the date of Remigius’s tomb.15 The tombs were probably moved to this location soon after the rebuilding of the east end as part of a celebration of the line of episcopal succession. Similar schemes can be found in wall paintings in the choir at Ely and the series of retrospective monuments at Hereford and Wells.16 However, the fourth bishop was probably Geoffrey (c. 1175-82) rather than Walter of Coutances who held the see for barely a year before his translation to Rouen where he was buried. In 1363 Bishop Gynwell began the trend of nave burials;

13 Ibid.
14 Sanderson, Lincoln Cathedral, p. 15.
three subsequent bishops were buried at its west end, Alnwick (1436-49), Smith (1496-1514) and Attwater (1514-21). Bishop Alnwick’s choice of the west end of the nave was in part determined by his episcopal status as he stipulated the place ‘where the bishop makes his station during processions’. Bishops Fleming (1420-31), Russell (1480-94) and Longland (1521-47) were more ambitious and built their own chantry chapels at the east end.

For canons sacred space, proximity to altars, images and shrines, also played a part in their choice of burial place. Choice of burial place might also be an expression of devotion to a particular saint. In 1533 Nicholas Bradbridge requested burial in the chapel of his namesake, St. Nicholas. In addition, personal and social reasons, many of them now hidden, feature strongly as do expressions of fellowship and chapter identity. In 1338 Adam Limbergh asked to be buried ‘amongst my brethren the canons’. This may be a reference to the nave which from the fourteenth century and probably earlier was the principal burial place of canons; Robert Sanderson recorded forty-five canons buried there. The choir aisles did not become popular until somewhat later, the south aisle from the 1430s and the north from the 1480s. For some, ties of patronage were the determining factor: in 1394 Henry Brauncewell wished to be buried next to ‘his master’ Richard Ravenser. For others it was family ties: Geoffrey Scrope (d. 1383) wished to be buried next to his sister under the central tower and William Waltham (d. 1416) next to his uncle and benefactor, John Ravenser (d. 1393).

Until the fifteenth century most minor clergy were probably buried in the cathedral cemetery, a pattern confirmed by archaeological evidence from Wells; only a handful of fourteenth-century intra-mural minor clergy burials are known. During the fifteenth century, however, increasing numbers of those with means wished to be buried inside the cathedral and from the 1460s onwards the majority of surviving wills request burial in the cathedral rather than its cemetery. Sanderson and Browne Willis recorded sixteen minor clergy brasses and Gibbs nineteen incised slabs. Many wished to be buried close to the altar at which they had served. Both Oliver Horne (d. 1515) and John Castle (d. 1517), priests of the Works Chantry, wished to be buried in St. Anne’s chapel, the location of the chantry. As with canons there was insufficient space inside the cathedral for all the minor clergy. Indeed the reuse of some slabs may suggest multiple burials in a grave. In 1517 John Castle reused the slab of a fellow chaplain of the Works Chantry, Richard Copeland, who had died in 1456.

As reminders of the dead, whatever their location the visibility of monuments was crucial. Without being seen their primary function to elicit the prayers of the living to ease the passage of the deceased through Purgatory could not be fulfilled. Dean Sheppey (d. 1412) went to considerable trouble to attract passers-by to his tomb and make them linger long enough to offer up a prayer for his soul. Not only did he give three devotional images, of the Three Kings, the Virgin Mary and St. John the Baptist, to be placed near his tomb but he also gave a glossed copy of the Gospels to be chained near his burial place to attract pious worshippers.

Type, Design and Style of Monuments

As well as having a hierarchy of burial location, English secular cathedrals also had a hierarchy of clerical funerary monuments: raised tombs for the episcopate, flat slabs, often with brasses, for canons and dignities and incised slabs for senior minor clergy. Of course there were exceptions. Opulent brasses were popular with bishops, but very few canons had raised tombs and none commemorating minor clergy have been identified so far. This was the prevailing tradition and the standard pattern at secular cathedrals until the Reformation. Flat slabs, which left plenty of scope for display, were an effective practical solution to the conflicting demands of liturgy and commemoration, both of which were important functions of cathedrals. As early as 1200 St. Hugh established a tradition for modest and practical commemoration at Lincoln, requesting that his tomb should be set near a wall so that it did not ‘take up too much of the pavement and obstruct or injure those who pass by’. In this spirit William Waltham (d. 1416), a non-resident canon, wanted no stone above his body but the ‘pavimentum’ inscribed with his epitaph and Canon John Beverley (d. 1473) asked for a ‘lapide marmoreo honesto non sumpluoso’.

Episcopal tombs were intended to proclaim the dignity and importance of the office, the bishop as pastor and defender of his see, as well as to commemorate a high-ranking individual. They were, therefore, visually impressive and portrayed the bishop in an idealized way with the insignia of his office, mitre and crozier, and often a hand raised in the act of blessing. At Lincoln, unlike their counterparts elsewhere, and perhaps in the spirit of St. Hugh, few bishops after 1250 chose to be commemorated with raised tombs. Between 1253 and 1547 only four of the sixteen buried in the cathedral had raised tombs. Two of the exceptions, Robert Grosseteste and John Dalderby, were commemorated with shrine-like monuments in recognition of their reputations for sanctity. Grosseteste’s tomb had deep niches to enable pilgrims to get closer to the body on top of which was a continental-style cast bronze effigy. No description of Dalderby’s monument has survived because, as Leland laconically put it, in ‘nomine superstitionis’ it was destroyed in June 1540. A memorandum records that 4285 ounces of silver was taken from the cathedral, much of it from ‘St John Dalderby his Shrine’ which was of ‘pure silver’.

32 Saul, English Church Monuments, pp. 176-7.
34 The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543, ed. L.T. Smith, 5 vols., (London, 1910), V, p. 122.
Fig. 1. Sedgwick’s drawing of Bishop Fleming’s tomb (BL Add. MS 71474, f. 97) (© British Library Board)
Bishop Burghersh’s tomb is part of a major remodelling of the chapel of St. Katherine to create a family mausoleum and chantry and a new shrine of the head of St. Hugh.36 Begun in the 1330s (Burghersh founded his chantry in 1332), it included the tombs of Bishop Henry (d. 1340), his brother Bartholomew (d. 1355) and their father Robert (d. 1306) as well as the shrine to St. Hugh. Bishop Henry’s tomb, which abuts the shrine of St. Hugh’s head, comprised a chest, an effigy and a canopy which has since been lost. Its elaborate heraldic scheme can be dated to between 1341 and 1345, which suggests that the tomb was completed after the bishop’s death by his brother. Close by, between the buttresses of the second bay from the east, is Bishop Fleming’s monument, the first purpose-built chantry chapel in the cathedral, which is usually dated to c. 1431. As Sedgwick’s drawing shows (Fig. 1), it is a much more complex monument than first appears and has been substantially remodeled; the four tabernacled canopies are not original. One of the earliest ‘double-decker’ transi tombs in England, the cadaver, an emaciated, skeletal figure in a shroud, was originally surmounted by a plain slab behind which was the bishop’s effigy in a recess decorated with the bishop’s arms.37

The chantry chapels of Bishops Russell and Longland flank the Last Judgement porch on the south side of the cathedral. Dating from c. 1494, when it was described as recently built, Russell’s has a tripartite design, a tomb chest below a low arch between the doorway which is balanced by a sham doorway.38 On top of the tomb chest was a brass of an episcopal figure with four shields, one at each corner. The north and south sides each have three quatrefoils which contained enamelled brass escutcheons, the central one surmounted by a mitre; two of these survive (Fig. 2). On the east wall of the arch was a brass plate containing Russell’s epitaph. Longland’s chantry was designed as a companion to Russell’s and also has a tripartite design. Probably built in his lifetime, since Longland gained permission from the chapter to construct it in 1528, its elaborate tracery has ogee reticulation and Renaissance details.39 Sedgwick’s drawing shows that like Russell’s tomb there was a brass plate on the east wall of the arch but no record of the inscription survives. Across the pediment there is a painted

38 TNA: PRO, PROB 11/10/334.
Fig. 3. Sedgwick’s drawing of Bishop Gynwell’s brass (BL Add. MS 71474, f. 93v)
(© British Library Board)
punning inscription adapted from Job xi.9: ‘Longa terra mensura eius Dominus dedit’ (‘Long land, God gave to him according to his measure’).\textsuperscript{40}

Most of Lincoln’s bishops favoured monumental brasses, though usually considerably grander and more elaborately decorated than those of canons. Among the earliest episcopal brasses at Lincoln is a group of three dating from the later thirteenth century, those of bishops Gravesend and Sutton and allegedly Lexington (1254–8). However, there is some uncertainty over their identification. Sedgwick illustrates three brasses located in the south-east transept, two rectangular plates with inscriptions commemorating bishops Gravesend and Repingdon (d. 1424) and between them a lost episcopal figure brass. The most readily identified of these early episcopal brasses is the plain rectangular plate on a large marble commemorating Richard, bishop of Lincoln, presumably Richard Gravesend (d. 1279), an unusually modest monument in its lack of adornment. The lost figure brass has sometimes been associated with this. Browne Willis describes ‘a very large Marble, whereon hath been the Portraiture of a Bishop, viz Bishop Gravesend mitred in Brass, at the Head whereof is engraven in large Characters an inscription’ whereas Sanderson describes Gravesend’s monument as ‘a large marble’ with an inscription ‘in Saxon characters’.\textsuperscript{41} As the figure has a substantial foot inscription a separate inscription on another marble seems unlikely. Browne Willis, following Hollar’s 1672 plan for Dugdale’s Monasticon Anglicanum, attributed the figure brass to Henry Lexington.\textsuperscript{42} The mistake seems to have been Hollar’s. He attributes Repingdon’s tomb to Lexington but dates it to Repingdon’s time, May 1420. Furthermore, Nicholas Rogers has dated the brass to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{43} It seems unlikely that a century or more after his death a new monument would be made for Lexington, an otherwise undistinguished, short-lived bishop. There is no obvious late-fourteenth or early-fifteenth-century bishop who this might commemorate. Bishops Buckingham (1363–98) and Beaufort (1398–1404) were buried at Canterbury and Winchester cathedrals respectively. Perhaps it commemorates Bishop Gray (d. 1436), though he wished to be buried in the upper lady chapel.\textsuperscript{44} The third late-thirteenth-century brass, an indent of a full length episcopal figure with mitre and crozier beneath a single canopy, now in the south choir aisle, has been convincingly attributed to Bishop Sutton (d. 1299).\textsuperscript{45}

Bishop Gynwell (d. 1362) is commemorated by a relatively plain episcopal brass: a full length mitred figure with crozier under a single canopy with two pinnacles, a border inscription and four quatrefoils, one at each corner (Fig. 3). Its design is considerably less elaborate than that of his contemporary Bishop Trillek (d. 1360) at Hereford. Bishop Repingdon’s simple rectangular plate is a reflection of his austerity and was intended to be a humble monument as the first line of the inscription makes clear, ‘marmoris in tumba, simplex sine


\textsuperscript{41} Willis, Survey of Cathedrals, p. 16; Sanderson, Lincoln Cathedral, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{42} Willis, Survey of Cathedrals, p. 8; Hollar, ‘Plan of Lincoln Cathedral, 1672’.


Fig. 4. Sedgwick’s drawing of Bishop Alnwick’s brass (BL Add. MS 71474, f. 93r)  
(© British Library Board)
felle columba’ (‘a simple marble tomb without niches or canopies’). An Augustinian canon and formerly abbot of Leicester, who had been attracted to Wyclif’s ideas early in his career, Repingdon was an energetic diocesan who shunned royal service and resigned his see five years before his death in 1424. Although he requested a simple burial, naked in a sack in the cemetery of St. Margaret’s church in the Close, his executors, who included two resident canons, ignored his instructions and buried him in the south cross aisle close to the saintly Bishop Grosseteste. Its design was perhaps intended to match Bishop Gravesend’s nearby, another plain rectangular brass plate.

The brass of Bishop Alnwick (d. 1449) is a more elaborate version of Gynwell’s with a triple canopy and four pinnacles (Fig. 4). In addition, there is a foot inscription and abundant heraldic display, two shields flank the figure and there are shields at each corner of the border inscription. The florid extravagance of John Chedworth’s brass, in the north aisle of the Angel choir, is sui generis: an episcopal figure with two shields at his head and two at his feet where there is a foot inscription, and its most striking feature multiple scrolls (Fig. 5). There are twenty-four, twenty-two of which are horizontal folded scrolls, arranged in three sets of four at the top, middle and bottom and five sets of pairs, one each side of the figure. The scrolls perhaps had the same invocation or prayer. In addition there is a longer vertical scroll each side of the bishop’s head. The brasses of bishops Smith (d. 1514) (Fig. 6) and Atwater (d. 1521) are closely related in style as well as being adjacent to each other. Both are portrayed in full episcopal vestments beneath triple canopies with columns containing six canoped niches with saints on each side, probably the twelve apostles, and border and foot inscriptions. The principal distinction between them is their display of heraldry. Smith’s had four shields at the corners of the border inscription whereas Atwater had a shield above each shoulder. Nothing remains of the tombs of either Bishop Bek or Bishop Gray nor are there any antiquarian descriptions.

The handful of raised tombs for canons in secular cathedrals are generally exceptions to the prevailing pattern. There are three at Lincoln: those of John Mackworth (d. 1452), Nicholas Wymbush (d. 1461), and William Skelton (d. 1501). Mackworth and Skelton had freestanding altar tombs in the second bay of the nave which are now lost; Mackworth’s had a fine brass. Wymbush’s survives in St. Nicholas’s chapel. Quite why they chose and were allowed by the chapter to have raised tombs is difficult to explain. Was it simply a matter of personal choice? Wymbush’s monument is far grander than that of any other canon and some bishops and has several unusual features. He is the only canon with an effigy which, curiously for a cleric, is clothed in a mantle rather than ecclesiastical vestments and has its head resting on a Saracen-headed helmet. The effigy rests on an existing mid-fourteenth-century tomb chest with a double canopy next to Sir Nicholas Cantelupe’s monument. Despite this there can be little doubt about the attribution. Leland, writing between 1540 and 1543, identifies it as Wymbush’s monument and this is confirmed by its heraldry. However, the tomb was probably the work of his executors. In his will Wymbush simply asked to be buried where God pleases, which suggests that he had

46 Sanderson, Lincoln Cathedral, p. 10.
48 Itinerary of John Leland, V, p. 122. It contains the Wymbush arms (Sanguine a lion rampant argent) and those of Darcy (Argent three sexfoils pierced gules); his mother was the heiress of the Darcys.
Fig. 5. Sedgwick’s drawing of Bishop Chedworth’s brass (BL Add. MS 71474, f. 96v)
(© British Library Board)
Fig. 6. Sedgwick’s drawing of Bishop Smith’s brass (BL Add. MS 7474, f. 92v)  
(© British Library Board)
Late Medieval Clerical Monuments in Lincoln Cathedral

not planned an elaborate monument.\textsuperscript{49} The Wymbushes were a prominent Lincolnshire gentry family from Nocton with close connections to the cathedral chapter and Nicholas was a leading chancery clerk and a residentiary canon.\textsuperscript{50}

William Skelton appears to have been a worthy and long-standing residentiary with a strong commitment to the cathedral; he held a succession of senior administrative offices and was a generous benefactor.\textsuperscript{51} However, he was far from unique among residentiaries. A fragment of the side of a late fifteenth-century tomb-chest now in the south-east transept may be part of his monument. Dean Mackworth’s privileged commemoration is harder still to explain given his poisonous relations with others (Fig. 7). Described by Thomas Gascoigne as a ‘decanus superbus’ who wished to be treated like a bishop, Mackworth was in almost continuous dispute with the chapter and three successive bishops for thirty years, a dispute only ended by his death

\textsuperscript{49} LAO D&C A/2/35, ff. 87v-88v.
\textsuperscript{51} A.B. Emden, \textit{A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500} (Cambridge, 1963), p. 530; LAO D&C Bj/3/1-2; A/3/1, f. 13v passim; A/3/2, ff. 12v-15.
in 1451. The chapter may have welcomed both a new altar and the establishment of a new and popular cult of St. George, to whom the chapel was dedicated. However, it is doubtful whether the chantry was ever operational, though the altar was certainly used.

The overwhelming majority of Lincoln canons were commemorated with floor slabs, either a simple stone or, increasingly from the late thirteenth century, a brass. Even so, canons were expected to have monuments commensurate with their status. The size and material of the surviving indents proclaim the status of canons as boldly as the now lost brasses. Even the smaller ones are what might be called life-sized, 2135 x 915 mm, and the largest 3050 x 1220 mm. The slabs were made of expensive stone, either Purbeck limestone or Flemish marble, rather than cheaper local varieties. The simplest had no more than a rectangular brass plate containing an inscription. These plates ranged in size from 76 x 737 mm to 197 x 660 mm. Sanderson records more than twenty such monuments.

The earliest datable surviving brasses of canons are those of Dean William Lexington (d. 1272) and Simon Barton (d. 1280), archdeacon of Stow, now in the chapels of St. Michael and St. Andrew respectively. They are two of an important group of five late thirteenth-century Purbeck marble slabs with Lombardic inscriptions in Latin, made locally by a Lincoln workshop. Sanderson recorded the inscription on Lexington’s monument but not Barton’s. However, he also recorded two others of this date, those of Anthony Sausthorpe, archdeacon of Stow c. 1280-6, and William of Southwell, canon c. 1250-70/1. In all three cases Sanderson noted that the inscription was in ‘Saxon’ letters or characters, a reference to their Lombardic script.

The early fourteenth-century clerical monuments have left almost no trace; two are known from descriptions but no traces survive. The ‘Mastre Roberte de Revestingworth’ listed by Sanderson and Browne Willis is probably a misreading of Robert de Kyvelingworth (d. 1317), prebendary of Liddington, who is known to have been buried in the cathedral nave. Perhaps the more elaborate design comprising a life-size full length figure with a variety of embellishments: border and foot inscriptions, canopies, scrolls, shafts, shields, quatrefoils and in some cases religious imagery.

56 Sanderson, Lincoln Cathedral, pp. 24, 27.
57 Emden, BRUO, II, p. 1044; LAO Episcopal Register III, f 376r.
58 Benniworth (d. 1318), Ralph Barry (d. 1316), Gilbert Eyvill (d. 1307), Richard Rowell (d. 1316), William Thornton (d. 1313), and Jocelin Kirmington (d. 1321) (LAO Episcopal Register III, ff. 181, 278, 356, 392v; LAO Episcopal Register V, f. 278).
most striking slab of this date, and perhaps for that reason described in a little more detail by Sanderson, is that of Adam de Osgodby (1316), a senior chancery clerk, who though not a canon of Lincoln held prebends in York and Salisbury. As well as having an unusual Norman French inscription the stone had ‘a cross much flourished’ and ‘many escosheons in Saxon [Lombardic] letters’, though the precise meaning of the latter is unclear. It may have resembled the brass of Henry de Everdon (d. 1303) at Everdon, Northamptonshire. Indents of mid-to-late-fourteenth century styles have survived well at Lincoln. They display many of the developments of the 1330s to the 1350s: increasing use of devotional imagery, fillet and plate inscriptions to enable longer epitaphs and greater stylistic experimentation.

Varieties of cross brass predominate. A fine surviving indent with a floriated cross with vine-leaf-shaped ends, though stylistically related to Osgodby’s monument, probably dates from towards the end of the fourteenth century because of its border indent which is too narrow for Lombardic lettering. This might be the monument of John Warsop (d. 1386) which Sanderson describes as ‘circumscribed on a marble, in the midst whereof is a cross of brass …at the foot of the cross Fili Dei, Miserere mei’. Two other cross brasses, both with kneeling figures and scrolls, can be dated to this period, those of John Selby (d. 1373) and John Belvoir (d. 1391). Roughly contemporary with these, since the style was current from the 1340s to the early fifteenth century, are two particularly impressive foliated cross brasses with octofoil heads containing images of priests, one wearing pendant surpliced sleeves with hands open and wide apart. Both have border fillets, one with barbed quatrefoils. This style was popular among other higher clergy as can be seen in the brasses of Robert de Tring (d. 1351) at Merton College, Oxford, and William Herlaston (d. 1353) at Sparsholt, Berkshire, both from the London A workshop, and Richard de la Barre (d. 1386) at Hereford from the London B workshop. The mid to late fourteenth-century canons’ brasses and Bishop Gynwell’s are among the first in the cathedral not manufactured by the local Lincoln workshop but brought in from London. By this date Lincoln canons sought the latest and best metropolitan designs.

Later fourteenth-century stylistic experimentation in brasses at Lincoln culminated in a group of six surviving indents with a similar design: a devotional image under a single canopy flanked by pinnacles on brackets from rising stems, and square-angled border fillets. This design probably derives from the brass of Adam de Brome (d. 1332) in St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, which dates from c. 1350. The two finest, both London B brasses now in the south choir aisle, which commemorate Hamo Belers (d. 1370) and John Haddon (d. 1374), are closely related not only chronologically but stylistically. Both canons are portrayed kneeling in front of images of the Virgin and Child enthroned and crowned, each with a scroll and shields. Two others share a
similar style; both have small figures of priests immediately below the bracket. The remaining two, now in St. Andrew’s chapel, display characteristic invention. One has the stem rising from a couchant animal, shields either side of the image and detached barbed quatrefoils in the corners. Three further shields are probably evidence of its reuse in the sixteenth century. The other has a floriated stem rising to a bracket below which is a shield.

From the late fourteenth to the early sixteenth century the typical style adopted by canons was a full-length composition with marginal inscriptions. The plainest were decorated with quatrefoils and shields. However, it was more usual to have costly elaborate canopies with pinnacles, a style ultimately derived from architectural models such as shrines and entrance portals. The grandest, matching the design of episcopal brasses, had triple canopies. The indents of six of these have survived. Such opulent monuments reflect not only the wealth of Lincoln canons but their desire for ostentatious commemoration commensurate with their status. Comparable examples can be seen at Hereford and in Sedgwick’s drawings of those once at St Paul’s.

Given their relatively low status at the bottom of the cathedral clerical hierarchy, there are records of a surprisingly large number of monuments of the minor clergy; thirty-five are known, of which nineteen still survive in the cathedral. The vicars choral, poor clerks, chantry priests and choristers, the four ranks of minor clergy at Lincoln, bore the brunt of the daily liturgy; without them the cathedral could not function. They were generally commemorated with incised slabs of local Ancaster or Lincoln stone, which was cheaper than Purbeck limestone, and rarely had effigies on them. Robert Darcy (d. 1466) requested a plain stone (honestus lapis) to cover his body. The wealthier and more senior of them, office holders such as the keeper of St. Peter’s altar, sacrist, succentor, and vice chancellor – and also some chantry priests – had brasses; sixteen are known. Their wills reveal some to have had considerable means and a comfortable lifestyle despite the onerous nature of their liturgical duties and modest salaries; some were small-scale pluralists. The earliest known minor clergy monuments, those of Humphrey de Carleton and Adam de Oversby, can be dated to the mid fourteenth century. Carleton occurs as sacrist in 1351 and Oversby as a vicar choral in 1352. Sanderson notes that Oversby’s had ‘Saxon’ characters, that is Lombardic lettering, which suggests that the local workshop was still active after the Black Death. He also records this script being used on the ledger of Robert Browne de Rothwell ‘quondam capellanus istius ecclesie’ which is probably of a similar date. Most minor clergy brasses were simple plates with inscriptions without embellishment.

Inscriptions

The inscriptions on monuments had two principal functions, to elicit prayers and to proclaim status. Episcopal epitaphs tend to be
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longer and by the fifteenth century increasingly likely to praise the virtues of the individual. Those of canons were more formulaic and impersonal but might have additional inscriptions or verses whereas this was rare among the minor clergy. Inscriptions can too easily be dismissed as formulaic and therefore of little interest. While the variations are often fascinating, the formulaic elements contain crucially important statements of piety and identity.

The earliest recorded episcopal epitaph, that of Bishop Gravesend (d. 1279), is also one of the simplest and most common, a biblical quotation, Job xix. 25-27, expressing hope in the Resurrection, familiar from the Office of the Dead.77 Bishop Gynwell’s is also simple, a basic statement of his office, date of death and a request for prayers. This seems to be a deliberate choice as the words were widely spaced; there was room for a longer epitaph.78 The early fifteenth-century epitaphs, those of bishops Repingdon and Fleming, are untypical. The brevity of Repingdon’s four-line epitaph is in keeping with his modest monument, an unadorned marble slab, but in one respect contradicts his request for the simplest burial.79 Probably written by his executors, it is the first Lincoln epitaph to praise the virtues of the deceased, albeit briefly, as ‘Flos adamas cleri, pastor gregis’ (‘Flower and lodestone of the clergy, pastor of his flock’). Such sentiments reflect Repingdon’s reputation as an austere, pious and hard-working diocesan.

Bishop Fleming’s epitaph was painted on a board by his monument but is now lost. ‘Tables’ of this sort relating to images and the liturgy are known to have existed in both parish and greater churches but such ephemera rarely survive.80 They were also used, as in Fleming’s case, to provide longer epitaphs for high status tombs but were presumably not necessary for brasses where there was room for a lengthy epitaph. According to Anthony Wood, Fleming wrote his own epitaph.81 It forms an essential part of his sophisticated commemorative scheme, a gruesome cadaver below a splendid episcopal effigy, which, as the epitaph makes clear, was intended to teach the passer by about the inevitability of death and the transience of worldly success. It begins, ‘Isthuc qui graderis paulisper perlege lector; sta speculans, quod eris, in me nunc verminibus es’ (‘Reader, whoever comes this way, read for a while; pause, seeing in me, who is eaten by worms, what you will be’). Although at times pompous and self-aggrandising, Fleming describing himself as a brilliant doctor and excellent bishop (‘Doctor clarus erat; prestans et episcopus ipse’), it is, nonetheless, an endearing meditation on the vanity of human achievement, especially academic achievement. He writes wistfully of his youthful promise ‘Qui fueram pridie juvenis, forma speciosus; artes Oxoniae discens puer ingeniosus … Quid doctorate cacumen?’ (‘I was once a handsome youth, a clever boy who learned the arts at Oxford … why scale the heights of a doctorate?’). Ultimately, the epitaph warns us, our brief lives are vain and death does not spare the best things (‘vita brevis vana est … mors … non parcens rebus optimis’).

77 Sanderson, Lincoln Cathedral, p. 10.
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The remaining fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century episcopal epitaphs are more conventional records of the virtues and achievements of the deceased, coupled with meditations on mortality. Bishop Alnwick’s is particularly fulsome in its praise of his career if predictable in its evocation of death.\footnote{Sanderson, \textit{Lincoln Cathedral}, pp. 17-18.}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Quondam privati custos fuit ille sigilli}
\textit{Noluit ille pati falsum, dum constitit illi.}
\textit{Primo Norvici pastoris fulsit honore}
\textit{Postea multiplici stetit hic non absque labore.}
\textit{Multos sudores populi pro pace subivit,}
\textit{Abstulit errores sua sicui cura petivit. \ldots}
\textit{In cinerem reditii cinis, \& nequit hic remanere.}
\textit{Mortem non fugiet homo natus de muliere.}
\end{quote}

(Formerly keeper of the privy seal, 
He would not tolerate deceit. 
First he was a distinguished bishop of Norwich 
Afterwards he continued here not without much varied effort. 
He laboured hard to bring peace to the people, 
and strove to remove error from his flock. \ldots 
Ashes to ashes, nothing remains. 
Man born of woman cannot escape death).

It was probably written by Alnwick himself. Although he died suddenly in December 1449, he began making arrangements for his death as early as September 1445 when he wrote his will.\footnote{R.C.E. Hayes, ‘Alnwick, William (d. 1449)’, \textit{ODNB}, \url{http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/421}.} Bishop Chedworth was praised for his pastoral qualities, ‘\textit{Clerum dilexit, fovit, coluit, bene rectit}’ (‘he esteemed, fostered, and tended the clergy and ruled them well’), and Bishop Smith for the foundation of two colleges.\footnote{Sanderson, \textit{Lincoln Cathedral}, pp. 8-9, 16-17.}

Unlike those of bishops, the inscriptions of canons are generally impersonal and formulaic. Set out in border inscriptions or rectangular plates, virtually all had at least seven standard elements beginning with the phrase \textit{Hic iacet}, a product of intra-mural burial. Next followed the deceased’s name and cathedral office, that is canon or dignity. Sometimes their prebend is given. Some, nearly half of the known inscriptions, recorded their status as residentiaries. Far more, most of those who had them, also listed their academic qualifications; this was an important mark of status. The inscription ended with the deceased’s date of death and a prayer \textit{cuius anime propicietur Deus. Amen.} What is striking about these standard elements is the importance of the cathedral in canons’ sense of identity, their membership of the chapter and status as resident canon. Notice also what is not mentioned. Other benefices or offices held are rarely given though many were large-scale pluralists often engaged in service to church and state. Nor is other biographical information included. There is no \textit{curriculum vitae} or account of the deceased’s character or good works until the sixteenth century and even then not much. Canons, particularly residentiaries, defined themselves in terms of their cathedrals, as members of a prestigious group, the cathedral chapter, which gave them status and identity.

The conspicuous lack of individualism in these and most other late medieval monumental inscriptions, differentiated only by the deceased’s name, reflects their eschatological, intercessory purpose. They looked forward to the trials of Purgatory rather than backwards to past achievements or a life well-lived, hence the prayer for God’s mercy on their soul and the care over the date of death. The latter was important for obits, annual Masses for the soul of the deceased usually held on the anniversary of the death and sometimes near the grave, which proliferated in the later middle ages.
Fig. 8. Sedgwick’s drawing of Philip Tilney’s brass (BL Add. MS 71474, f. 95v)  
(© British Library Board)
Monuments were part of the much wider provisions made for the souls of the deceased that included obits, chantries and almsgiving. They were a reminder of the obligation of the living to pray for the dead. For this reason the composition of inscriptions barely changed until the Reformation. Most inscriptions were set in borders around the slab where space was limited. Only the essentials could be included. Brevity required the use of abbreviations. Though flat stones had space for longer texts in addition to border inscriptions, when these were added they usually took the form of moral and religious verses and not additional biographical detail.

Nearly half the canons’ monuments recorded by Sanderson had additional inscriptions. These ranged from brief scrolls to substantial poems. Most invocatory scrolls tended to be conventional phrases appealing for mercy, many taken from the Office for the Dead. Some reveal the piety of canons. John Sheppey appealed to the five wounds of Christ, his medicine. Some inscriptions were exceptional. In 1388 John Rouceby’s outraged executors not only denounced his murderer from beyond the grave, accusing him of ‘malitia precogitata’ (‘malice aforethought’), but also named him. That of Philip Tilney (d. 1453) is noteworthy for its length, four stanzas, its language, English rather than Latin, and the breadth of its themes (Fig. 8). A late entrant to the priesthood, he was of armigerous gentry stock from Boston, ‘descended of lyne right’, and married an aunt of Thomas, Lord Scales. His epitaph also praises his virtues, ‘full noble and liberal was he to every wyght’. The final stanza moralizes about death, ‘Consyder here a caryon wormes to fede’. Not without cause, Edward Darby (d. 1542) took particular care to express his loyalty to the crown by giving Henry VIII’s titles in full: king of England, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith and Supreme Head of the Church in England and Ireland. Four years earlier, the treasurer, Henry Litherland, had been executed for his part in the Pilgrimage of Grace.

There was a well-established tradition at Lincoln, dating from at least the 1380s, for canons to include Latin verses on their monuments; eleven were recorded by Sanderson. Like those found elsewhere they are usually written in hexameters and moralize about death and the transitory nature of life. Better than doggerel if rather trite and unoriginal, they display some literary competence and were probably written by canons themselves. Geoffrey Scrope used an arresting image, chosen in part at least for literary effect, ‘G[alfridus]. Scrope legista iacet hic sub marmore cista,/Quem, quasi ballista ferit mors flebilis ista’ (G[eoffrey] Scrope, student of law, lies under marble here in a coffin/Doleful Death struck him as if with a crossbow). Only one is known to be taken from existing verses. ‘Ut rosa pallescit cum solem sentit abesse; sic homo vanescit; nunc est; nunc desinit esse.’ (‘As the rose fades without the sun, so man vanishes; now he is, now he ceases to be’), chosen by John Marshall (d. 1446), can be found in two fourteenth-century manuscripts.
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Canons were certainly familiar with each other’s inscriptions and sometimes borrowed phrases. John Breton (d. 1465) lamented the loss of the trappings of his comfortable lifestyle, ‘Vestibus ecce meis, famulis, opibus quoque nudor./Sum privatus eis, sub terram terra recludor’ (‘Look I am stripped of my clothes, my household and goods. I am deprived of them, buried under the ground’). Fifteen years later Hugh Tapton (d. 1481) expressed the same sentiments in very similar language, ‘Vestibus inde meis, opibus famulis quoque nudor./Sum privatus eis; sub petra carne recludor’.

The inscriptions on almost all minor clergy monuments, like those of many canons, were brief and formulaic. They record the essentials: name, office, date of death and a prayer. Of the very few exceptions the most notable is Thomas Loveden’s prayer, ‘O Pater …[Egidi?] Thome Loveden/michi tende. In te confido/unicus modo dona/repende’ (‘O Father …[Giles?] incline unto me. In you alone have I trusted; repay my trust’). That of Richard Anelys (d. 1477) is unusual in recognizing ‘twenty-one years of praiseworthy service’ as receiver of the common fund. In the sixteenth century some minor clergy monuments had additional brief inscriptions. Three incised slabs dating from the 1530s, two of which commemorate minor clergy, those of Robert Plankney (d. 1531) and William Baytman (d. 1536), had ‘Iesu’, ‘Merci’, ‘Lady’ and ‘Help’ written on folds in the four corners of the border scrolls containing their inscriptions. Gilbert Thymolby (d. 1543), who served the Ravenser chantry, had the names of the four evangelists instead. All these inscriptions were intended for a sophisticated audience. This was a literate, Latinate but small audience, primarily the cathedral clerical community. But it also included the educated laity with sufficient basic Latin to recognize familiar prayers and devotional texts.

Iconography
The iconography of monuments, like their design and inscriptions, expressed the piety, identity and status of the cathedral’s clergy. However, the stripping of the brasses in 1644 makes this hard to reconstruct at Lincoln. Sanderson, though generally a meticulous recorder of inscriptions, in a typically English fashion, was uninterested in visual matters and rarely comments on the design of monuments beyond whether or not there was an image of the deceased. Fortunately Sedgwick’s drawings help visualise the grander monuments. These and the many surviving indents enable some observations to be made. Bishops were portrayed with the full symbols of their office, mitres, pastoral staffs, in full episcopal vestments and usually in the act of blessing. There is also a distinction between the minor clergy and canons in how they were depicted and the imagery used on their brasses. Canons tended to be portrayed wearing copes and other marks of status whereas minor clergy favoured eucharistic imagery.

About half of the canons’ monuments recorded by Sanderson had images of the deceased. How they were portrayed, particularly their vestments, made a clear statement of status and identity. John Beverley, in 1473, asked to be portrayed in his choir robes (habitum chori). Most were shown wearing a cope or an almuce, or both, rather than a chasuble. This was a deliberate expression of status, especially the almuce, a fur shoulder cape trimmed with tassels, which only canons were entitled to wear. There is good evidence that these were regularly worn by canons attending the liturgy.
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When the chancellor Peter Partrich was attacked by the henchmen of Dean Mackworth during vespers on 28 June 1435, he was dragged out of the choir by his almuce.98 Liv Gibbs has identified five indents with almuces.99 Copes were particularly important in cathedral worship. Their expensive fabrics, dazzling colours and elaborately embroidered images were a spectacular form of worship that matched the sophistication of cathedral liturgy. On display during the processions held on greater feasts in the cathedral and round the close, they also proclaimed its status as a great church. Something of their splendour emerges from the 1536 inventory: John Sheppey gave a cope of red cloth of gold embroidered with gold swans, and blue velvet orfreys embroidered with stars; Nicholas Wymbush one of white cloth of gold decorated with pearls, its hood embroidered with the Coronation of the Virgin.100 Remarkably few canons are known to be portrayed in chasubles or have eucharistic imagery on their monuments. This would suggest that the Lincoln chapter saw themselves first as canons, then as priests.

In striking contrast, when present, iconography on minor clergy monuments often contains eucharistic themes such as patens, chalices and representations of the host. The earliest known, a chalice with a host inscribed ‘ihs’, is on Thomas Loveden’s slab, now in the south walk of the cloisters, which dates from c. 1400. A further four incised slabs with eucharistic imagery, all dating from between 1522 and 1543, survive.101 Of these the most striking is Humfrey Bradbery’s which is dominated by a large chalice and host at its centre. Dating from 1543 it was a bold conservative statement at a time of religious change.

Loveden’s memorial, an incised slab of Ancaster stone, is the only surviving minor clergy monument with an effigy. He is shown wearing Mass vestments, a chasuble rather than a cope, a further eucharistic statement; his head rests on two tasselled cushions and his feet on a dog. Although a somewhat crude representation, it is a large and impressive monument for a vicar choral.102 Only two other minor clergy monuments with figures are known, those of Robert Newton (last occurs 1526), keeper of St. Peter’s altar, and Nicholas Bayt (d. 1527), vicar choral and vice-chancellor. This break with convention was probably due to their status as senior office-holding minor clergy. In addition, Newton was a Cambridge graduate.103

Some canons wished to be portrayed kneeling in supplication, perhaps to suggest humility and piety. A remarkable group of four contemporary residents in the 1370s, Hamo Belers (d. 1370), John Haddon (d. 1374), John Selby (d. 1373) and John Belvoir (d. 1391), are depicted in this way.104 Belers and Haddon chose almost identical designs and imagery for their brasses, small figures, to emphasize humility, kneeling before the Virgin and Child. Selby and Belvoir were portrayed kneeling before the cross, for Selby a fitting devotion as he held the prebend of
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Sanctae Crucis. In the invocation of his will Belvoir made a particular reference to the most holy ‘blood of the cross’. A generation later Dean Sheppey (d. 1412) was also depicted kneeling but with two scrolls rather than a devotional image. Peter Partrich (d. 1451) followed Selby and Belvoir in being shown kneeling before the cross to which he appealed for salvation in a scroll at his feet.

Heraldry was often used as a visual statement of social rank by the armigerous and when present can reveal a carefully nuanced identity. The destruction of the brasses makes this very difficult to reconstruct for Lincoln cathedral clergy. Sanderson records fourteen clergy monuments with heraldic shields, most of them bishops, eleven of which are illustrated by Sedgwick. But as the surviving indents make clear, Sanderson did not always record the presence of shields and heraldry, probably because the brass had been lost; several of Sedgwick’s drawings show lost shields. Eight non-episcopal clerical matrices with shields can be identified. Sanderson describes two of these, those of Hamo Belers and John Haddyn, without recording the presence of shields.

At much the same time as Sanderson, between c. 1634 and 1642, Gervase Holles made a more detailed description of the heraldry of the cathedral. From this we can date the earliest use of heraldry on a Lincoln clerical monument to the first third of the fourteenth century: Thomas Corbridge, a resident canon who resigned his prebend in 1329, bore: ‘on a cross fitchy, 3 Escalops’.

Fig. 9. Sedgwick’s drawing of Christopher Massingberd’s brass (BL Add. MS 71474, f. 106v) (© British Library Board)
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Only John Breton is known to have included his rebus, albeit a prosaic one, a cask surmounted by the letters BRE, but there were probably others.  

Academic status was important to canons and though usually expressed in the inscriptions on their monuments can sometimes been seen in their portraiture. Two fifteenth century indents show canons wearing the *pileus quadratus*, known as a doctor’s cap, a squarer version of the *pileus*, a small round skull cap with a point adopted by those with higher degrees. A third indent shows a small demi-figure wearing a square cap but with a point similar to the one worn by John Gygur (d. 1504), also a Lincoln canon, at Tattershall.

The inclusion of devotional images on Lincoln clerical monuments was much more widespread than the handful of known examples would suggest. Sanderson, a Calvinist, was silent about the devotional imagery on monuments, which is only known from Sedgwick’s drawings. Indeed his description of Bishop Atwater’s brass simply refers to ‘six portraiture of men & women on each side’. This was, of course, the twelve apostles in the shafts of the canopies, which can also be found on Bishop Smith’s brass. The surviving indents suggest that where canons had images of saints they were on their copes rather than in the shafts of canopies, as can be found in the brass of Simon Bache (d. 1414), a non-resident canon, at Knebworth, Hertfordshire. As the brasses at Hereford clearly demonstrate, the saints canons included on their monuments reflected their personal devotion and cathedral identity. At Lincoln this is clearest in the Marian iconography of the brasses of Hamo Belers and John Haddon; the Virgin was the cathedral’s patron. The devotion of John Selby, John Belvoir and Peter Partrich to the Holy Cross has already been discussed. John Crosby (d. 1477) asked to be portrayed with two angels. Angels traditionally accompanied the transfigured dead in eternity.

The cult of the macabre, though introduced in the cathedral at an early date by Bishop Fleming (d. 1431) in his cadaver tomb, was not taken up in other monuments until the 1480s when Martin Joynor (d. 1485), whose inscription contained a paraphrase of Job’s faith in the resurrection, Job xix. 25-27, included what Sanderson calls an ‘anatomy’, a skeleton, beneath his feet, out of whose mouth a scroll begs for mercy. This was perhaps similar to John Rudyng’s well-known brass at Biggleswade. Though they were contemporaries and both members of the chapter there is little to connect them; Rudyng died in 1481 soon after Joynor became chancellor. Small-scale macabre imagery can also be found on the monument to Humphrey Bradbury (d. 1543), a chantry priest, now in St. John the Evangelist’s chapel: in the top lef corner a skull and crossed bones, in the bottom right a pair of crossed bones and in the bottom left corner a skull.

**Conclusion**

There was a hierarchy of commemoration according to status for the later medieval clergy of Lincoln cathedral, whether bishop, canon or...
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minor clergy, which was expressed not only in the type of monument and its material but also in its composition, that is its design, imagery and inscriptions. Bishops were commemorated by either raised tombs or elaborate brasses, according to personal taste. Their effigies proclaimed their status by depicting them in episcopal vestments with mitre and crozier, often in the act of blessing, and their virtues and achievements were set out in a laudatory epitaph. Canons were usually commemorated by large flat slabs of costly stone, Purbeck or Flemish marble, with brasses, the most elaborate of which might emulate episcopal monuments. When there is an image it demonstrates their status as canons by showing them wearing copes and almuces. Their inscriptions, though impersonal, also emphasized their status and were sometimes augmented with moralizing verses. The minor clergy mostly had to make do with incised slabs of local stone with only brief inscriptions, though when present the images on their monuments are often eucharistic in contrast to the iconography of canons’ memorials. Thus the dual functions of monuments, to elicit prayers and proclaim status, were achieved. It is not entirely fanciful to suggest that they were seen, read and elicited prayers and thereby helped answer Philip Tilney’s plea ‘for his soule of payne to have a lysse’.
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John Waryn and his Cadaver Brass, formerly in Menheniot Church, Cornwall

Paul Cockerham and Nicholas Orme

John Waryn (c. 1380-1426) was a Cornishman by birth who graduated at Oxford, was principal of three university halls there, and acquired the rectory of Menheniot, Cornwall, in 1411, subsequently spending time both in Cornwall and at Oxford. He died at Menheniot and a monumental brass was placed upon his grave of which an eighteenth-century drawing survives. The brass, which has since disappeared, contained one of the earliest images of a cadaver on a tomb in England. The article discusses the life of Waryn, the inscriptions on the brass, the context for the cadaver, and the relationship of the brass to those of other clergy in late-medieval Cornwall.

The Life of John Waryn (Nicholas Orme)

John Waryn, rector of Menheniot, Cornwall, who died in 1426, was honoured in his parish church by an unusual monumental brass portraying him as a cadaver: a kind of representation that was just coming into fashion at the time (Fig. 1). The brass no longer exists, but a drawing of it was made, probably in the eighteenth century, and inserted into a copy of Richard Carew’s The Survey of Cornwall (1602), once belonging to the antiquary Richard Gough (1735-1809) and now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.1 A good deal is known about the man whom the brass commemorated, thanks to the fact that he studied at Oxford University and left an informative will.2 There were in fact two men with the same forename and surname who had similar careers at much the same time. Our John Waryn is first recorded in 1406, and the other from 1416 until his death in 1441. Both were Oxford graduates and both held benefices in Cornwall, although the other Waryn became a wealthy pluralist cleric and ended his life as a canon of Exeter Cathedral and archdeacon of Barnstaple.3 The two men’s paths must have crossed, but they do not appear to have been relations or friends because John the rector of Menheniot makes no mention of his namesake in his will. Our John Waryn was probably born in the parish of St. Veep, Cornwall, since he bequeathed a pair of vestments and the sum of four nobles (£2) to the church for prayers for himself and his parents, implying that his family was connected with that church.4 His first certain appearance in records is in 1406, when he was an Oxford magister (probably a master of arts), which suggests that he was then at least twenty-five and that his birth can probably be dated to about 1380. Many Cornishmen from families with wealth or wealthy patrons studied at Oxford in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, so there need be no surprise about Waryn’s ability to do so.5 He may well be the John Waryn who was tonsured by the bishop of Exeter at St. Germans, Cornwall, on 9 August 1387, because the tonsure could be conferred on boys from the age of seven upwards.6

1 Bodleian Library, Gough Cornwall 22 (printed book), opposite f. 135.
3 Ibid.
Going to university required a substantial knowledge of Latin, probably in a grammar school, from which one proceeded to Oxford, if one went on to study there, at about the age of eighteen: in Waryn’s case in about 1398. The likelihood is that he followed the university arts course, taking the degree of B.A. in about 1402 and M.A. in about 1405, but there are no records of the conferment of degrees at this time. Grammar schools and universities charged fees, and in the case of a university (and often that of a school) there was the additional cost of living away from home. This suggests that Waryn’s family was wealthy or that he had a wealthy patron, such as a local clergyman or gentleman. Not all his relations were well off, however, because he made a bequest in his will to some of his kinsfolk whom he described as ‘very poor’.7

Masters of arts at Oxford were required to spend two years after they graduated as ‘regent masters’ giving lectures within the university. Teaching or doing administrative duties there was also a good way of earning a living until some permanent post came their way. In 1406 Waryn is recorded as principal of Broadgates Hall next to All Saints Church in Oxford’s High Street, and of Great and Little Lion Hall in Magpie Lane.8 These were university halls of residence, each containing a dozen or two dozen students, for whom the principal acted as a supervisor and guardian. It was his duty to pay the rents of the halls, arrange for meals and cleaning, collect payments from the students, maintain discipline over them, and perhaps look after their money and organise their tuition. These tasks, probably combined with some university lecturing, would have provided

7 Cornish Wills, ed. Orme, p. 61. 8 Emden, Biographical Register, III, p. 1996.
him with an income and accommodation in one of the halls, and formed the centre of his life from at least 1406 until 1411.

In the latter year, he gained a benefice: the rectory of Menheniot. The patrons of the benefice, responsible for choosing the rector, were the Cornish gentry family of Carminowe, but the heir to the family was a minor and the patronage was exercised on his behalf by the prince of Wales and duke of Cornwall, later to be King Henry V. A challenge to Henry's patronage was made by two members of the gentry on behalf of another candidate, but the bishop of Exeter found in favour of Waryn and instituted him to the benefice on 12 December 1411. Whether the prince selected him because of his Cornish or his Oxford connections is not known; either is possible. He had not at this point been ordained beyond the first tonsure, but eight days after his institution the bishop granted him letters dimissory enabling him to receive the higher degrees of ordination in other dioceses. Waryn probably went down to Exeter for the institution, and then returned to Oxford where he would have been ordained in stages later on. Unfortunately, the records of ordinations in the relevant diocese, that of Lincoln, do not survive in this period.

Despite gaining his benefice, Waryn was reluctant to leave Oxford. In 1411-12 he made a small donation towards the provision of stalls in the university church of St. Mary, and he continued to be principal of the three halls until at least 1422. This necessitated gaining leave of absence from the bishop of Exeter, which would have required him to appoint a curate to serve his church in his stead, and he is recorded as receiving grants of leave on five occasions between 1411 and 1417. He did not altogether stay away from Cornwall, however. In 1418 and 1421 he was appointed as a penitentiary (with power to hear confessions of serious sins) in the rural deanery of East. Lent, when confessions were heard, was a time when clergy were especially expected to be in their benefices. In 1421 he was also licensed to preach throughout the diocese of Exeter in Latin or the vernacular. He was made a penitentiary for a third time in 1426, and the bishop arbitrated between him and his parishioners in a dispute over tithes in the same year. That year, however, when he was aged about forty-six, was the last of his life. He was at Menheniot on 15 July when he made his will, and died two days later, according to his monumental brass. The brass indicates that he was buried in the church (Fig. 2), probably in the chancel as he requested in his will, and his executors proved the document very quickly after his death, on 26 July. The drawing of the brass gives the year date as 1427; this must be a mistake of the maker or of the person who did the drawing.

Waryn's will bears witness to his roots and activities in both Cornwall and Oxford. At Menheniot, he had begun a project to build a chapel of St. Anne within the parish church and to found a fraternity of parishioners to support it. He bequeathed £4 6s. 8d. towards completing the chapel, a set of vestments for its worship, and £1 16s. 8d. to help start the fraternity. The cult of St. Anne was still fairly new at this time, especially in Cornwall, although it is mentioned at St. Ive and

10 Ibid., p. 254.
11 Ibid., p. 254.
14 Ibid., pp. 154-7.
Launceston in the late fourteenth century and at St. Neot in 1425. Waryn may have developed a devotion to her because there was a chapel of St. Anne in the university church of St. Mary, of which he was a parishioner by virtue of his principalships. Subsequently, other chapels were founded in Cornwall in her honour. Waryn left money to a priest to pray for his soul in Menheniot church for two years, all the fraternities within the church, the friaries of Bodmin and Truro, Launceston Priory, and the clergy of St. Mary Magdalene in the latter town, as well as the church and clergyman of St. Veep. He also remembered various local people, both clergy and laity, and bequeathed the residue of his movable goods to his sister Christine and others of his kinsfolk.

In Oxford, his bequests testify to a wide circle of contacts. They included the church of St. Mary and its chapel of St. Anne, Merton College, Oriel College (the patron of St. Mary’s), the Augustinian priory of St. Frideswide, the Benedictine priory of nuns at Littlemore, all four houses of friars in the city, and the hospital of St. Bartholomew. A notable omission from the list is Exeter College, which specialized in receiving students from Exeter diocese both in the college itself and in its dependency, Hart Hall. This probably means that Waryn never studied at the college or the hall, and reminds us that it was possible to go from the diocese to Oxford as an independent scholar, paying one’s own way and choosing one’s own accommodation.

The will shows Waryn to have had a relish for learning, since it refers to at least ten books. Liturgical texts are represented by an old breviary and a glossed psalter. There are two grammatical works: the early fourteenth-century treatise on Latin grammar, *Memorale Juniorum* by Thomas of Hanney, and Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologies* which is part dictionary, part encyclopaedia. Religious volumes include Alain de Lille’s *De Planctu Nature* – an attack on human vices, Robert Holcote’s commentary on the Biblical *Book of Wisdom*, St. John Chrysostom’s commentary on the *Gospel of Matthew*, and an unidentified work by Robert Kilwardby, the friar, theologian, and archbishop of Canterbury. Two other untitled books are also mentioned. As well as these, Waryn had several possessions that point to a comfortable style of life: a great mazer (wooden bowl), a silver goblet with a cover, two silver salt cellars, and blue and black gowns lined with fur. His monetary bequests totalled well over £80. This sum reflects the fact that Menheniot was a reasonably lucrative benefice valued at nearly £22 in 1535, but probably also came in part from family wealth or the profits of his Oxford career.

**Waryn’s Memorial Brass (Nicholas Orme)**

The central image of the brass (Fig. 1) is a small skeletal figure, from whose mouth arises a sinuous scroll containing the words, with expansions shown here in italics, *Domine, misericordiam peto et non iusticiam* (‘Lord, I seek mercy and not judgment’), perhaps alluding to Psalm 100 (101), verse 1, ‘I will sing to you of mercy and judgment’. Beneath the figure are four lines of text. The first two identify the man whom the brass commemorates and his death date:


(‘Here lies Master John Waryn, formerly rector of this church, who died on the 17th day of the month of July in the year of the Lord 1427 [correctly 1426], on whose soul may God have mercy. Amen.’)

The identification is followed by two longer lines of text, extending further left and right, each of which contains two parallel lines of verse. The question arises whether the verses are to be read across, or downwards in two columns, left then right. Reading across is supported by the transcript of the lost Bartlot brass, mentioned below, but that transcript may have been made in error of the correct procedure. Reading downwards in two columns is more strongly corroborated by the fact that the two left-hand lines occur sequentially in other texts, and the order and meaning of all four lines when read in columns are more logical. Following this principle, the lines read:

Quisquis ades bustumque vides sta perelego plora;
Sum quod eris fueramque quod es tua posteriora;
Judicii memor esto mei; tua nam venit hora;
Commemorans miseris memorans pro me precor ora.

(‘Whoever you are who come and see this tomb, stand, read, weep. I am what you will be in your coming time, and I was what you are. Be mindful of my judgment, for your hour comes. Remembering, remembering, the unhappy, pray for me, I pray.’) The last line does not seem to be quite right. In the Bartlot text of the verses, *memorans* appears as *miserans*, giving a better meaning: ‘Remembering, having pity on, the unhappy, pray for me, I pray’. Perhaps either the engraver of the brass or the Gough artist mistook one word for the other.

The first two lines are variants of a couplet widely found in written texts in western
Europe. The latter two lines are not recorded in the standard dictionaries of medieval verse, but this reflects the limitations of such dictionaries which cannot cover every written source. In fact all four lines (reading *vultum* for *bustum* and *miserans* for *memorans*) were inscribed on the tomb of Laurence Bartlot, registrar of the bishop of Lincoln, who died on 1 October 1470, in the church of St. Dunstan in the West, London. The four lines are therefore likely to have been in general circulation and not composed specifically for Waryn’s tomb, since they could hardly have become widely known from Menheniot. They may have been chosen by Waryn or his executors, depending on whether he commissioned the brass before his death or left detailed instructions about it, but the choice of the cadaver, being unusual, seems likely to have been due to Waryn, and hence perhaps that of the verses as well.

**Waryn’s memorial brass and the context of its patronage (Paul Cockerham)**

It is rarely clear, beyond reasonable doubt, just who commissioned the medieval funeral monument and arranged its subsequent installation in the church. Sometimes the directions made in written documents such as probate material, and a very few contracts, were duly acted upon by the executors of the deceased’s estate, as the monuments survive as hard evidence. Equally, the absence of a date of death on an inscription is usually a pointer that the monument was ordered, made and appropriately positioned in the church in the lifetime of the commemorated. Yet overwhelmingly there is nothing at all to suggest who was responsible for the erection of a particular monument, let alone in a specific form, which is the case with this curious brass once at Menheniot: its genesis is unknown. However, the fact that this is one of the earliest manifestations of this kind of macabre imagery on an English funeral monument suggests that not only was it a specific commission, but that it was certainly intended by the man whom it commemorated. It seems highly unlikely that any of the four executors of his will, namely Master Robert Opz, John Bawdyn, Robert Bray and William Deket, would have gone to so much trouble to oversee something so unusual; Waryn’s inherent *persona* percolates through this brass.

The other mechanisms of memorialization he sponsored in his will as discussed above are routine; he endowed ‘priests’ at Menheniot for two years to ‘celebrate for my soul’ and those of others; he gave financial bequests to ‘the four orders of friars at Oxford’ and Truro, who would certainly have been conditioned to pray for his soul in return; he financed obits for himself, founded a fraternity of St. Anne in Menheniot and equipped the new chapel there with a Missal, a set of vestments (which may have been embellished with his initials as a token of remembrance), and a chalice ‘with a certain inscription outside’ which may have been intended to enhance its value to him as a personalised *memento mori*.19

---


18 For an overview see S. Badham and S. Oosterwijk eds., *Monumental Industry: The Production of Tomb Monuments in England and Wales in the Long Fourteenth Century* (Donington, 2010), passim.

At the time of his death a monumental brass was already in situ in Menheniot church, comprising a simple London-A style two-line inscription to Sir Ralph Carmynow, knight, (d. 1386) (Fig. 3); not just was there a precedent for Waryn to use a brass as a commemorative mechanism, but it further demonstrates a relationship between the affluent of Menheniot and the brass workshops of London. On a wider scale, Waryn’s brass adds to the other early-fifteenth-century brasses in Cornwall which almost exclusively represent the clergy: Thomas Awmarle (c. 1400) at Cardinham, John Balsham (d. 1410) at Blisland, an anonymous figure (c. 1410?) once at Warleggan, and Laurence Merther (d. 1421) once at Padstow. Although located in a remote area of the country, these brasses commemorated educated men like Waryn, with the desire, the financial means and the contacts to engineer brasses for themselves from London. The earliest of these was to Thomas Awmarle, a scion of the influential Albemarle family, and who as such was armigerous, an important social cachet for a parish priest which is clearly manifest on the brass (LS.W.I) (Fig. 4). He was instituted in the aftermath of the Black Death at Cardinham, a parish dominated by the wealthy Dynham family, and appears to have stayed there for the remainder of his life. With his elite connections, however, and possibly serving personally at the Carminowe oratory at Glyn in Cardinham, it is inconceivable that he did not have suitable contacts in London facilitating the commission of his brass. Like Waryn, he is depicted as an idiosyncratic figure, in a cassock but with a dagger – reflecting the reality of moorland life? – and with a curious (undated) inscription expressing a mutuality of intercessory prayer between him and the onlookers of his brass:

Hic iacet Thomas Awmarle Rector ecclesie de Cardynan. / Rogo vos fratres orate pro me & ego pro vobis in quantum possum.

('Here lies Thomas Awmarle, rector of the church of Cardinham. I ask you, brothers, pray for me and I [will do so] for you in as far as I may.')

John Balsham was instituted to the neighbouring parish of Blisland in 1396, moving from Little Gransden (Cambridgeshire - the same county as Balsham which was perhaps his native parish). He died in 1410 following episcopal approval in 1332 to serve for Joan, widow of Sir John de Carmynowe; the Carmynowe family held the manor until the late fourteenth century.

Curiously, although there has never been any question over the surname ‘Awmarle’, on scrutinising the inscription it is equally easy to make out ‘Albmarle’ – much closer to his original family name.


Register of Edmund Stafford, ed. Hingeston-Randolph, p. 147.
and was commemorated by a conventional brass showing him as a priest vested for Mass, with a factual, orthodox inscription (LSW.I) (Fig. 5). A very similar brass (now lost but of which the indent survives) was laid down at Warleggann (Fig. 6), a parish bordering Cardinham to the east, perhaps to William Umfray, who was instituted there in 1384, with the living vacant by 1434 (LSW.4). Laurence Merther, magister of Oxford, was rector of Padstow from 1400 until his death in 1421, and was commemorated by a conventional demi-figure of a priest in Mass vestments (now lost but known from a rubbing), with an inscription referring to his academic title (LSW.1) (Fig. 7).

It is very likely that these clerics knew each other, especially those who were based on Bodmin moor, as their periods of office overlapped, sometimes significantly so. Awmarle started the trend for individual memorialization with a brass, and the others in turn appeared to follow suit. While it is unlikely that there was any monumental kinship link between these individuals, it is significant

---

26 Lack, Stuchfield and Whittemore, Cornwall, pp. 3-4.
27 Register of Thomas de Brantyngham, ed. Hingeston-Randolph, I, p. 87.
28 Lack, Stuchfield and Whittemore, Cornwall, pp. 172, 175.
29 Dunkin, Brassey of Cornwall, p. 89, pl. LX fig. 3; Emden, Biographical Register, II, p. 1266; Lack, Stuchfield and Whittemore, Cornwall, pp. 88, 90.
Fig. 5. John Balsham (d. 1410), Blisland, Cornwall, LSWI
(from Lack, Stuchfield and Whittemore, Cornwall)
that apart from the later brass to Merther (London B), these brasses were all ordered from the London A workshop, John Balsham’s being one of its last products, and, moreover, the same workshop to which Sir Ralph Carmynow had earlier turned for his brass of 1386. A further local stimulus to commissioning brasses must have been the order from the newly established London D workshop for the magnificent monument to Margery Arundell (d. 1420) at Antony (LSW.1), as other commissions, both secular and religious, soon followed, again all from London D.30 Away from his Cornish environment Waryn may also have been aware of brasses at Oxford, particularly at Merton College and New College, where succeeding generations of officers were duly commemorated in their chapels, the chapel at Merton in Waryn’s time already accommodating at least seven fourteenth-century brasses.31 Otherwise, funeral monuments in Cornwall were thin on the ground: a few cross-slabs were imported from the Purbeck workshops,32 and there are early-fourteenth-century three-dimensional figures of a knight and lady of the Carminowe family now in Mawgan church in the far west of the county, the damaged figure of a man in armour at Lansallos and the Ham Hill stone military figure at Stratton, also dating from the early fourteenth century, as well as the elaborate Courtney (?) effigies of

30 Lack, Stuchfield and Whittemore, Cornwall, p. 181.
c. 1370 at Sheviock;\textsuperscript{33} but all these were commissioned from workshops elsewhere as the indigenous Cornish stone is not receptive to the production of finely detailed effigial sculpture.

This commemorative context suggests that the choice of a brass by John Waryn was both logical and practical. The textual elements of the brass were not unconventional, inasmuch as the inscription relates the facts of the deceased – his name, his role in the parish, the date of his death (used as an obit reminder) – together with a routine request for the passer-by to pray for his soul. Equally, the Latin verses, or the gist of them, were apparently circulating in contemporary literature. The requested position of the monument, too, is conventional: he wanted to be buried in the chancel of his church at Menheniot, which as well as being invested with a desirable element of holiness from its proximity to the altar, would also have been a relatively private area, rarely open to the parishioners, and where burial was restricted to ecclesiastics and the elite. However, Waryn

\textsuperscript{33} All described and illustrated by M. Downing, \textit{Military Effigies of England and Wales}, I, Bedfordshire-Derbyshire (Shrewsbury, 2010), pp. 85-9. The figure at Stratton is traditionally associated with Ralph Blanchminster (d. 1348?), yet in a recent study of Ham Hill stone figures it was redated to the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century, making it rather too early for this attribution: B. and M. Gittos, ‘Medieval Ham Hill Stone Monuments in Context’, \textit{JBAA}, CLXV (2012), pp. 89-121, at p. 112.
John Waryn and his Cadaver Brass, formerly in Menheniot Church, Cornwall

Fig. 8. The Three Living and the Three Dead, Psalter of Robert de Lisle (BL Arundel MS 83 II, f. 127)
(© British Library Board)
combined the conventional with the unusual, by using a skeleton to represent himself, to produce an innovative monument virtually unique for its time, and thereby manifesting a distinct connoisseurship in how he wished to be remembered.

The design of the skeleton is quite static. It is in a frontal position facing the spectator full on, with the arms straight down by its sides. The source of such a design is speculative, but presuming the brass was engraved in London (and probably the London D workshop) the seminal imagery of the ‘Danse Macabre’ painted in Old St. Paul’s was probably finished too late (post-1430) to be influential.34 The story and associated imagery of the ‘Three Living and the Three Dead’ were well established at that time however, first appearing in French poetry in the thirteenth century, and while found in several illuminated manuscripts they were much more widely disseminated via wall paintings in parish churches. E.W. Tristram was the earliest of many to discuss the possible influence of the illumination of the subject in the French-inspired early-fourteenth-century Psalter of Robert de Lisle (British Library Arundel MS 83 II),35 which invests the figures with a particular monumentality, highly suitable for their reproduction on a much larger scale on a church wall (Fig. 8).36 It is noteworthy that of all the representations of skeletons,

that furthest to the right of the Arundel MS illumination is very close to the figure on Waryn’s brass. While the kings are depicted in variously animated postures of alarm and dread, and two of the skeletons are clothed in tattered shrouds, gesturing to the kings, the third is completely uncovered, presented full-face and with the arms hanging limply down by its sides. The fourteenth-century paintings at Charlwood, Surrey, Hurstbourne Tarrant, Hampshire (Fig. 9), Lutterworth, Leicestershire, and Pickworth, Lincolnshire, also incorporate similar skeletal forms, although it was seemingly not the norm.37 It is open to speculation whether Waryn encountered images of this sort in his (presumed) travels between Cornwall, Oxford and London, whether in manuscripts owned by the elite or, more likely, in wall paintings. The partial survival of numerous wall painting schemes in Cornwall which include moralistic imagery, such as the Sunday Christ, suggest that the incorporation of morbid morality imagery in the county’s churches was equally possible.38

Monumentally this brass is among the earliest forms of macabre tomb imagery in England, and is contemporary with the elaborate transi tomb to Archbishop Chichele (d. 1443) in Canterbury, which was completed by 1426, yet which is in an entirely different league of design, location and patronage.39 A closer example to Waryn’s figure is on an incised slab at Saint-Réverien (Nièvre), France, to Hugues de Lespinasse (d. 1387) which comprises simply a full-faced skeleton with its arms hanging down limply by its sides (Fig. 10). Here, though, the marginal inscription is completely factual, recording Hugues’ occupation as a ‘vigneur’, and as there is a similar but later slab in the same church to Marguerite de Thianges (d. 1413), wife of Auguste de Lespinasse, there may have been a family motive for the specific macabre depictions.40 There is no textual reference to death on either of the slabs, however, and, as Emile Mâle makes clear, the theme became increasingly commonplace in France only after the Duke of Berry had it incorporated into the sculptured portal of the church of the Holy Innocents in Paris, his intended burial place, around 1408.41 Kathleen Cohen and Paul Binski discuss the topic in a wider geographical base, yet conclude that macabre imagery was uncommon on funeral monuments before the fifteenth century, and only took off in the second quarter of that century.42 Pamela King suggests that the fashion for macabre imagery ‘did not arrive here until c. 1424 … [and] … that it was imported from France and the Low Countries by people who


40 F.A. Greenhill, Incised Effigial Slabs, 2 vols. (London, 1976), II, pp. 144, 156, although there are errors in this listing.

41 E. Mâle, Religious Art in France: the Late Middle Ages (Princeton, 1986), pp. 324-8; and for a definitive version of the legend and imagery as depicted on wall paintings in France, see Groupe de recherches sur les peintures murales (France), Vifs nous sommes, morts nous serons: la rencontre des trois morts et des trois vifs dans la peinture murale en France (Vendôme, 2001).

travelled there for reasons of state in the early fifteenth century’. Furthermore, she traces a Lancastrian connection between many patrons favouring this style of tomb as ‘a select trend passing amongst members of a discernible group, to be picked up later by lesser persons living in the same area or owing some debt of allegiance or admiration’. This is all very well, but crucially, Waryn’s brass was commissioned a decade or so before this ‘select trend’ was disseminated further, and we are left to try and understand how and why an educated but remotely-based parish priest could select the same kind of macabre imagery on his monument at the same time as the greatest ecclesiastic in the land. French influence at Court may well have directed Chichele and a group of intellectual clergy to pursue this commemorative philosophy and art form, and it may be that while Waryn was similarly inclined, he had, for reasons of economy and status, to adopt a simpler monument. As Saul has traced, the c. 1370-75 brass of John the Smith at Brightwell Baldwin, Oxfordshire, was most likely another isolated and very early example of a shroud brass, and it is possible that ‘the idea of a cadaver was suggested by wall paintings in the church’.

Whatever the source of the design, John Waryn’s brass was engineered to perform several functions. Primarily, it served as a tool to solicit prayer for his soul, and the arresting design may well have attracted more attention, comment and curiosity, than, say, the ecclesiastical figure of John Balsham at Blisland nearby. Its impact on memory, both individual and corporate, would have been all the greater for this singularity. Secondly, the choice of a brass, being laid in the floor and thus walked upon, suggests an element of personal humility, already perhaps revealed in his will, and compounded by his wish to appear not in ecclesiastical finery but physically reduced to

Fig. 10. Hugues de Lespinasse (d. 1387), incised slab, Saint-Réverien, France

(photo.: Paul Cockerham)


44 King, ‘English Cadaver Tomb’, p. 54.

bare bones. On the one hand there is a visual dichotomy between the living being via a mouth scroll beseeching ‘Lord, I seek mercy and not judgement’, and the lifeless skeleton acting as a parody of the living. On the other hand, the brass skeleton is a small version of the bones which lay underneath: the brass vividly mirrored the bodily decay. Thirdly, there is a didacticism here: the inscription urges the reader to ‘stand, read [and] weep’ at what Waryn had become, and by being mindful of the fate of his soul to pray for him, as the same fate would shortly befall the spectator. This cleverly converts the introspective and disturbing anxiety of the beholder concerned with his own demise directly into prayer for the commemorated. It is a step removed from versions of macabre verse and associated iconography with an enhanced didactic message, urging onlookers to mend their ways, as on the 1454 brass to John Brigge at Salle, Norfolk (M.S.V) or the Resurrection imagery of the remarkably complex incised slab and tomb at Ashby Folville, Leicestershire.

Waryn’s personal qualities – his learning, his devotion to the parish and parishioners, and his perceived humility – were all combined here, leading him to commission a specific image with a specific set of verses. Yet although this was just one part of his overall strategy for remembrance, it was the part which was intended to exist in perpetuity. Forever, he presumed that his brass would visibly remind the succeeding rectors of Menheniot of their own mortality and the need for clerical humility; and, forever, it would serve as a means of supplicating their intercessory prayer. His living, vividly naturalistic skeleton was always meant to be seen as that transient form suspended somewhere between death and decay, praying to God for mercy rather than judgement, which message was an exemplar to follow. All too soon those who saw it and memorized the image and its message would be joining him in the ground, their bodies reduced to bones, and like him, requesting God for mercy for their own souls.
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The Victor of St. George’s Cay: Commander John Ralph Moss, R.N. (1759-99)

Michael Harris

An inscription in a private collection commemorates Commander John Ralph Moss, Royal Navy, who was buried in the Cayman Islands, where he died shortly after his victory over the Spanish in the Battle of St. George’s Cay. This article reconstructs the career of a little-known naval officer whose actions were significant in securing the independence of Belize.

SACRED/To the Memory of/JOHN RALPH/MOSS Esq/Commander/of/His Majesty’s/Sloop/MERLIN/Who Died the 24 of Augt, 1799./Aged 40 Years./On Board the said Sloop/in this Bay/Upon his Return to/JAMAICA,/after having Defeated/a Spanish Armament/of Sloops, Schooners & Gun Boats/with 2000 Land Forces/Destin’d for the Reduction of/The Logwood Cutters in the/BAY of HONDURAS ~

So reads the simple inscription, surmounted by the words MEMENTO MORI with the customary skull and crossbones (Fig. 2). It appeared on one of a number of rubbings brought by Martin Stuchfield to a meeting of the Society on 6 February 2010, to illustrate his talk on ‘Brasses in Private Possession’. As his inscription describes, Moss was the victor of the Battle of St. George’s Cay, which effectively secured the independence of present-day Belize from Spain on 10 September 1798, a day that is still a national holiday there. Little was known about Commander Moss; this article attempts to remedy that deficiency. For a start the inscription is inaccurate both as to date of death and place of burial: Commander Moss did die at sea aboard his ship, HMS Merlin (Fig. 1), but his death took place a fortnight earlier, on 10 August, and he was buried the next day with appropriate naval honours in the presence of all his officers near the beach at Hog Sty Bay, Grand Cayman,1 then a sparsely populated tropical island where no clergyman would reside until 1839.2 The ship herself reached Port Royal, Jamaica, some 300 miles to the east, on 24 August.3 This leads one to suppose that the brass was commissioned by his family in England when the news of the circumstances of his death, which may not have been entirely clear, reached them. The brass itself was

1 TNA: PRO, ADM 36/14463, HMS Merlin Master’s Log, entry for 10 August 1799. Moss’s Captain’s Log is missing.
2 Cayman Islands National Archive (CINA), e-mail from Mrs. Tricia S. Bodden, 10 May 2010.
3 Merlin’s log, entry for 25 August 1799. The naval day began with the noon observation of the sun, so the naval 25 August began at noon on the (civil) 24th.
Fig 2. The inscription to Commander John Ralph Moss, Royal Navy. 839 x 359 mm.
An unusual feature is the large number of fixing holes drilled around the perimeter.

(photo: © Martin Stuchfield)
probably made in London, and the large number of holes, thirty-five in all, drilled around the edge suggests that it was nailed to the wooden headboard of a grave.\(^4\) How it came to be lot 35 in the sale at Rowley’s of Newmarket on 5 September 2006 via a Canadian antique shop is a mystery that may never be solved.

John Ralph Moss was baptised on 28 October 1759 at St. Mary’s church, Whitechapel, in the East End of London, the son of John and Ann Moss of Wentworth Street.\(^5\) His father was a merchant in the fishery business who emigrated to Canada with his family and settled at Nepisiguit (now Bathurst) on the south shore of Chaleur Bay in New Brunswick. This settlement had been founded by Commodore George Walker, a retired privateer, in 1768 to develop fisheries, agriculture and forestry. It would come to an end in 1778 when it was razed to the ground by American privateers. In the meantime John senior had met a number of business reverses; by September 1772 he was virtually bankrupt and was applying to his patron in England, the Earl of Denbigh, for ‘an Employment under the Crown … notwithstanding I endeavour to give my children a liberal education. They are three likely boys for their years, & if so happy as to meet with your lordship’s protection, hope to make them do very well’.\(^6\) Basil, sixth Earl of Denbigh (1719-1800), was a Warwickshire nobleman and, in parliament, one of the Earl of Sandwich’s men.\(^7\) He was a generous but perceptive patron of professional and political men in an era when patronage was a necessary lubricant to a man’s career. Moss would be indebted to him, both for his entry into the Royal Navy and for his advancement within it.

It is likely that the elder John first sent his son to sea in the ships of one of his merchant friends. Be that as it may, he joined \textit{HMS Ardent} on 21 May 1777 as a seventeen-year-old Volunteer from London, already a skilled, or able-bodied, seaman.\(^8\) \textit{Ardent} was a 64-gun ship of the line, or battleship: her captain was Constantine Phipps, 2nd Baron Mulgrave, a friend of Denbigh’s and an interesting man (Fig. 3). He was a Fellow of the Royal Society and of the Society of Antiquaries, a friend and neighbour of Sir Joseph Banks the naturalist, who had

\(^4\) Opinion of Jon Bayliss.  
\(^5\) London Metropolitan Archives (LMA), P71/MRY/033/001, Register of baptisms, St. Mary’s, Whitechapel.  
\(^6\) Warwickshire County Record Office (WCRO), CR2017/C243, f. 361.  
\(^8\) TNA: PRO, ADM 34/6, Ship’s pay book, \textit{HMS Ardent}, Ship’s Book (SB) No.1164.
accompanied Captain Cook on his first voyage. Mulgrave had himself led the first serious expedition to look for the North-West Passage in 1773. It failed, but is now remembered because on it Midshipman Horatio Nelson came across a polar bear; less well remembered is that Phipps, in his report, was the first European to describe that animal. As a result of his friendship with Banks he became acquainted with the Earl of Sandwich and formed a personal and political friendship with him that led to his being elected an M.P. and joining Sandwich on the Board of Admiralty in December 1777 whilst in command of Ardent; a combination possible in those days.\footnote{ODNB, XLIV, pp. 178-9.}

In February 1778 Mulgrave transferred to the larger 74-gun HMS Courageux, taking many of his officers and ship’s company with him, including Moss, whom he rated up to Midshipman on 13 June.\footnote{TNA: PRO, ADM 34/161, Ship’s pay book, HMS Courageux, SB No. 53.} Moss would now need to spend a total of six years at sea before he was eligible to take the oral board, or examination, for Lieutenant, then the Royal Navy’s lowest commissioned rank. For most of this time he remained in Courageux under Mulgrave’s command. This was the period of the War of American Independence, and Courageux took a full part in it as a unit of the main, or Channel Fleet whose task was to watch over the Western Approaches to the United Kingdom, and counter the activities of the French and Spanish navies.

On 27 July 1778, just six weeks after Moss was rated Midshipman, Courageux took part in the Battle of Ushant against the French, a large-scale fleet battle involving some thirty ships of the line on each side, which ended indecisively and, on the British side with political controversy over the government’s preparations for war. Mulgrave had done well in the battle, his ship taking on the much larger Ville de Paris, but Courageux had been in the Rear Division of the fleet under the immediate command of Sir Hugh Palliser. Both men were Lords of the Admiralty, government men under the patronage of Sandwich, while the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Augustus Keppel was also an M.P., but was a member of the opposition. The subsequent politically-inspired Courts Martial damaged both Admirals, and Mulgrave was fortunate to keep his appointments, both at sea and in Whitehall.

On 13 March 1780 Courageux, together with the Alexander, captured the French privateer Monsieur some 150 miles southwest of the Scilly Isles, and in January 1781 took the frigate Minerve, this time with the aid of the Valiant, thirty miles west of Ushant. In December that year she was part of Admiral Kempenfelt’s force which decimated a French convoy, again west of Ushant. Finally, on 20 October 1782, she took part in the battle of Cape Spartel, in which Admiral Lord Howe countered a joint French and Spanish attempt to prevent a British convoy relieving the garrison of Gibraltar, which was under siege by Spain. Four months later the war was over and, as ever, the fleet was rapidly reduced in size with Courageux being one of the many ships to be paid off.

Young Moss had had a good war under Mulgrave’s tutelage but he was still some months short of the necessary sea time to qualify him to sit his Lieutenant’s Board. However, in April he was found a berth in the 32-gun frigate Winchelsea for a return voyage to Newfoundland;\footnote{TNA: PRO, ADM 34/810, Ship’s pay book, HMS Winchelsea, SB No. 90.} it can have been no coincidence that her captain, Thomas
Farnham, was about to become Denbigh’s brother-in-law. Moss duly sat his Board on 28 January 1784, his Passing Certificate being issued on 5 February. He had thus succeeded in reaching the gateway to a career as a commissioned officer, but only the gateway. The year 1784 marked the beginning of nine years’ peace, when only a small Navy was needed and very few Lieutenants’ jobs existed: his Passing Certificate merely made him eligible for one. To become an officer he needed to be commissioned as a Lieutenant of a particular ship and, until he was, he would not be paid at all, not even the ‘Half Pay’ of unemployed officers. He was to wait very nearly seven years for this opportunity, when he was commissioned Fifth Lieutenant of the new 74-gun ship *Leviathan* on 3 November 1790, to be commanded by none other than Captain Lord Mulgrave.

Back in March 1782 Mulgrave had lost his job on the Board of Admiralty when Sandwich retired, but by 1784 he had joined William Pitt’s new administration as Joint Paymaster General and, importantly, become a Lord of Trade in the reconstituted Board of Trade. This was a key department for Pitt’s strategy of opening up trade and colonization in the East, including the settlement of New South Wales, to compensate for the losses following defeat in the American War. Mulgrave was particularly active in the government’s promotion of the establishment of the new South Seas whaling fishery, whale oil and its associated products being vital to provide lighting and lubrication in the Industrial Revolution, and the trade itself being a nursery for seamen for the Navy. The leading firm in the London whaling fraternity at this time was Samuel Enderby and Sons; Enderby and his friends spent much time and effort lobbying the government to open up whaling rights in the South Pacific, in the face of opposition abroad from Spain, which considered the waters off South America to be hers, and at home from the East India Company, whose charter gave it exclusive rights to the area. Mulgrave was closely involved in all of this, and another familiar name, Admiral Sir Hugh Palliser, wrote to the Board of Trade in 1786 to encourage the whalers in their search for new grounds because ‘distant Seas and Coasts, now little known, may be explored and be better known, which may hereafter be used in other respects’. Pitt’s policy led to the passing of an Act for the Encouragement of the Southern Whale Fishery in June 1786, amended in 1788 to allow whaling in the south-east Pacific as far as ‘180 degrees West Longitude’.

In November 1790 the fleet was again drastically reduced in size. On the 15th, *Leviathan* was one of a number of ships ordered to be paid off, and Moss found himself jobless after just twelve days as an officer. Seven weeks

12 WCRO, CR2017/C244, f. 205, Denbigh’s letter to Lady Halford, dated 27 April 1779, telling her that he had been able to procure the promotion of her brother, Thomas Farnham, and hopes he will soon be promoted further. Lady Halford replies on 2 May acknowledging ‘the Essential service your Lordship has Renderd him’; f. 279 and f. 282 are two letters from Farnham dated 1781 and 1782 begging Denbigh’s further assistance ‘as nothing but Interest will do’. Sarah, widow of Sir Charles Halford, Bt., daughter of Edward Farnham and sister of Captain Thomas Farnham, R.N., married Denbigh, as his second wife, on 21 July 1783 (*Complete Peerage*, IV, p. 181).

13 TNA: PRO, ADM 107/9, f. 172, passing certificate.

14 TNA: PRO, ADM 6/24, Commission and Warrant book, 3 November 1790.


16 Stackpole, *Whales and Destiny*, pp. 82, 115-16.

17 TNA: PRO, ADM 3/107, Admiralty Board’s minutes, 15 November 1790: ‘Commissioned on occasion of the late Armaments ..... paid off in order for the Reduction of the Fleet to the Peace’.
later he applied for twelve months’ leave abroad from 8 January 1791 ‘to command the ship William employ’d in the Southern Whale Fishery’. This may seem a startling turn of events: the most junior officer in the Royal Navy being given command of a sizeable merchant vessel to go whaling in the Pacific. William was a full-rigged ship of 302 tons, quite big for a whaler of her day, and she was owned by Samuel Enderby and Sons of London. It seems probable that Moss, already a skilled merchant seaman, had looked for work in the whaling industry when he left naval employment in 1784, and possible that Mulgrave had persuaded Samuel Enderby to take him as an apprentice, which would have made him by 1790 an officer of some experience in an expanding trade.

Enderbys had originally been oil merchants, buying their oil from the Quaker whalers of Nantucket Island, off the north-east coast of America, who sold much of their product in London. The War of Independence disrupted their trade and its outcome denied them their main market. In 1785 the Nantucketeers had made an unsuccessful application to the Governor of Massachusetts to become a neutral state. Samuel Enderby had already taken the opportunity to establish his own whaling fleet in London, using skilled Nantucketeers to start with to fill the key roles in his ships, with English apprentices under training, the first of whom were expert harpooners, or ‘boatsteerers’ by 1786. In all this he was successful, lobbying the government as we have seen above, and exploring new whaling grounds including the South Pacific.

His preparations included writing to Sir Joseph Banks to ask about conditions in the Pacific, whether and where sperm whales were to be found, whether the island of Juan Fernandez was settled and whether the Spanish would be friendly, and whether any good charts were to be had; he also offered to bring back any specimens that Banks might want. He took a strong line on a matter that concerned all merchant ship owners: ‘We very earnestly request your Lordships’ attention to have the apprentices in the Southern Whale Fishery protected (from impressment), they being the instruments by which the Fishery must become an English instead of an American Fishery. Many boys of very creditable parents are indentured and brought up for officers in the Fishery, and if suffered to be impressed we never shall get any more lads of creditable parents to be indentured in the Fishery’. To investigate the possibilities of the South Pacific, Enderbys had sent their whaler Emilia round Cape Horn and she had returned with a favourable report to London in March 1790 after an eighteen-month voyage. The firm was anxious to exploit this new fishery and by January 1791 they had two ships fitting out on the Thames: the Britannia and the William. The former was destined to form part of the ‘Third Fleet’ of convict ships to Botany Bay, before sailing on into the Pacific to catch whales; the latter, under Moss, to exploit the eastern side of that ocean, off the coast of Peru.

William’s voyage started inauspiciously enough in a sudden blizzard on Friday 25 February and the next day the St. James’s Chronicle or British Evening Post reported pessimistically that

---
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'The William, Moss, from London to the South Sea, is ashore near Sheerness, and it is feared will be lost. Several other vessels are ashore below Gravesend.' However, by 1 March Lloyd's List was reporting that ‘it is expected (she) will be got off.’ No doubt she had to put back for repairs, but ‘got off’ she was, and on 2 April she set sail from the Downs anchorage off Deal for a two-year voyage to the south-east Pacific via Delagoa Bay in south-east Africa, thus rounding both the Cape of Good Hope and Cape Horn. Until April 1793, when she touched at Plymouth, she would only be heard of four times, when returning whalers brought news of her: one of these occasions would have been particularly welcome to Enderbys, when, in late 1792, the Countess de Galvez reported that William had been ‘All Well on the coast of Peru’ on the previous 18 April with 100 tons of spermaceti in her hold, indicative of a successful voyage. As well as hunting whales and fur seals, Enderbys instructed their masters to report on places that could be used as refuges in this distant fishery. Thus William called at the two Spanish-owned islands of what is now known as the Juan Fernández Group, comprising Isla Robinson Crusoe and Isla Alejandro Selkirk, but then known as Más a Tierra (‘Closer to land’) and Más Afuera (‘Further Away’). The latter was, and is, uninhabited with a forbidding, steep coastline: Moss did well to find fresh water there although ‘the seals play in these waters so far up the valleys, that the water has a bad taste, unless it is taken from above the places which they frequent’. He also proved to have diplomatic skills in persuading the potentially hostile Governor of Más a Tierra to allow him to land on 15 November 1792 to cut firewood.

William’s crew was suffering from scurvy, as all crews on long voyages did in those days, and the Governor presented him with ‘a large quantity of vegetables,’ a godsend, and ‘a loaf of sugar, four fine sheep and as much craw fish as he wanted’. Moss, in return, gave him ‘from his nearly exhausted stock ... a dozen of wine, a dozen of plates, two dishes, half a dozen of wine glasses, a small pot of pickles, and a pair of new boots’, reflecting the privations of living on a small, remote island.

William reached Plymouth on 9 April 1793. In the two years that she had been away, the political scene in Europe had changed considerably, culminating in revolutionary France’s declaration of war on Britain two months earlier. The Navy was once again expanding rapidly and Moss was commissioned Third Lieutenant of the 32-gun frigate HMS Blonde, fitting out at Deptford, on 24 June. Her Captain was John Markham, son of the Archbishop of York, a man ‘with interest’ like Mulgrave, a future Lord of the Admiralty and M.P. for Portsmouth (Fig. 4).

Fitting out, rather than being at sea, provided Moss with the opportunity to change his life: he married Mary Pender, a Cornish girl, by Special Licence at St. Mary’s, Rotherhithe, on 14 July. They had little enough time together, as Blonde was ready for sea by the end of August and set off to convoy a group of merchantmen to Holland, before being ordered to Spithead (off Portsmouth) to collect General Prescott and his staff who were bound for the West Indies. A young Midshipman, Frederick Hoffman, whose mother was a friend of the captain, joined at this time; years later, he wrote an
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Blonde finally set off on 20 October 1793, only to encounter at dawn on the 24th three French frigates within gunshot in very light winds off Falmouth. Outnumbered, it was Markham’s duty to flee and fight another day but this was easier said than done in the prevailing conditions, and the subsequent chase lasted, on and off, for twenty-four hours, with both sides getting out sweeps, and Blonde throwing ‘overboard a variety of stores to lighten the ship and bring her to good sailing trim … at the same time wetted all the sails with the Engine’ as well as setting every stitch of canvas. She finally shook them off and put in to Falmouth, where she stayed for three weeks, firstly to replenish her stores and then because of contrary winds. Since the Mosses had set up home in Falmouth, this must have been an unexpected blessing.

Blonde arrived in Barbados on 20 December to take part in the successful seizure of the French island of Martinique by Admiral Jervis and General Grey, which was complete by 25 March 1794 when the Admiral gave Captain Markham the compliment of sending his ship home with his despatches. Blonde moored in Falmouth’s Carrick Roads and stayed there a week before arriving at Plymouth for a docking on 1 May. This was another happy occasion for the Moss family: their son Charles had been born on 16 April and his father was given leave to attend his christening at Falmouth on 30 April while the ship was on passage to Plymouth.

31 ‘mastheading’: a punishment whereby a miscreant was sent to the top of a mast to ponder his sins.
33 ‘sweep’: a long oar used to propel a ship ... when becalmed (OED).
34 TNA: PRO, ADM 51/112, Captain’s Log, *HMS Blonde*, entries for 22-25 October 1793; also reported by the Sherborne Mercury, 1 November 1793; TNA: PRO, HO 42/26, ff. 796-7, letter from passenger Col. Francis Dundas to his brother Henry, Home Secretary, dated 25 October 1793; Markham Collection, now in the National Maritime Museum (MC), Markham to Archbp. Markham, 20 (sic) October 1793, describes Lord Howe’s operational reaction.
35 TNA: PRO, ADM 107/46, f. 732, and ADM 6/112, f. 171, Passing Certificate, Midshipman Charles Moss, 2 November 1814, contains his date of birth and baptismal certificate.
Coming out of dock on 19 May, *Blonde* spent the next three months in the English Channel and the South-west Approaches as part of Lord Howe’s Channel Fleet. However she missed the great battle of the ‘Glorious First of June’ because her squadron was detached to the Bay of Biscay. By the 8th, though, they were off Brest and saw the badly damaged French fleet enter port. Their state caused John Moss to write to Lord Denbigh to tell him the good news: ‘five of them completely dismayed & several others in such a state as I never saw ships before ... the sides of many of them were covered with canvas to keep out the Water & had not the weather favoured them very much since the Action some of them must have gone to the bottom’.³⁶ The next two months were spent off Cherbourg and the Channel Islands where, at 4 a.m. on 23 July, the local pilot made a mistake and caused the ship to hit a rock as she was passing through the Little Russell Channel, between Guernsey and Herm: ‘in going through, the ship struck on the Rock Russell so hard that she made so much water as caused to Keep the Pumps Continually at Work’. Her only hope was to make for Plymouth, and this she did under a press of sail, in a fresh gale and hazy weather, with the ship lurching dangerously because of the amount of water swilling about in her. She finally reached safety two days later at 1.30 p.m. and only because crews from other ships of the squadron came and helped at the pumps.³⁷ Having reached port, Captain Markham, like all good captains, rewarded his people, in this case by issuing extra rum.³⁸

*Blonde* went into dock, Moss being commissioned as her Second Lieutenant on 29 July.³⁹ Her captain and most of her crew were not to sail in her again because Captain Markham, man of influence that he was, had persuaded the First Lord, Lord Chatham, to give him command of *HMS Hannibal*, a 74-gun ship of the line that was fitting out at Portsmouth, and he took most of his people with him, Lieutenant Moss and young Hoffman among them.⁴⁰ Moss became her Second Lieutenant, Hoffman now describing him as ‘a thorough seaman [who] carried on the duty with a tight hand. Woe betide the unfortunate mid[shipman] who was remiss in his duties: the masthead or double watches were sure to be his portion. [We] designated him “The Martinet”’. His ‘noble’ captain, he now pronounced, had ‘many good qualities’ despite his ‘praying propensities’.⁴¹

*Hannibal* was ready for sea by February 1795 and became a unit of Lord Howe’s fleet in home waters, having the good fortune to capture the French 44-gun frigate *La Gentille* off the Scillies in April. During this entire period the ship’s First Lieutenant had been sick onshore with gout, and on 6 May Captain Markham wrote to the Secretary of the Admiralty: ‘I request that you will move their Lordships to gratify me in the appointment of Mr John Ralph Moss 2d Lieut.t to be first, an active zealous Officer, having passed for Lieut.¹ eleven years ago ... I trust their Lordships excuse for (sic) my application, feeling that I should discharge my duties feebly towards their

³⁶ WCRO CR2017/C244, f. 447, Moss to Denbigh, 12 June 1794.
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Lordships as well as those under my command, if I did not recommend deserving men to their notice for advancement in the King’s Service.42

At this juncture, with Moss as her new First Lieutenant, the ship was ordered to the West Indies. Markham was appalled. Eighteen months earlier, when in command of the Blonde, it seemed for a while that Admiral Jervis would not be leading the Guadeloupe expedition, he had written to his father: ‘I wish it to be understood by you that I do not wish to go to the West Indies, that is unless Sir John Jervis goes with the expedition, for I think nothing can compensate to me for my health, unless it is the prospect I had with Sir John Jervis ... I wish to make my desires known to you, for at any rate I shall wish to get back from the heat as soon as I possibly can’.43

\[Fig. 5. Map of the approximate limits of the Jamaica Station, 1795-1799. Shown under its modern name of Haiti, the western one-third of the island of Hispaniola was then the French colony of Saint-Domingue.\]
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The Jamaica Station, to which *Hannibal* was ordered, had Port Royal, Jamaica, as its main base and its area of responsibility comprised the seas surrounding the Spanish island of Cuba in the western Caribbean, from the Bahamas to the north, the Bay of Honduras on the mainland to the west, Jamaica itself to the south and the island of Hispaniola to the east (Fig. 5). This last was to dominate affairs for the next three years. Hispaniola is the second largest island in the Caribbean after Cuba, and in those days was the second most prosperous: the eastern two-thirds belonged to Spain while the western third was the French colony of Saint-Domingue, now Haiti. Between it and Cuba lay the Windward Passage, one of only two routes for trade between Jamaica and Europe. Politically, the turmoil of the French Revolution had provoked the black slaves of Saint-Domingue to rise up in 1791, leading to civil war with the white planters, who declared themselves royalist and unilaterally offered to give up ports to the British, in the hope of securing their help. This led to a Convention in August 1793 that declared Saint-Domingue to be a British Protectorate, resulting in a force of a Lieutenant-Colonel and 900 troops from Jamaica seizing the large natural harbour of Mole St. Nicolas which dominated the Windward Passage. The British, however, had no more troops to spare in the West Indies, and estimated that 5000 would be needed to capture Port-au-Prince, the capital. A paltry 1600 were sent from England in the spring of 1794 and, though initially successful, this fatal under-provision was the hallmark of an increasingly expensive and disastrous campaign; the French were broken anyway but the power of the black armies was released.

It was to Mole St. Nicolas that *Hannibal* was bound, arriving there in June 1795, and there she was to stay for much of the next three years as it fell to the Navy to support the culpably inadequate garrisons at ‘The Mole’ and at the other ports of Saint-Domingue, a situation that became worse from July when Spain ceded her part of the island to France. On the passage across the Atlantic the Captain of Marines had shot an albatross, more probably a frigate bird, an evil omen of events that were soon to manifest themselves in the forms of scurvy and yellow fever, starkly demonstrating why Markham had never wanted to serve in the West Indies.44 Two months later, still at Mole St. Nicolas, he was writing to his father, ‘Since my arrival here six of my people are dead. Thank God however we are keeping healthy excepting from the scurvy which every man in the ship has in a degree and though from time to time they become too ill to do their duty, yet by means of vegetable acids we continue to prevent its making any serious devastation as yet .... We have had so little fresh provisions these last four months. When I stated their condition to the Admiralty that nothing but very great care and considerable expence to myself would have enabled me to preserve them as they are. It was truly the most inhuman thing that men could do to send a ship out on this service in the state we were, just come in from a cruise and not permitted to refresh, while 24 sail of the line had been three months at Spithead in perfect health & fit for any service’.45 Three weeks later, with the ship in Port Royal because she had sprung her mainmast, he reported, ‘I am well’, but very frustrated being inactive in this ‘detestable land’, that he never left the ship and that he was busy with arrangements with the hospital for the increasing numbers of sick: above all he wanted to be able ‘to distinguish himself at Home’.46 Having the influence that he did, he was able to persuade the Commander-in-Chief
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to send him home in a lugger with a convoy on 1 October on the grounds of ill health. He had escaped for the good of his own health and his career, but he was not an uncaring man as his correspondence with his former First Lieutenant would reveal. The two men were almost the same age: he was thirty-four and Moss two years older, and they were clearly on friendly terms.

The backdrop to the next few months is provided by the quite frightening figures in the Sick Returns of the Royal Naval Hospital, Jamaica. Yellow fever, a mosquito-borne disease which had been cutting swaths through the troops, was endemic in all the West Indian islands and played havoc with Hanibal’s ship’s company of 590, already weakened by scurvy. About two-thirds of cases were fatal: by the end of September she had lost 53 men; in October, the worst month, another 67; and in November, 30, before the worst was over. Added to these were another 47 who deserted, mainly from hospital. The full horror of it is exposed in John Moss’s letters to his former captain, although the first is from Lieutenant Reginald Buller, the Third Lieutenant, as Moss had been struck down himself. On 8 October, a week after Markham had left for home, Buller wrote to him, ‘I am sorry to inform you poor Cope & Potts died a few hours after you left us ... Moss is recovering fast & I am happy to say the fever is not quite so bad as it was with us ... I was going to write to Copes friends of his death but I suppose you will’. Cope was a young Volunteer and Potts a Midshipman; the writer himself had only nineteen days to live.

Five of Moss’s letters to Captain Markham survive, dated between December 1795 and May 1796. They are written in a friendly tone and concentrate on three themes: the health of the ship’s company, the latest news of the war on the Jamaica Station and his own desire to get away from the disease-ridden West Indies, preferably by promotion. On 5 December, when he had yet to hear of Markham’s safe arrival home, he began, ‘I am happy to inform you that I am well altho’ I have had another very severe attack of the fatal fever, since you left us; poor Buller, Britske and Sarjeant [Lieutenants] were not so fortunate, they all fell victim to it with young Harrison [Midshipman], and thirty Men during fourteen day’s that we were on a Cruize and I am very sorry to add that, young Walker, Cope, Brandon, Martin [Midshipmen & Volunteers], and Jones your late Clerk died at the Hospital a few days after you saidl, in short its baneful effects has been dreadfully felt in the Hannibal. 170 has been buried already and many more must go I much fear; the ships Company is now reduc’d to three hundred Men & Boys and many of them in a very feeble state – We have had two Convoys on the south side of S Domingue & have been fortunate enough to Capture three Privateers, and a National Sloop of War, which has given our fellows great spirits, and makes them do their duty with cheerfulness.’ Later he added, ‘Almost all the Petty Officers and two hundred of ye crew [are dead]’, and on 6 April, looking back on a terrible few months, ‘I have wrote to you by every opportunity that has offerd; in some of my letters I mention’d the Death of my poor messmates, and my own recovery from a second and dreadful Attack – It was a scene that I shall ever remember as long as I live, Buller & Briskey absolutely bled to death – the former expired in my Arms – I now remain the only Officer that you know – how long I shall, ...
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God knows the hot months are coming quick upon us, and I then fear every thing.’

In February Moss wrote, ‘It gives me great pleasure to find that you are safe home, and that I have it in my power to say that what remains of the Hannibal’s crew is healthy; but our situation has been dreadful, all which I have acquainted you with in my former letters—I have had my escapes and hope yet to see you again’, and then went on to tell him about the various senior appointments that had been made. In March yet another under-resourced and unsuccessful amphibious attack was made, this time on the town of Léogane, close to Port-au-Prince: ‘The Army seem to blame us and we them, which is right I don’t know, as we lay at the Mole—and saved both our Bacon & Credit.’

On more personal matters, in February: ‘We have now Captain Lewis [Thomas Lewes], who has wrote the most handsome letter to [the 3rd] Lord Mulgrave in my favour (much more so than I think I deserve) I hope it may, join’d with yours & Lord Denbigh’s interest, be of use’; and in April: ‘I had the pleasure this day to receive your letter by the last Packet. I hope you know that it made me very happy—I most truly rejoice that you left us in time. The distressing scenes that followed your departure will be ever present to my memory—it was this, which I am sure would have cut you to the soul—I am thank God (only 1 ?) alive out of all that you brought to the West Indies ... Respecting my Promotion I have not heard a word. I am far from sanguine—nor do I wish any thing but to be with you at home. I am as happy with Capt Lewis as I can be—but I am out of the way, and must think that Lord D[enbigh] is in duty bound to see me provided for. You know that he has disposed of me just as he has thought proper, I therefore must surely have a Claim on him—My Obligations to you Sir I will ever remember, and allow me to thank you for your Goodness for writing to Mrs Moss—I have wrote to you by every Packet since you saild. God bless you’.

Having mentioned Lord Denbigh to Markham, he also wrote to him in the same vein, although the letter does not survive. Denbigh’s reaction does, though: on 15 September he wrote to Earl Spencer, now First Lord of the Admiralty, reminding Spencer that Moss ‘was brought up by my old Friend the late Lord Mulgrave who, by the bye, could never be persuaded but that he was my own son’. He went on to record Moss’s professional excellence and his miserable time in the West Indies and asked for him to be promoted to Commander, the next step, before signing himself in the customary way, ‘Your Lordship’s most obedient Humble Servant’, followed by ‘(And hope to be your obliged friend)’. Spencer replied ten days later that he would not ‘fail to recommend Lieut. Moss to the present Commander in Chief on the Jamaica Station’.

Poor Captain Lewes, referred to by Hoffman as ‘an elderly farmer-looking man’, very remote, died ‘unregretted’ after only four months in command. He was succeeded by Captain Edward Smith, ‘a libertine ... liked but not respected’, and apparently given to borrowing money, even from Midshipmen, and forgetting to return it. He also seemed a little accident-prone: on 2 August Hannibal was at sea as part of a squadron when, shortly after tacking, ‘at ½ past 8 [at night] the Sampson run on board of us, on the Starboard Quarter, Carried away the Lower Quarter Gallery, the
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Main topsail yard ... three of the Mizen Topmast Backstays, dismounted one of our guns, and sundry other damage. Sampson came off worse, having lost her bowsprit, foremast, main topmast and figurehead, and both ships had to spend some months in Port Royal for repair. One casualty of this collision, Hannibal’s starboard lower quarter gallery, had been fitted out by Moss as his library, and Hoffman comments mischievously that the loss of all his books was a punishment inflicted on him for mastheading the Midshipmen so often.

Later that month Vice Admiral Sir Hyde Parker (Fig. 6) assumed command in Jamaica: an able administrator, he injected some much-needed energy into operational matters and, more importantly, insisted on a properly organized victualling system, which produced some improvement to health on this disease-ridden Station. Hispaniola was to be a millstone round his neck for the next two years because the dispersed and inadequate army garrisons needed constant support at the expense of countering the large number of French privateers which were disrupting trade in the region. The only good thing about it from a naval point of view was the large and strategically-placed harbour of Mole St. Nicolas, but Parker was very short of the small ships necessary for convoying and the protection of trade generally.

Hannibal was never again to be struck so badly by yellow fever, although it remained a chronic risk, as did scurvy, despite a readier supply of fresh provisions. The general situation worsened considerably, though, with Spain’s declaration of war on 5 October 1796, and the land campaign in Saint-Domingue was going so badly and costing so much in money and men that the British government decided to send out Brigadier Sir Thomas Maitland to assess the situation. He arrived in April 1797 and immediately recommended withdrawal from Port-au-Prince and two other towns, a proposal that was resisted by the local army commanders and took the London government aback. Time drifted on, and by March 1798 the ex-slave general, Toussaint L’Ouverture, leading an army of 15,000 men, was laying siege to Port-au-Prince, having declared his intention of driving the British forces into the sea. At this point Maitland was put in command, immediately ordered the withdrawal that he had recommended almost a year earlier, and asked Parker for his help to cover it.

Fig. 6. Captain, later Admiral, Sir Hyde Parker by George Romney (© National Trust, Melford Hall)

55 TNA: PRO, ADM 51/1188, Captain’s log HMS Hannibal, entry for 2 August 1796.
56 Hoffman, Sailor of King George, p. 48.
57 ODNB, XLII, pp. 687-8.
At the same time he agreed a five-week truce with L'Ouverture so that the troops could be taken off peacefully by the Jamaica squadron, which was done between 6 and 9 May.

It soon became apparent to Parker that Maitland intended to evacuate the whole island, and this he resisted strongly because of the overwhelming strategic importance, as he saw it, of the naval base at Mole St. Nicolas for British interests in the area; in June he wrote twice to Maitland to tell him that he would refuse to agree to evacuate it: `nothing would induce me to take such a measure but express and most positive orders of government'.58 But in the end, that is what he got: evacuation of Mole St. Nicolas took place between 25 September and 4 October 1798, and these were the last British troops to leave Saint-Domingue.

Hannibal herself, with the other heavy ships of the squadron, had spent most of 1797 in and around Mole St. Nicolas providing support for the army,59 followed by three lengthy periods there in the first half of 1798, interspersed with cruises around the Station.60 On 16 May 1798 she was moored there in company with the Commander-in-Chief, whose journal for the day reads in part, `Having given Capt. Carthew of the Regulus leave to proceed to England for the Recovery of his health, Made several Appointments & Removals in consequence thereof – Having promoted Captain Dundas from the Merlin to La Prompte & Lieut. Moss to Command the Merlin, Ordered the latter to proceed to Jamaica in the Albacore & make the best of his way to Honduras. Sent orders by him to Capt. Dundas, to give up the Sloop, with all Orders & Instructions relative to the Settlement to Capt. Moss & make the best of his way to this port’.61 So, in the midst of the Commander-in-Chief’s worries over the British withdrawal from Hispaniola, John Ralph Moss at last received his longed-for promotion and disappeared westwards from the main scene of action.

When the news of his promotion reached England, Lord Spencer wrote to tell Lord Denbigh,62 who replied that, `Lord D. Makes it an invariable rule never to apply for promotion in behalf of a man, unless he is perfectly well informed of his professional ability’.63 He then wrote to Moss, `I hope you'll get [a] little prize money before you come home and then I will do my best endeavours to get you made post (i.e. to get him promoted again to the rank of Post Captain). I have informed your mother of your promotion – She is pretty well – My best compliments to Sir Hyde Parker, shew him this’.64 Moss, in a letter of thanks which crossed with this one, wrote, `to assure your Lordship that my constant endeavours shall not be wanting to merit your goodness, which I have experienced from a Child – I am waiting for the first opportunity, - hope it will soon take place’.65

The 365-ton ship-rigged sloop Merlin had been built by Dudman’s of Deptford in 1796 and had been sent straight to the Bay of Honduras to act as guard ship to the British settlement at Belize River’s Mouth, hereinafter referred to by its modern name of Belize City.66

---


59 TNA: PRO, ADM 51/1188, Captain’s log 

60 TNA: PRO, ADM 51/1228, Captain’s log 

61 TNA: PRO, ADM 50/65, Admiral’s Journal, Sir Hyde Parker, entry for 16 May 1798.

62 WCRO, CR2017/C244, f. 552, 10 July 1798.

63 Ibid., f. 553, 13 July 1798.

64 Ibid., f. 553, 29 July 1798.

65 Ibid., f. 553, 21 May 1798.

This settlement had been in existence for more than a hundred years but had no official status since it was situated in what was generally accepted to be Spanish territory under the terms of the Treaty of Tordesillas of 1494, whereby newly-explored lands on the western side of the Atlantic Ocean were allocated to Spain. By this period Belize City lay nominally in the Spanish province of Yucatan, part of modern Mexico, nominally because Spain had never made any attempt to occupy this part of its province, which is protected by the world’s second-largest barrier reef. It had become a haven for British seafarers: firstly as buccaneers and later as loggers exploiting the logwood trees although, by the late eighteenth century, mahogany was the more valuable crop.67

While, for the most part, the Spanish paid little attention to the settlement or its inhabitants, known as Baymen, regarding them as no more than an irritant, they were not above pouncing when presented with an opportunity. In 1779, when Spain entered the American War of Independence, a force from Yucatan struck at the settlement before the Baymen knew that a state of war existed, seized all the inhabitants of St. George’s Cay, an off-lying island,68 and made them all, men, women and children, black and white, march 300 miles across Yucatan to Mérida, the capital, before shipping them to Havana, where they remained incarcerated until the war ended three years later.

In 1798 the outrage of St. George’s Cay was still fresh in the Baymen’s minds. Their demi-official position had been re-established by terms in the Treaty of Versailles in 1783, modified by the Convention of London in 1786. This allowed them to continue to cut logwood, and mahogany too for the first time; to gather ‘all the fruits or produce of the earth’; but forbade them to establish plantations of ‘sugar, coffee, cocoa or other like articles’; forbade them to build any forts or stockades or any industrial capability; and continued to forbid any form of government.69 In practice this meant that the settlement was ruled by a committee of annually-elected magistrates who by July 1796, fearing an outbreak of war with Spain, had asked Governor Balcarres of Jamaica to appoint a Superintendent over them. This had first been done in 1786, but the position had been allowed to lapse. There were, after all, only some 200 Baymen, with about 500 ‘free persons of colour’ and 2000 slaves, the vast majority of whom felled the timber up-country, and customarily carried machetes supplemented by palmetto pikes in wartime.70

Thus Lieutenant-Colonel Thomas Barrow arrived in Belize City on 31 December 1796 as Superintendent, or the Crown’s representative, carrying with him a secret commission as Commander-in-Chief should war be declared.71 He discovered that the Spanish had been attacking shipping, and a captured Spanish officer told him that war had already been declared on 7 October. He found there the new sloop, \textit{HMS Merlin}, and a quantity of arms and ammunition sent from Jamaica, with little else to encourage a nervous populace. Indeed, by the following June he was reporting to Balcarres that the situation of the Settlement ‘amounts to absolute anarchy’ owing in part to the lack of troops, and shortage of


68 Cay, Caye or Key, pronounced ‘key’: OED, a low island, sand-bank, or reef, as in the W. Indies, etc.


71 TNA: PRO, CO 137/98, instructions and commission from Lord Balcarres, Lieutenant Governor of Jamaica, to Thomas Barrow, 7 December 1796.
food and clothing. Famine was a real danger: on 18 May the magistrates had resolved that ‘everyone must do his share in supplying the Merlin with food to prevent her departure’ and that people should be freed from their military duties ‘to enable them to derive subsistence from fishing, etc’. Supplies eventually arrived from Jamaica, as did some troops at the end of September: three Companies of the 2nd Regiment of the Irish Brigade and a detachment of the Royal Artillery. In January 1798 Balcarres followed up by sending officers, non-commissioned officers and drummers of the 6th West India Regiment, telling Barrow that the Baymen should provide the required 171 privates from ‘their well behaved slaves’ who would be paid. This caused uproar, but by the end of March the matter was sorted out.\footnote{Burdon, \textit{Archives}, I, p. 227.}

It was into this cauldron that Commander John Ralph Moss was plunged on 9 June 1798; a week later he was acknowledging the congratulations of the magistrates on his appointment, and promising his utmost efforts on their behalf.\footnote{TNA: PRO, CO 137/99, Barrow to Balcarres, 31 March 1798.} Moss was not impressed by the Baymen and their interminable public meetings, at which they were not averse to making resolutions proffering military advice to the Superintendent. They decided to pronounce, on hearing that a Spanish ‘Armament’ (invasion force) had been sighted 200 miles up the Yucatan coast to the north, that martial law was unnecessary. He therefore sat down on 21 July and wrote to them the most effective letter of his life:

\begin{quote}
Gentlemen,

I am sorry that I find it necessary to observe to you that there appears to me a tardiness, want of unanimity, and promptness in putting the Settlement in that state of defence it is capable of receiving, and the exigency of the present time requires.

\textbf{TIME} is evidently thrown away in desulting meetings without coming to a definitive point all which is injurious to service, particularly on a point that so materially concerns yourselves, I have only to say that if I see a manly determination on the part of the Inhabitants to defend the place that the Merlin shall remain in the most favourable position to support it while a shot remains on board, on the contrary should any person attempt to escape or effect their retreat, to the River Seboon or any other place to which they may pass within gun shot of the Merlin I am determined to oppose it without Colonel Barrow and the majority of the Community thinking it necessary. It is hardly worth my while mentioning how much the Forts may be strengthened by placing logs of wood between the embrasures and that it should be done by the negroes now in town without any delay. The Flats\footnote{‘Flats’ or Flat-boats: lighters used to carry timber down the rivers.} may be fitted in two days to receive Guns, should the enemy then force the Haulover\footnote{‘The Haulover’: a strongpoint near the river’s mouth in Belize City.}, their passage down the River may be disputed with a certainty of Success.

The Slaves must be called down and every pecuniary consideration done away till a certainty of the enemy’s intentions are known, many other precautions that may occur to yourselves must be put in practice without delay. By acting in this manner you may secure yourselves. I have therefore to beg that you will send me a Copy of your determination tomorrow by eight o’clock and should a want of unity prevail where all ought to be united I assure [you] that H.M.S. after receiving King’s
Officers and such of the Inhabitants on board that have shown Zeal on this and other occasions shall be got under way and leave you to your fate.

I am etc.,

J.R. Moss
Captain H.M.S. Merlin

Only the day before in Jamaica, a vessel had arrived reporting that the Spanish force had been at anchor off Cape Catoche, the northeast corner of Yucatan, some six weeks earlier. Their commander, the Irish-born Field-Marshal Arturo O’Neill, Governor of Yucatan, was having a difficult time. Soon after war was declared he had received instructions to conduct ‘an immediate and effective expulsion’ of the Baymen. This he set about planning to do but, described as having more of the attributes of an energetic junior officer than of a general, it had taken him a long time to organize his expedition: the fleet finally left Campeche, Yucatan’s main port, on 29 May 1798 with orders to meet the troops at Bacalar, a river port about 70 miles north of Belize City. O’Neill himself set out from Mérida on 3 June with 2000 troops to march overland the 200 miles to Bacalar. The two parts of the expedition finally merged on 28 July, but by no means in the same condition in which they had started out. In particular, O’Neill had lost his heavy guns as well as his naval expertise, in the shape of two frigates, whose senior officer had announced that they did not have the right charts for Belize and then disgracefully deserted him, proceeding to their base at Veracruz, some 400 miles away. With their departure, O’Neill’s senior naval officer for this amphibious operation was Lieutenant Don Francisco de Fuentes Bocanegra, commanding the armed schooner Feliz, who was a very junior officer and one who did not appreciate greatness being thrust upon him. In due course the expedition began feeling its way south along the barrier reef towards Belize City.

All the British knew was that they were being threatened by a considerable amphibious force commanded by a Field-Marshal, so they had every reason to be concerned. Moss’s letter to the magistrates had had an electrifying effect: apart from strengthening the forts and razing all the buildings on St. George’s Cay in case the Spanish tried to land there, local craft were taken in hand and converted to temporary warships, with the skilled work being provided by Merlin’s carpenters.

By early September Moss’s little squadron amounted to three sloops, two schooners and no less than seven flats, all armed: these last being particularly useful as they were flat-bottomed, drawing little water, and could operate freely inside and even within the reef. The two larger sloops, Towser and Tickler, each with an 18-pounder cannon, were commanded by merchant ship masters whom Moss, on 30 August, commissioned for the occasion. The rest of the crews comprised landsmen, colonial troops and slaves.

79 TNA: PRO, ADM 52/3214, Master’s Log HMS Merlin, entries for 15, 20, 25, 29 and 30 August, and 1, 3 September 1798.
80 TNA: PRO, CO 137/101, ff. 37-39, Barrow to Balcarras 23 September 1798, Moss to Parker, 27 September 1798. These are the two commanders’ campaign reports, published in the London Gazette, 22 January 1799.
81 Burdon, Archives, I, p.252, Captain Potts’s commission.
Meanwhile the Spanish force came slowly southward along the reef; their accounts mention the first skirmishes taking place on 31 August. The British, although aware of the gathering threat, do not mention any action until 3 September. The discrepancy can be accounted for by O’Neill’s character and consequent tactics. He was without naval advice and trying to capture a port that lay behind a huge reef, with the only known channel deep enough for ships of any size to pass through lying beyond Belize City itself, to the south-west. Thus he felt he needed to be cautious, but he wasted time in excessive reconnaissance, councils of war and unnecessary withdrawals, which gave his enemy plenty of time to prepare.

On 3 September, though, five of the smaller Spanish vessels were observed trying to find a way through the shoals by Montego Cay, about eight miles northeast of Belize City (Fig. 7). They tried again the following day while their main force remained at anchor off Cay Chapel, six miles further north, having marked the channel they had found with beacons and stakes: these the Baymen, in canoes and flats, removed by night. On the third day, 5 September, the Spanish tried again with two more vessels and a number of launches, but met with a similar lack of success. On the 6th their whole fleet weighed anchor and they came south outside the reef.

Merlin meanwhile had remained at anchor as close to Belize City as possible to provide protection should the enemy have landed up the coast and come overland. Moss was very restricted by the reef in what he could do: either he stayed where he was, or he had to go out to sea by the deep channel mentioned above, which would take him twenty miles away from the enemy until he was outside the reef, when he could turn northwards, following its seaward edge. Having watched the Spanish probing slowly southwards, with no attempt at landing their troops, he decided the moment had come to stop them dead in their tracks. He weighed anchor on the evening of the 5th and, having had to anchor again overnight as going through the reef in darkness was foolhardy, he arrived off St. George’s Cay in time to force the Spaniards to turn back to their previous anchorage. Once there they showed little sign
of movement, and Moss went in close to the cay and moored there, in a spacious anchorage that was as close to the enemy as he could get, whilst barring their way to Belize City, while he disposed the little vessels of his squadron across their line of advance.

The Spanish remained at anchor for four days, then weighed and made as if to attack before anchoring again. This was the period when O’Neill ordered Lieutenant Bocanegra to attack the British ships, but the latter refused saying that his duty was only to escort the troop convoy. The Field-Marshal was no doubt astounded but showed his innate weakness by failing to tell Bocanegra in no uncertain terms to get on with the attack; and then not only allowed him to insist on an order in writing, but called a Council of War as well. The Council determined that Bocanegra should lead the attack, whereupon he refused again, and O’Neill’s reaction was to nominate a junior Lieutenant, Don Pedro Grajales, in his place.

This brings us to the Battle of St. George’s Cay itself on 10 September, recorded in Merlin’s Master’s Log as follows: ‘½ past 1 PM the enemy’s vessels got underweigh and bore down on us. ½ past 2. Seeing that their intention to lay two of our Gun Boats on board, opened our fire which they returned and continued until 4 o’clock when they rowed and towed off in confusion into shallow water’. Part of the reason for this was that Moss, concerned about a possible landing on the cay, had sent a message to Barrow asking for soldiers, at which his colonial troops had commandeered all the available small craft and set off enthusiastically to do battle. They never got there, but the sight of them panicked young Grajales, who ordered a retreat. The Spanish never advanced again, not that year nor ever.

This terse log entry summarises admirably the culmination of a long campaign to which Moss was introduced at a late stage: on 10 September he had been in Belize for three months, whereas Field-Marshal O’Neill had been planning this attack for over two years. But the latter, in spite of having overwhelming force, had no effective naval advice at all. He faced, in Moss and Barrow, a pair of opponents who were relatively junior in rank but wise, energetic and fearless despite the apparent odds against them. Their success lies in comments made by Barrow in his excellent report written after the action: after roundly praising his naval colleague, he continues, ‘I am happy to say that the most cordial co-operation has always existed between us’, a comment all too often missing in the long history of combined operations.

By the end of September it was at last clear that the Spanish were not coming back, and on the 26th Merlin’s log reads: ‘At 5 unmoored. ½ past 7 weighed and made sail. Returned the Armed Sloops to their proprietors’, and she anchored in her usual berth off Belize City the next day. Barrow signed his report of the battle on 23 September, Moss not signing his until 27th. The difference between them is instructive: Barrow’s is a lengthy and full account of the events of the week of 3 to 10 September. Moss had to write two reports, one to his Commander-in-Chief and the other direct to the Secretary of the Admiralty, and they are altogether more succinct, reflecting the writer’s concerns of being in an exposed anchorage on the front line, followed by a tricky twenty-four hours navigating back through the reef. The Admiralty’s version was the shortest of all, though Moss’s letters both contained an unusual mention for a report of a naval action: ‘The spirit of the Negro slaves that manned the small craft was wonderful and the good

82 TNA: PRO, ADM 1/2136, Cap M 343, Moss to Nepean, 27 September 1798.
management of the different commanders does them credit’.

These naval and military reports reached London together on 19 January 1799, and were published on the 22nd. All this time Merlin remained on guard at anchor off Belize City where she was to remain until July, when she was relieved by the sloop HMS Albicore. The intervening ten months passed quietly enough, indeed they must have been excruciatingly boring: 21-gun salutes were fired on 18 January for the Queen’s birthday, and on 5 June for the King’s; the ship’s company was mustered periodically and the Articles of War were read, the great guns were exercised, and stores ships arrived occasionally from Jamaica escorted by warships, one of which was HM Schooner Recovery which disembarked two officers for the Merlin on 18 March: Lieutenant Robert Knipe, a new officer, and Mr. Pearson, the Master, who had been in hospital in Jamaica.83 It is from the logs of these two officers that we know what was to happen later in the year.

Earlier the Magistrates had shown their gratitude to Moss by resolving that ‘the thanks of this Meeting be given to Captn Moss of His Majesty’s Ship Merlin for his gallant defence against the Spanish fleet at St Georges Key and that His Majesty’s Superintendant be requested to transmit a copy of the same to Admiral Sir Hyde Parker and to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, recommending Captn Moss for Promotion in His Majesty’s Navy ...’.84 We do not know how that resolution fared but Moss had sensibly written a third report of the battle to his patron, Lord Denbigh. It had got lost in the post, so he had sent another which Denbigh forwarded immediately on 31 March 1799 to the First Lord of the Admiralty, commenting, ‘I therefore hope and trust he will no longer want my assistance in troubling you for promotion, not doubting but his own merit will be a recommendation much stronger to your Lordship than any thing I can say in his behalf’.85 Spencer wrote back the next day: ‘I return Capt. Moss’ Letter whose Conduct has been highly meritorious, and he shall be noticed in an early Opportunity’.86 However, this was to no avail, for ‘man proposes, but God disposes’.

On Friday 19 July the Master’s log records, ‘Employed wooding and watering the ship, getting her ready for sea’. Six days previously Albicore had arrived ‘with some prizes’ and almost certainly with orders for Merlin to go to Port Royal for repair and maintenance. On hearing of his forthcoming departure the Belize magistrates sprang into activity, and at a Public Meeting on 16 July resolved that an Address ‘be presented to Capt. Moss on account of his leaving the settlement’, and also ‘a letter expressive of the good conduct of the officers and seamen of the ship Merlin’, added to which ‘a sword to the value of one hundred guineas be presented to Captn Moss in the name of the inhabitants as a token of the great sense they entertain of his services to the settlement’.87 He replied on the 18th, ‘thanking them for their friendly address and assuring them that his influence will not be
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found wanting with Sir Hyde Parker in furthering the protection of the Settlement’, and returning sincere thanks to the [his] officers and men, ‘whose firmness has enabled me to receive such testimony of respect’.88

It was a stormy day on 24 July: Knipe remarks that there were ‘strong gales and [it was] cloudy’.89 *Merlin* ‘made and returned a salute of 11 guns to the forts’ and set off down the channel through the reef. Within 30 minutes she had lost her mizzen topsail yard, which was found to be rotten, and she anchored, still inside the reef. The next day she tried again at 6 a.m., but it was squally and she gave up again after two hours, anchored, and ‘stayed the masts and set up rigging’ for the rest of the day: she was showing every sign of having been moored and inactive for months on end. Again at 6 a.m. on Friday 26 July she weighed anchor under reefed topsails and was clear of the reef by noon, to start her slow voyage eastwards to Jamaica, into the eye of the prevailing wind.90

The logs report nothing out of the ordinary until on the morning of Saturday 10 August there appears the simple statement, ‘at 9 Departed this life Captain Moss’. At noon the ship’s Latitude by observation of the sun was 19° 14’ North, only six miles south of the island of Grand Cayman, which lay somewhere to the east.

How did Moss die? We do not know: although the ship carried a surgeon, Hugh McVey, his journal does not survive. It seems probable that Moss contracted a third bout of fever in Belize City, probably malaria rather than yellow fever because of the lengthy incubation period, and that this one killed him. His work was not in vain, however, although it may have seemed to be so at the time. The war with Spain ended in 1802 with the Peace of Amiens, and the settlement in the Bay of Honduras was so insignificant to the British government that it was not mentioned in that treaty at all. Thus the terms of the unsatisfactory 1786 Convention of London remained theoretically in force, which led to the next Governor of Yucatan pressing feebly for the territory to be given up, but he had no stomach for a fight. War broke out again in 1804, lasting until 1808, when Napoleon invaded Spain, and she changed sides. All this passed the Baymen peacefully by, and in 1825 Britain recognized Mexico’s independence from Spain. In 1862 the settlement at Belize River’s Mouth in the Bay of Honduras became the colony of British Honduras, under the oversight of the Governor of Jamaica, achieving the status of a Crown Colony, with a governor of its own, in 1871.91 Following decades of border disputes, firstly with Mexico to the north and then Guatemala to the west, the country, renamed Belize in 1973, became fully independent in 1981 as the only English-speaking nation in Central America.92

At dawn the next day *Merlin*, under the command of Lieutenant Knipe, sighted land and the pilot was on board by 11 a.m., the ship being anchored close to the shore at 2 o’clock. This must have been in Hog Sty Bay, near the southwest tip of the island, as the contemporary Sailing Directions advise that ‘the only place of anchorage is at the west end, abreast of the Hogsties’ (Fig. 8).93 The Master’s Log continues,

88 BARS, MLA, Moss to the magistrates, 18 July 1799.
89 National Maritime Museum (NMM), ADM/L/M/104, Robert Knipe’s Lieutenant’s log entry, 24 July 1799.
90 TNA: PRO, ADM 52/3214, Master’s Log *HMS Merlin*, entries for 24 to 27 July 1799.
93 UK Hydrographic Office, q43 Shelf ag1, G. Gauld, Grand Cayman Island chart and sailing directions, 1773.
‘Sent the body of Cap’ Moss Deceased on shore for interment attended by all the officers. Fired 15 minute guns and interred the body with the accustomed military honours. At 6 [a.m., the 12th] weighed and made sail. Discharged the pilot at 8 a.m. the NW end of Grand Cayman S[outh] b[y] E[ast] 6 miles. Fresh breezes and Cloudy weather’. Omitted was any mention of the Purser, John Gurney, being found on the island after the funeral so drunk that he had to be taken back to the ship by the Gunner, lying unconscious in the bottom of the boat. At his subsequent Court Martial in Jamaica aboard HMS Hannibal, still commanded by Captain Smith, the Court heard that ‘Whilst on Shore to attend the funeral of the late Captain Moss at the Grand Cayman, [he] conducted himself in a manner as disgraceful in the eyes of the Inhabitants of that Island, who readily came forward to assist on that unfortunate occasion, as in the Officers and Ship’s Company’s, by drinking to a state of extreme intoxication’. They were unimpressed by his claim of having had to take quantities of ‘Rum and Oil’ for medical reasons, found the charge ‘fully proved’ and adjudged him ‘to be broke and rendered ever incapable of Serving as an Officer in any capacity in His Majesty’s
Navy; and to serve before the Mast onboard any Ship the Commander in Chief of His Majesty’s Ships and Vessels shall think proper to direct. And he is hereby sentenced to be Broke and rendered incapable accordingly’.94 Thirteen days after leaving Grand Cayman, on Saturday 24 August 1799, shortly after noon, with ‘Moderate breezes and clear weather’, Merlin anchored in Port Royal harbour, Jamaica ‘with the best bower Anchor in 9 fathoms water’95 to tell the Commander-in-Chief that her captain had died at sea, and later the mail packet would take the news home to his widow and small son in Falmouth that, after over four years’ away, John Ralph Moss was no more.96
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94 TNA: PRO, ADM 1/5350, Court Martial Papers, 1799 July-Oct, and ADM 35/1120; ‘broke’ was to be cashiered, to serve ‘before the mast’ was to serve as a rating, again in Gurney’s case. He had joined Merlin as a 23-year-old Ordinary, or semi-skilled, Seaman in 1796 (SB No.38), was a Midshipman in June 1797, and took over as Purser when the previous one died in July 1798. He was sent to HMS Pelican, another sloop.
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Conservation of Brasses, 2013

William Lack

This is the twenty-ninth report on conservation which I have prepared for the Transactions. Thanks are due to Martin Stuchfield for invaluable assistance with the brasses at Baconsthorpe, Bocking, Hillingdon, Lowthorpe, Orford, Stokesby, Tiltshead and Winterton; to Derrick Chivers for assistance at Hillingdon; to Patrick Farman and Peter Hacker for assistance at Lowthorpe; to Leslie Smith for assistance at Luddesdown; and to the incumbents of all the churches concerned. Generous financial assistance has been provided by the Francis Coales Charitable Foundation and the Monumental Brass Society at Bocking, Hillingdon, Orford, Stokesby, Tiltshead and Winterton. The brasses at Baconsthorpe, Stokesby and Winterton have been given ‘LSW’ numbers following surveys for the forthcoming Norfolk County Series volume.

Baconsthorpe, Norfolk

LSW.I. Inscription to Alice Heydon, 1479 (Fig. 1). This Norwich 2 brass comprises an inscription in two Latin lines (63 x 336 mm, engraved on three plates with thickness 3.7, 3.5 and 3.4 mm, 4 rivets). At the 1868 restoration the brass was taken up in its slab; the slab was cut down and set into the east wall of the south aisle. When Martin Stuchfield visited the church to record the brasses for The County Series he found the central portion of the inscription missing from the indent. Enquiries revealed that the fragment had become detached some fifty years ago and was in safe-keeping locally. With diocesan approval the other pieces were removed from the slab on 17 February 2013. After cleaning I rejoined the three plates and fitted new rivets. The brass was reset on 27 July 2013.

Bocking, Essex

LSW.XV. World War II memorial. This inscription (355 x 609 mm, thickness 3.4 mm, 6 screws) forms part of a memorial erected c. 1920 and extended shortly after World War II. It was removed on 13 December 2012. The plate was cleaned, polished, lacquered and reset on 30 April 2013.

Hillingdon, Middlesex

Two brasses were removed on 11 June 2012.

M.S.V. Inscription to Anne Wilson, 1569. This London G brass (410 x 565 mm overall, engraved on a main plate with 10 English verses and two smaller plates, thicknesses 1.4, 3.0 and 3.3 mm, 17 rivets) had been relaid in a small slab on the south wall of the south aisle. It had suffered considerable corrosion and was not well secured. The two small plates were found to be palimpsest, being cut from the upper part of an effigy of a priest in cope, engraved c. 1460. After cleaning I produced resin facsimiles of the palimpsest reverses, repaired fractures, fitted new rivets and rebated the brass into a cedar board.

M.S.VII. Inscription and achievement to William Gomersall, 1597. This Johnson-style brass, comprising an inscription in six lines of Roman Capitals (132 x 529 mm, thickness 1.8 mm, 8 rivets) and an achievement

3 The brasses were described by Dr H.K. Cameron in part 17 of ‘The Brasses of Middlesex’, Trans. of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Soc., XXVII (1976), pp. 263-7 and figs. 5, 7 and 8.
(217 x 194 mm, thickness 2.0 mm, 4 rivets), was removed from the original slab in the west wall of the south aisle. The plates were considerably corroded and not well secured. After cleaning I fitted new rivets and rebated the brass into a cedar board.

The two boards were mounted over the slabs on 4 September 2013.

Lowthorpe, Yorkshire

M.S.I. George Salveine, 1417, and wife Elizabeth (Fig. 2). This York 1c brass now comprises an armoured effigy (661 x 196 mm, thickness 3.7 mm, 4 rivets) and a mutilated three-line Latin inscription (originally 106 x 770 mm, now 106 x 546 mm, thickness 3.4 mm, 3 rivets). The female effigy and four shields are lost. The brass was originally laid down in the chancel. Towards the end of the eighteenth century the roof of the chancel deteriorated and the chancel became ruined. In about 1800 a brick wall was built across the west end of the chancel, covering the upper part of the slab. The male effigy was removed from the slab and kept loose in the vestry for many years, before being mounted on a board on the north wall of the nave, where it was noted by Mill Stephenson in 1926. The inscription had become lost. In 1952 the head of the female effigy was discovered in the slab; it was removed and rubbed but has been lost since then. The mutilated inscription was re-discovered during a house clearance in Scarborough in the 1940s but was not identified until 1979-80. It was returned to the church in 1981 and mounted on the north wall beneath the effigy. The effigy was subsequently mounted in a new stone, but was stolen from the church in 1999. Mr. Peter Hutchings of Barnt Green was commissioned to engrave facsimiles of both effigies and these were set into a modern stone together with the remaining portion of the original inscription and four blank shields. The effigy was recovered in July 2001, having been left in nearby Howden church with a crudely written note. When Mr. Stuchfield visited the church on 28 July 2001 he found the new stone stored on its side in the Tower/Vestry. After this Mr. Hutchings removed the inscription from the new slab and replaced it with a brass facsimile. He mounted the effigy and inscription on a board and this was stored in the vestry.

5 The inscription was recorded when complete by Roger Dodsworth who visited the church in 1622 (Yorkshire Church Notes, College of Arms, f. 72B).
6 The original slab survives, in poor condition and exposed to the elements. The upper part is covered by the brick wall and the exposed portion measures 1430 x 1090 mm.
7 MBS Trans., III, pt. 3 (1898), p. 143.
Fig. 2. George Salveine, 1417, and wife Elizabeth (M.S.I)
Lowthorpe, Yorkshire
(rubbing: Patrick Farman with head of female effigy by John Page-Phillips)
The plates were removed from the church on 10 April 2010. The base of the effigy and the left-hand end of the inscription were distorted and dished, the result of their previous ill-treatment! After cleaning I fitted new rivets. Michael Ward produced a resin facsimile of the lady’s head from John Page-Phillips’ rubbing. Mr. Andrew Adamson of Ebor Stone Co. Ltd. produced a new stone of Hopton Wood limestone measuring 1200 x 875 mm and cut indents for the male effigy, inscription and facsimile. I re-laid the brass and facsimile in the slab on their premises at Tollerton on 12 August 2013. Mr. Adamson mounted the stone on the north wall of the nave on 2 September 2013.

Luddesdown, Kent

M.S.I. [James Montacute, 1452] (Fig. 3).

This London B brass now comprises a mutilated armoured effigy (originally about 695 x 220 mm, now 441 x 186 mm, thickness 4.2 mm, 3 rivets). It originally comprised the effigy, foot inscription and two shields, and was laid on an altar tomb in the chancel. In 1865 the roof of the nave collapsed and the tomb was presumably dismantled during the subsequent restoration. The mutilated effigy was secured in a new slab set into the base of the east wall of the south chapel in an inaccessible location. The organ is located at the east end of the chapel leaving only a narrow area between it and the wall, accessed through a curtain beside the organ. I removed the brass on 10 May 2013. It had become quite corroded and was secured into the slab with three large woodscrews rendering it vulnerable to theft. After cleaning and fitting new rivets the effigy was rebated into a cedar board with a conjectural outline of the missing parts. The board was mounted on the south aisle wall on 15 October 2013.

11 In The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent, 2nd edn., 12 vols. (Canterbury, 1797-1801), II, p. 373, Edward Hasted recorded that ‘In the chancel, ... in the north-east corner, over an altar monument, are two brass plates; on one, the effigy of a man in armour; on the other a shield, being two coats quarterly, 1st and 4th, three lozenges in fess; 2d and 3d, an eagle displayed, over all a batton dexter; there has been another plate of arms, which as well as the inscription, is lost.’ He attributed the brass to James Montacute, illegitimate son of Sir Thomas Montacute, 4th Earl of Salisbury, who died in 1452. Old drawings of the tomb, the slab and a shield with this blazoning, dating from 1830-50, are preserved in the British Library.
Orford, Suffolk

M.S.IX. Civilian, inscription and three sons; the remains of the brass to Bridget Coo, 1580, and two husbands. This London G brass, comprising the right-hand male effigy (469 x 180 mm, thickness 1.7 mm, 7 rivets), a mutilated five-line English inscription (originally 128 x c.675 mm, now 128 x 638 mm, engraved on three plates, thicknesses 3.3, 3.1 and 2.9 mm, 5 rivets) and a group of three sons (228 x 154 mm; thickness 2.9 mm, 2 rivets), was taken up from the original Purbeck marble slab (1970 x 1085 mm) in the north chapel on 15 February 2012. The surface of the slab has been extensively made up with cement and there are very worn indents for the left-hand male effigy (475 x c.180 mm), female effigy (c.475 x c.190 mm) and two effaced groups of children. The brass was conserved by W.E. Gawthorp c.1930. The left-hand male effigy has been in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries of London since 1920. The Society has agreed to return the plate on permanent loan.

The inscription was discovered to be palimpsest c.1904 and found to be cut from two separate Flemish brasses which were both engraved c.1470. The group of sons was also found to be palimpsest, the reverse showing part of a third curving Flemish border inscription. This was engraved c.1440 and links with the reverse of the group of sons from the brass of a civilian and wife, c.1580 (LSW.II), at Wendron in Cornwall. After cleaning I produced resin facsimiles of the palimpsest reverses and fitted new rivets. The inscription and sons were relaid on 15 April 2013. As already noted the left-hand effigy is scheduled to be returned from the Society of Antiquaries of London. As the indents for the two male effigies from this brass are almost effaced, arrangements are being made for these to be recut by a stone mason and both effigies will then be relaid. Facsimiles of the palimpsest reverses will be mounted on a board and this will be secured in the north chapel at the same time.

M.S.XI. Bridgett Smith, 1605 and her daughter Jone Bence, 1603. This Johnson brass, comprising two female effigies (upper originally 765 x 301 mm, now 729 x 301 mm, thickness 1.7 mm, 14 rivets; lower 624 x 251 mm, thickness 1.6 mm, 16 rivets), two inscriptions in four English verses (upper 113 x 683, thickness 2.3 mm, 10 rivets; lower 138 x 580 mm, thickness 1.8 mm, 8 rivets), one son (158 x 65 mm, thickness 1.8 mm, 2 rivets), three daughters (153 x 143 mm, thickness 1.4 mm, 4 rivets) and a marginal inscription in English (1864 x 964 x 64 mm, engraved on 6 fillets, mean thickness 2.0 mm, 52 rivets), was taken up from the original Purbeck marble slab (1940 x 1035 mm) in the south chapel on 15 February 2012. The marginal inscription was conserved and relaid on 14 December 2012. The sons and daughters are known palimpsests, both being cut from an English inscription of similar date which was never laid down. After cleaning I produced resin facsimiles of the palimpsest reverses and fitted new rivets to the brass. I soldered a rivet to the reverse of the upper female effigy where the plate had fractured across the original rivet-hole. The effigy, inscriptions and groups of children were relaid on 4 April 2013.

17 Palimpsests, p. 75, pl. 133 (318L1), and ‘10th Addenda to Palimpsests’, p. xlviii, pl. 237.
Stokesby, Norfolk

Five brasses were removed from their slabs early in the twentieth century and screwed to a wooden platform in the chancel. They were removed from the platform in 1979 and thereafter put into storage locally. They were collected on 5 March 2012.

LSW.I. Inscription to Dorothy Berney, c. 1470 (Fig. 4). This is a Norwich 3 two-line Latin inscription (68 x 311 mm, thickness 3.1 mm, 2 rivets).

LSW.III. Thomas Gerard, 1506 (Fig. 5). This brass comprises the upper part of a London debased F effigy in academic dress (292 x 211 mm, thickness 4.2 mm, 2 rivets) and a Norwich 5 three-line Latin inscription (94 x 559 mm, thickness 4.4 mm, 3 rivets). The head of the effigy is mutilated and the inscription broken across the centre.

LSW.IV. Ann Clere, 1570 (Fig. 6). This London G brass comprises the lower part of a female effigy (150 x 219 mm, thickness 4.1 mm, 3 rivets), an inscription in ten Latin verses with one Latin line (259 x 444 mm, thickness 3.7 mm, 6 rivets) and two shields (upper sinister shield 143 x 119 mm, thickness 2.2 mm, 3 rivets; lower dexter 142 x 119 mm, thickness 2.0 mm, 3 rivets). Two other shields are lost. An engraving by Cotman, reproduced as Fig. 7, shows the brass more complete (with the head and shoulders of the effigy and one other shield). The brass is palimpsest, the reverses of the inscription and effigy both showing parts of Flemish inscriptions and the reverse of the shields a geometrical pattern.

LSW.V. Ann Clere, 1614 (Fig. 8). This London brass comprises a female effigy (636 x 250 mm, thickness 2.1 mm, 10 rivets), a five-line English inscription (156 x 636 mm, thickness 2.1 mm, 10 rivets), a group of five sons (179 x 248 mm, thickness 2.6 mm, 5 rivets) and a group of six daughters (180 x 249 mm, thickness 2.5 mm, 5 rivets).

LSW.VI. Inscription to John Holte, 1616 (Fig. 9). This London brass comprises a four-line Latin inscription (98 x 447 mm, thickness 1.9 mm, 6 rivets).

After cleaning I produced resin facsimiles of the palimpsest reverse of LSW.IV and fitted new rivets to the brasses and facsimiles. They were rebated into two cedar boards, LSW.I, IV and VI into the first and LSW.III and V into the second. The boards were mounted on the north wall of the nave on 3 April 2013.


19 Palimpsests, p. 65, pl. 107 (248L1-3); and ‘10th Addenda to Palimpsests’, p. lii, pl. 240 (248L4).
Fig. 5. Thomas Gerard, 1506 (LSW.III)
Stokesby, Norfolk
(rubbing: Martin Stuchfield)

Fig. 9. Inscription to John Holte, 1616 (LSW.VI)
Stokesby, Norfolk
(rubbing: Martin Stuchfield)
Fig. 6. Ann Clere, 1570 (LSW:IV)
Stokesby, Norfolk
(rubbing: Martin Stuchfield)
Fig. 7. Ann Clere, 1570 (LSWIV)
Stokesby, Norfolk
(from Cotman, Engravings of Sepulchral Brasses in Norfolk and Suffolk)
Fig. 8. Ann Clere, 1614 (LSW.V)
Stokesby, Norfolk
(rubbing: Martin Stuchfield)
Fig. 10. Parham inscription, 1876; before conservation
Tilshead, Wiltshire
(photo: Martin Stuchfield)

Fig. 11. Parham inscription, 1876; after conservation
Tilshead, Wiltshire
(photo: William Lack)
Tidmarsh, Berkshire
LSW.II. [Henry Leynham, 1517]. This London F brass now comprises a mutilated armoured effigy (originally 925 x 290 mm, now 836 x 290 mm, thickness 4.6 mm, 6 rivets) and four shields (134-5 x 109-13 mm) which lie in the original Purbeck marble slab (1850 x 745 mm) in the chancel. The slab is quite worn and has been made up with cement in places; there is an indent for a lost foot inscription (110 x 470 mm). The effigy was removed from the slab on 29 November 2012. After cleaning I fitted new rivets. The plate was relaid on 8 May 2013.

Tilshead, Wiltshire
Inscription to John Parham, 1875, aged 81, and son, George Parham, 1870, aged 51; recording the Foundation of John Parham’s Charity in 1876. This eleven-line inscription (336 x 764 mm, thickness 2.7 mm, 4 screws) was formerly mounted directly to the wall below the south-west window of the south aisle. It had become seriously corroded (Fig. 10) and was removed from the wall in July 2011. It was collected 21 February 2013. It was cleaned, lightly polished, lacquered and rebated into a cedar board (Fig. 11). The board was mounted on the south aisle wall on 8 April 2013.

Winterton, Norfolk
LSW.II. Inscription to Thomas Husband, 1676, and wife Anne (Fig. 12). This ten-line English inscription (306 x 566 mm, thickness 1.7 mm, 12 rivets) had been screwed into a wooden frame which had been loose in the vestry since 1925! The plate was considerably corroded. It was collected from the church on 19 March 2013. After cleaning and removing corrosion, I repaired a fracture, fitted new rivets and rebated the plate into a cedar board. The board was mounted on the north wall of the chancel on 30 December 2013.

---
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