

The medieval episcopal monuments in Llandaff Cathedral

By RHIANYDD BIEBRACH

The six surviving medieval episcopal effigies at Llandaff cathedral have been the focus of scholarly debate and speculation for many years, including on several occasions in the pages of this journal.¹ Well before this, however, beginning with the visit of the royalist soldier and antiquarian Richard Symonds (1617–1660) to Llandaff in 1645,² the episcopal monuments had begun to exert a fascination over successive generations of observers compelling them to attempt to identify the figures commemorated and explain them according to the *mentalité* of the day. It may be argued that enough ink has already been spilled over these monuments, however none of the conclusions so far reached regarding their identity and purpose have been completely satisfactory, and this important collection of memorials amply repays further study. Taken as a group, Llandaff's episcopal monuments reveal a great deal about the nature of the late-medieval diocese, its bishops and its socio-economic and cultural links, while a recreation of the vagaries of their existence during the cathedral's later eventful history helps to explain their present location and appearance. Previous authors have aimed to reconcile their current positions with those recorded by Symonds and by the cathedral's other great chronicler, Browne Willis, in the early eighteenth century³ although the merits of this approach are somewhat limited by the flaws apparent in these accounts. It is the aim of this article therefore, to utilise a number of other little-studied sources as well as these more well-known descriptions, in order to put forward a new appraisal of these monuments which, it is hoped, will prove to be as definitive as the circumstances will allow.

THE MONUMENTS IN CONTEXT: LLANDAFF CATHEDRAL FROM THE TWELFTH TO THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Llandaff cathedral as we now know it was commenced by Bishop Urban (1107–34) in 1120. Only the chancel arch and a few other remaining fragments testify to the quality and beauty of the work executed during this short-lived Romanesque phase, and by the beginning of the following century work was under way to rebuild in the new Gothic style, under the patronage of Bishop Henry of Abergavenny (1193–1218).⁴ In the second half of the thirteenth century the Lady Chapel was added by Bishop William de Braose (1266–87);⁵ extensive alterations to the nave walls were made in the fourteenth century, and the north-west 'Jasper' tower was added at the end of the fifteenth. Building work ceased when the see became impoverished in the middle of the sixteenth century as its lands were leased and the offerings of the faithful dried up. By 1575 the building was suffering greatly from neglect,⁶ and by the early eighteenth century was in a worse state, structurally, than any other British cathedral.⁷ In 1718 Browne Willis reported that, although the windows were 'tolerably entire' the building was not well kept, and the 'whole Fabrick looks out of Order', with the old tower looking particularly weak.⁸

In the early 1720s the tower, together with fifty feet of roof over the west end and the south aisle, fell. The west door was subsequently blocked up and services were moved to the only safe part of the building, the Lady Chapel.⁹ A plan for the rebuilding of the cathedral in the newly fashionable neo-classical style was hatched and in 1752 the Bath architect, John Wood, erected a neoclassical structure around the sanctuary and choir at a cost of £7,000.¹⁰ The so-called 'Italianate temple' was generally considered an architectural and aesthetic travesty, but it may have preserved some of the medieval features of the

cathedral, including some of the effigies, because it was erected within the medieval walls, occasioning the removal or walling-up of certain items. The tomb of St Teilo, for example, was walled up and plastered over *in situ*, not to be re-exposed until a century later.¹¹ The rest of the building continued to deteriorate, however. By 1797 many of the monuments were in a neglected and ruinous state,¹² and by 1802 the nave and side aisles were completely in ruins.¹³ A visitor in 1805 saw green mould covering the aisle walls outside the confines of the temple, and ‘immense books’ lying scattered in heaps on the vestry floor.¹⁴ This picture of utter neglect is somewhat ameliorated by another account, of 1827, that although the building was ruinous ‘many figures and whole effigies’ had been removed from it, and presumably stored nearby.¹⁵ This suggests a measure of concern for the cathedral’s medieval sculpture, but how much was lost or damaged at this point can only be guessed at.

In the middle of the nineteenth century Bishop Ollivant (1849–82) began a thorough and sensitive (by Victorian standards) rebuilding of the whole structure. Not all the monuments were restored to their former positions, however,¹⁶ and what is seen now is largely a creation of that period. The building sustained bomb-damage in 1941, and underwent further restoration from 1948–57. In the following discussions the extent to which these upheavals have increased the difficulties of studying the cathedral’s memorials will become evident.

THE MONUMENTS

Six medieval episcopal monuments survive in Llandaff cathedral. Five are thirteenth-century in date and the sixth dates from the end of the fifteenth century. Several identities have been proposed for some of these monuments and it is by no means certain who most of them were intended to commemorate. It is currently accepted that the oldest of the memorials is that of Bishop Henry of Abergavenny (d. 1218) (Fig. 1), which lies under a niche in the south aisle, although there is no inscription on the monument to confirm this as fact. The figure of the bishop is carved from Blue Lias in fairly low relief,¹⁷ with a semicircular canopy over his head, on a tapered slab. The facial features are worn, but it is easy to discern the tall mitre and protruding ears. The left hand rests on the lower torso, holding a staff across the body from the left shoulder to the outside of the right ankle, where it is broken. The right hand is raised across the chest, possibly in benediction, but it is too worn to be certain. The feet lie on a flat ledge and an animal’s head (curiously, with no body) appears by the outer side of the right foot in such a position that it would have been speared by the staff in its unbroken state. The drapery is rendered in flat, shallow folds.

Dating from slightly later in the thirteenth century are the monuments traditionally identified as those of Sts Teilo (Fig. 2) (in a Victorian recess in the south side of the sanctuary) and Dyfrig (Fig. 3) (in a decorated wall niche in the north choir aisle), two of the diocese’s sixth-century founding saints, while another was recently identified by Madeleine Gray as possibly that of the third founding saint, Euddogwy (Fig. 4) (in a niche in the north nave aisle).¹⁸ The figure of ‘Teilo’ is executed in Dundry stone, quarried near Bristol, and is framed by side-shafts terminating in stiff-leaf capitals, from which springs a trefoiled, gabled canopy, flanked by figures. These figures have apparently proved difficult to interpret—Newman, for example, simply called them angels¹⁹—but they are in fact quite clear, if a little worn. That on the left is indeed an angel, holding aloft a smaller human figure in its hands, representing the soul ascending to Heaven, and on the right is a Virgin and Child, the Virgin now headless.²⁰ Within the point of the gable, above the middle lobe of the trefoil, is a rayed star or sun. The head of the effigy, which is very worn, lies within the canopy and wears a low mitre. The left hand holds what remains of the staff diagonally across the body, while the right is raised in benediction. The drapery is more naturalistic than that of Henry of Abergavenny and is formed by thin, rather flat folds. The footrest (which takes the form of a cockatrice), capitals and canopy are covered in modern gold paint.



Fig. 1. Effigy of Bishop Henry of Abergavenny (d. 1218).



Fig. 2. Effigy traditionally identified as St Teilo.



Fig. 3. Effigy traditionally identified as St Dyfrig.

Dyfrig, regarded as the first bishop of Llandaff,²¹ is the individual currently linked with the effigy in the decorated recess in the north choir aisle.²² As it stands now the Dundry stone effigy, recess and accompanying sculptured fragments are clearly an amalgam of at least two different monuments, from the thirteenth and probably the fifteenth centuries. The effigy is delicately carved, although much worn. The head lies within a plain, unobtrusive arch, on a flat, square cushion, the corners of which overlap the inner rim of the arch, and there are no side-shafts. The bishop holds a staff over the right-hand side of his body, while the left hand rests on the left side of the abdomen and grasps a scroll, which descends down toward the knees and drapes itself over the staff. There is no footrest, the feet merely lying on a plain slab. The head is one of the most intriguing features of this effigy. It wears a high mitre and has a short beard and a small, flat object, shaped rather like a heart or an ivy leaf, rests on the right upper lip, as though coming out of his mouth. That this is not an accident of weathering, or damage, is demonstrated by the appearance of the same feature on the closely similar effigy further west in the north aisle (Fig. 4). What this object is, and its significance, is unknown.

As indicated above, the recess and most of the accompanying sculptural fragments are not thought to be originally associated with the effigy. The arch is Perpendicular in style, with semicircular arcading on the inside walls and back face of the recess. In the centre of the back wall is a shield-shaped panel depicting the Instruments of the Passion and on the underneath of the arch, positioned so that an effigy would be able to 'see' it, is a carving of the Image of Pity. On the tomb chest are placed, immediately below the slab, three panels. At each end is a half-length shield-bearing angel and in the centre is a worn panel of Christ in Majesty. Underneath these figures, and running the whole length of the chest, is an arcade of eight blind panels, formed by trefoiled ogee arches. The Christ in Majesty panel is the only element of this arrangement which may possibly have an authentic association with the effigy. It, too, is carved from Dundry stone and is of comparative date. Christ's robes have been given a very similar treatment to the vestments of 'Dyfrig', both exhibiting deep, narrow ripples, and it is conceivable that the same sculptor was responsible, but how it fitted in to the overall composition of the original tomb—if at all—is impossible to say.

The shield-bearing angels, Instruments of the Passion, Image of Pity and tomb-chest arcade, however, are of a much later date than the thirteenth-century effigy and cannot be part of the original tomb of 'Dyfrig'. While the ogee arch is seen from the beginning of the fourteenth century, shield-bearing angels are more normally associated with fifteenth-century and later tomb chests. The Instruments of the Passion and Image of Pity carvings also fit in with a later-medieval provenance, as a strong Christocentric strand appeared in fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century piety, elements of which encouraged the contemplation of Christ's body and wounds. It may also be significant that all these pieces are carved from Painswick stone, which may indicate that they were originally part of the same monument.²³

A third Dundry stone effigy, suggested by Gray as possibly that of Euddogwy but more recently named as that of Bishop William of Radnor (1257–65),²⁴ lies under a plain recess of thirteenth-century character in the north aisle of the nave, and is very similar to that of 'Dyfrig'. The figure lies with its head under a plain, arched canopy, attended by angels. His hands lie on his stomach, the right resting on a staff, the left lying on a scroll which descends down over the staff to the feet, which rest on a flat, broken-off slab. The head, like that of 'Dyfrig', wears a tall mitre and has the same heart-shaped, flat object against the right-hand side of the mouth, and somewhat larger in size. There is no beard, however, and the ears protrude, unlike those of 'Dyfrig'. The treatment of the drapery on both monuments is very similar, having the same narrow, rippling folds, although here the vestments seem less voluminous and the depth of the folds less marked. The flanking angels, when seen in isolation from 'Dyfrig', are very worn and difficult to interpret, but are likely to follow the same principles: the left-hand angel, for example,



Fig. 4. Effigy of unknown bishop.



Fig. 5. Effigy of Bishop William de Braose.

appears to be swinging a censer. This bishop and ‘Dyfrig’ may have been intended as a pair, or one may have been commissioned specifically in imitation of the other, perhaps in emulation of an illustrious predecessor.²⁵

The only monument which can be named with absolute certainty is that of Bishop William de Braose (Fig. 5), whose effigy in the north-east corner of the Lady Chapel carries the inscription WILLELMUS DE BREWSA EP’S LA’D. This monument is similar to that of Henry of Abergavenny in its use of Lias and its rather flat, stiff characteristics, although of a more developed form. The figure is set on a tapered slab within an architectural frame formed by side shafts, terminating in round, moulded capitals, topped by fleur-de-lis pinnacles. These are decorated with naively-carved naturalistic foliage, of a different form on each pinnacle. A trefoiled arch connects the two shafts. Within the upper lobe of the arch is set the bishop’s head, wearing an acutely pointed mitre. Unusually, the eyes are closed, and this looks like an original feature rather than later recutting. His left hand holds his staff across his body, diagonally from his left shoulder to just below his right inner knee, and his right hand is laid flat upon his upper chest. The effigy ends abruptly at the bottom hem of the vestments, where the feet and any footrest have been cleanly cut away. The drapery of the vestments is rather stylised, formed by regular ridged folds, giving a corrugated appearance.

Finally, after a hiatus of over two centuries, there is the monument of Bishop John Marshall (1478–96) (Fig. 6), which lies in the location in the north aisle where he requested burial in his will.²⁶ Bishop Marshall’s effigy, although made of Dundry stone, is a far inferior product to the thirteenth-century examples in this material. It is a very stiff composition, with no naturalism in the folds of the vestments or fluidity in the figure. The bishop lies with his head resting on a single, deep cushion, accompanied by angels, and holding his hands in prayer. Unusually these are held a number of inches apart, as if in a rather unconvincing depiction of the *orans* position. His feet rest on an odd-looking animal best described as a lion, which grasps a round object in its paws. The effigy lies on a chest reconstructed from panels of blind arcading on the south side and quatrefoils interspersed with mouchettes on the north, while a square plaque of the Instruments of the Passion has been affixed to the eastern end. The arcades are too shallow to have housed any sculpted figures, but they may have been painted. The chest is stylistically of a comparable date to the effigy itself, but there is clearly some difficulty in seeing the two as an entirely homogeneous whole, aside from the problem of the former’s asymmetry. The chest is too wide for the effigy, the top slab shows evidence of repair and patching and the plaque is awkwardly placed. While the various elements of the chest may, in fact, be part of the tomb’s original fabric, therefore, it is unlikely that they are in their correct positions.

IDENTITY AND FUNCTION

As has already been observed, the only bishop definitely known to have been commemorated by one of these monuments is William de Braose. His is by far the most straightforward of all the thirteenth-century episcopal monuments at Llandaff as it has an identifying inscription and can be linked to a specific period in the cathedral’s development. Bishop de Braose was responsible for the erection of the Lady Chapel, in which he made extensive use of Lias and ultimately chose to be buried, and so the use of Lias for his memorial—no doubt as a substitute for Purbeck marble—is readily understandable.²⁷ The patron of de Braose’s monument clearly took advantage of the presence on site of the stone, and the craftsmen accustomed to working it, in order to obtain a memorial marking his burial in a spiritually powerful area of the church. This monument, moreover, is one of the very few in Llandaff which does not seem to have been moved.²⁸



Fig. 6. Effigy of Bishop John Marshall (1478–96).

We can also be relatively certain about John Marshall, whose monument covers his burial place and fits his date of death in stylistic terms. The other four, however, are largely a matter of tradition. The identity of these bishops is a vexed question, but it is one worth trying to resolve if the motivations behind the commissioning of the monuments are to become clearer. The earliest commentator to name individual episcopal monuments was Browne Willis at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Willis's information was based on tradition rather than epitaphs, however, and so the best that can be said for his identifications is that they may represent a folk-memory of the medieval past. His first identification is of the bishop now on the south side of the sanctuary, which he names St Teilo (Fig. 2),²⁹ and most other commentators have since echoed this attribution.³⁰

The identity of the two bishops in the north aisle, however, is less straightforward. In Willis' time the name 'St Dyfrig'³¹ was attached not to the bishop in the north choir aisle as in current usage (Fig. 3), but to an effigy (Fig. 4) which then lay to the east of Bishop Marshall (Fig. 6). This is not made apparent in the published *Survey of Llandaff Cathedral* of 1718, where effigy 4 is not named, but is recorded in the fuller and apparently more accurate notes made in 1722 and preserved among Willis' papers in the Bodleian Library:³² 'on the North side the Choir is a Tomb of Bp John Marshall who died 1496 & above him is on One Side the Communion Rails St Dubritius'.³³ By the end of the eighteenth century the latter monument had been moved to lie alongside Bishop Marshall on the same tomb-chest, and was drawn in this position by the antiquary and draughtsman John Carter FSA in 1803.³⁴ That this was *not* the monument now thought of as 'Dyfrig' is clear from Carter's drawing: the clean-shaven face and prominent ears showing it to be the effigy which now lies in the more westerly niche in the north nave aisle (Fig. 4), which had previously been empty. Other commentators during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have taken Dyfrig to be effigy 4, such as R. W. Griffith in 1890 and J. H. James in 1929.³⁵ It is not clear when St Dyfrig came to be associated with the other bishop in the more elaborate tomb recess further east in the north choir aisle (Fig. 3), but the confusion had certainly arisen by the 1860s when E. C. Walcott so named it.³⁶

This confusion has undoubtedly been largely fostered by the close similarities between the two effigies concerned—a situation complicated by the removal of effigy 4 to different locations in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is also notable that a few authors have apparently entirely overlooked the fact there are two very similar monuments in the north aisle: Compton-Davies omitted effigy 4 from his list of bishops' tombs; F. J. North noted only two Dundry monuments of the thirteenth century instead of three and, perhaps most surprisingly of all, the current cathedral guidebook leaves effigy 4 out altogether.³⁷ To complicate matters further, effigy 3 has often been also identified as that of Bishop Edmund Bromfield (1389–93). Willis, Griffith, James, Alfred Ollivant, Peter Lord and Pat Aithie have all assumed this to be the case.³⁸ On stylistic terms it is highly improbable that this monument originally commemorated Bromfield, however, as it is quite clearly the work of the first half of the thirteenth century and bears little resemblance to episcopal effigies of the end of the fourteenth century, which invariably hold their hands in prayer and rest their heads on double cushions.³⁹

Three main observations can be drawn from this confusion. Firstly, two of the three founding saints of the diocese, Teilo and Dyfrig, have been associated with the Dundry effigies fairly consistently since at least the beginning of the eighteenth century. The confusion over which bishop is thought to represent St Dyfrig has come about more recently, however, as a result of the movements of effigy 4 in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and its close physical similarities with nearby effigy 3. Secondly, there has been a persistent association of Bishop Bromfield (d. 1393) with effigy 3, which can also be traced back to the early eighteenth century, and each of these traditional attributions undoubtedly represent an earlier oral tradition. Although, as has been demonstrated, effigy 3 cannot have been originally commissioned for Bromfield, we may have the echoes here of the previous existence of another monument to him which had disappeared by Willis' time.

The third and most puzzling observation is that no actual early thirteenth-century bishop of Llandaff is known to have been associated with any of the contemporary Dundry effigies, suggesting that the relevant individuals eschewed this form of commemoration. This is surprising as the precedent for effigial commemoration had been set with Henry of Abergavenny and Llandaff was well-positioned to take advantage of the Severnside trade in craftsmen, materials and ideas to commission fitting memorials—as the existing effigies themselves demonstrate.⁴⁰ Moreover, only one of Llandaff's thirteenth-century bishops, William of Christchurch (1240–44), did not die in office, leaving ample opportunities for episcopal commemoration. Other than Henry of Abergavenny and William de Braose, however, only one other thirteenth-century bishop, William of Radnor (1257–66), is known to have had a monument, leaving four for whom no memorial seems to have been erected.⁴¹ William of Radnor's monument is sometimes thought to be effigy 4,⁴² but—as with effigy 3 and Bromfield—this seems unlikely stylistically and Radnor's actual monument is thought to have disappeared after 1722 (see below). Alternatively, it is feasible that one of the Dundry monuments may have originally commemorated the builder-bishop Henry of Abergavenny (d. 1218). It is true that he has always been associated with the Blue Lias effigy in the south aisle (Fig. 1), but this is only a matter of tradition, and it seems strange that the man responsible for the early Gothic Dundry work at the cathedral did not take advantage of the presence of the craftsmen and material to commission a monument that was more in keeping with the architectural achievements of his episcopate than the rather old-fashioned-looking Blue Lias slab.⁴³ The Bishop of Abergavenny's date of death is not out of keeping with the style of the Dundry effigies, particularly the two in the north aisle, which have so much in common with the Wells west front statuary of the same date.⁴⁴

Another possibility which should be considered is that the thirteenth-century Dundry effigies were indeed intended as retrospective memorials to the founding saints with whom they have long been associated. The episcopacy was the first social group to embrace the memorial effigy and by the thirteenth century the episcopal monument was functioning as much more than a mere aid to the remembrance and salvation of an individual and was firmly established as a symbol of episcopal continuity.⁴⁵ This made the episcopal effigy a valuable political as well as a spiritual tool, a propensity recognised in the commissioning of the retrospective effigies of seven Saxon bishops at Wells cathedral. The effigies were carved in two campaigns from the first to the third decades of the thirteenth century. All are stock episcopal types and were intended not so much to commemorate the individual bishops, as to emphasise the antiquity and continuity of the see, since Wells had by this time lost its cathedral status to Bath. The seven bishops formed part of a campaign—which included the magnificent rebuilding and the forest of statuary on the west front—designed to win back cathedral status for the church.⁴⁶

The bishops of Llandaff also had cause to employ art in the service of propaganda. Since the episcopacy of Urban (1107–34) there had been a history of rivalry between Llandaff and the adjoining dioceses of St David's and Hereford. Urban complained to the pope of encroachments upon the territory of Llandaff, which he claimed was an ancient diocese, by the neighbouring sees. A concerted effort was being made at that time to make Llandaff a fitting seat for a bishop: St Dyfrig's relics were brought from Bardsey to join Teilo's in 1120 and in the same year Urban began a total rebuilding of his church in grand Romanesque style. In support of Urban's territorial claims he presented documents which purported to record grants of land made in the time of the bishopric's founding saints in the sixth century, which were later put together to form the *Liber Landavensis*.⁴⁷ In this document Herefordshire-born Dyfrig, the first bishop of Llandaff, is not only referred to as archbishop of the whole of southern Britain, but he is also seen as an influence on St David, who he persuaded to attend the Synod of Brefi, thus proving the 'antiquity and grandeur' of Llandaff.⁴⁸ According to Geoffrey of Monmouth, Dyfrig was crowned archbishop of Caerleon by King Arthur himself.⁴⁹ Geoffrey regarded Dyfrig's disciple and successor as

archbishop, Teilo, as no less important. On pilgrimage to Jerusalem with Sts David and Padarn, Teilo was shown by his actions to be the holiest of the three.⁵⁰ Less fantastic claims are made for Euddogwy, but as Teilo's successor he is also seen as a worthy founder.⁵¹ Llandaff's founders were thus established as leading figures in the early Christian history of Wales, and their association with the diocese was undoubtedly intended by later medieval propagandists to contribute to its political and spiritual importance. Urban's tireless campaigning was ultimately fruitless, however, and his death 'effectively ended the dispute over diocesan boundaries'.⁵²

Even so, Urban's claims, and those of the *Liber Landavensis*, were not entirely forgotten, and were resurrected under bishops Nicholas (1148–83) and Elias de Radnor (1230–40).⁵³ They were claims surely worthy of emphasis through the erection of the founding saints' effigies in their newly reconstructed cathedral, especially at a time when St David's had itself been undergoing an extensive rebuilding and was putting forward claims to primacy in Wales. The Romanesque reconstruction of St David's commenced in 1182 and has been seen as the catalyst for Llandaff's own rebuilding in the new Gothic architectural idiom.⁵⁴ Given this historical context, coupled with the fact that there has been a long tradition of associating St Dyfrig and St Teilo in particular with the thirteenth-century Dundry effigies, it must be considered that these effigies may have been conceived as retrospective memorials, commissioned to draw attention to Llandaff's ancient and distinguished Christian roots. This practice would certainly have been a familiar concept to both the clergy and craftsmen working at Llandaff at the time due to the precedent set at Wells.

However, there are problems with this theory. Firstly, none of the effigies display any saintly attributes such as nimbus, nor any other iconography that might mark out holiness, as may be expected on the memorial of a saint. Secondly, and more importantly, there are no surviving indications on the effigies of the supposedly archiepiscopal status claimed for the saints in the *Liber Landavensis*, such as the cross-staff and pallium. Admittedly, the heads of all three staffs are broken off so it is impossible to tell what form they took, but the pallium is nowhere in evidence, unless it was painted.⁵⁵ If the effigies were intended to commemorate the founding saints in order to enhance Llandaff's prestige, surely more effort would have been made to emphasise the primacy of their status as archbishops. Unfortunately there are few surviving pictorial depictions of Dyfrig, Teilo and Euddogwy with which to compare the effigies. An illumination depicting St Dyfrig in the late fifteenth-century Warwick Roll does not suggest that the craftsmen responsible for the 'Dyfrig' effigy were making an effort to identify him. In the Warwick Roll he has a nimbus and bears the three staffs of the arms of Llandaff, one of which is the archiepiscopal cross-staff and, as has already been pointed out, neither of these features is found on either of the two effigies historically associated with Dyfrig.⁵⁶ Pictorial representations of Dyfrig are so few, however, that it is difficult to assess whether these attributes were a later innovation or if they would have been associated with him in the thirteenth century.

This lack of clear personal identification with Dyfrig (or Teilo and Euddogwy) in the Llandaff effigies can be contrasted with two late fourteenth-century retrospective monuments to early Welsh saints in Anglesey. The 'effigies' of St Pabo, at Llanbabo, and St Iestyn at Llaniestyn, were probably set over their relics at their respective churches, and in both cases an attempt has been made to evoke the personal attributes of these early saints. Iestyn is unconventionally represented as hooded and bears a brooch and staff of archaic form, while the royal status of Pabo is indicated by his crown and sceptre.⁵⁷

The issue of identification has been further complicated by a recent claim that the Dundry figures may not be effigies at all and are better seen as statues—of the three founding saints—from the cathedral's west front in a pre-figuration of the scheme at Wells. This is an interesting suggestion, and is worth consideration. An iconographic scheme which included statues of the cathedral's prestigious founders in prominent positions in niches on the west front would indeed have added to the splendour of the new

building and emphasised the antiquity of the diocese. According to members of the Welsh Stone Forum in a paper published in *Archaeologia Cambrensis* in 2006, reading the figures as vertical statues rather than horizontal effigies would be consistent with several features. Effigies 3 and 4 in the north aisle both lack footrests, their feet resting on a plain ledge. This, and the positioning of the censing angels, is considered to indicate a lack of recumbency, and there is evidence of weather erosion from above consistent with being in a vertical position out-of-doors.⁵⁸ However, other than the weathering and perceived lack of recumbency, there is no evidence that the effigies were ever on the west front. The patterns of erosion could easily have occurred when the nave lost its roof and was in ruins, or when effigies were removed during the eighteenth-century ‘restoration’.⁵⁹

Despite this intriguing suggestion, the monuments are undoubtedly best read as recumbent effigies as their designs are entirely consistent with contemporary episcopal memorials. Achieving a convincing sense of recumbency was an issue early thirteenth-century sculptors wrestled with and the monuments’ canopies and ‘Teilo’s’ side-shafts are standard features of contemporary sepulchral sculpture. ‘Teilo’, moreover, does have a footrest, while the lack of the same on ‘Dyfrig’ and ‘Euddogwy’ is mirrored on the Saxon bishops at Wells, as well as on the Lias effigy of Henry of Abergavenny.⁶⁰ Other than tradition and a conducive contemporary situation, there is a lack of any convincing evidence that the Dundry bishops represent the founding saints, and the alternative possibility that they commemorate actual thirteenth-century bishops—or are even retrospective memorials to earlier bishops in the manner of the Saxon bishops at Wells—is ultimately a more logical one.

LOST MONUMENTS

Richard Symonds’ seventeenth-century account of the cathedral’s monuments is an often puzzling record, but it makes clear that there was once a greater number of episcopal memorials than survive today, although it is probably safe to discount his intriguing description of ‘A naked body, with a mitre on his head, going out of his mouth, and layd hold on by an angel, for his soule’.⁶¹ The reference to the naked body suggests that Symonds somehow muddled one of the bishops’ effigies in the north aisle with the nearby cadaver effigy, which he does not otherwise refer to. More interesting is his observation of a now lost robbed out episcopal brass—a very rare example of this form of monument in medieval Wales.⁶²

The brass is not the only memorial to have been lost. Willis’s manuscript notes made during his visit in 1722 reveal that there were at that time nine medieval episcopal monuments in total compared to the six we have today. A monument which lay on the altar steps in 1722, but was moved to a bench in the south aisle the following year, Willis identified tentatively as that of Bishop William de Radnor (d.1265), and this may have been non-effigial in character.⁶³ This indicates that effigy 4—sometimes identified as William de Radnor—cannot be the one Willis had in mind here as he saw that monument in a different position (see above). More importantly, he identified the robbed-out brass seen by Symonds in 1645 as the monument of Bishop John Pascall (d. 1361), who ‘had on ye Stone his Effigies in Brass with an Inscription on a plate of Brass but this is all tore off’.⁶⁴ Pascall’s monument was in the Lady Chapel, as was the third lost monument, that of John of Monmouth (d. 1323), who ‘had his Effigies cut in the Stone with a French Inscription Seemingly round the Verge but time has Obliterated it’.⁶⁵ By the time John Carter completed his detailed drawings of the cathedral and its monuments in 1803, all three had vanished. Significantly, each of the disappeared memorials is likely to have been what may be termed a ‘minor’ monument, in that they were not elaborate sculpted figures on tomb chests. Pascall’s was an empty stone indent, de Radnor’s sounds as if it could have been a non-effigial cross slab, and Monmouth’s was possibly an incised slab—a form of memorial where the figure is ‘cut in[to] the stone’ rather than

carved in three dimensions. Each of these monuments is likely to have been flatter, possibly less eye-catching (although maybe still painted, gilded or enamelled) and certainly less cumbersome than a sculpted effigy, and would therefore have been in greater danger of loss, wear, destruction or damage during the period of the cathedral's greatest neglect in the eighteenth century.

The 'rediscovery' of these monuments in Willis' papers also solves another mystery, namely the apparent two-century hiatus between the bishops of Llandaff's sustained interest in monumental commemoration during the thirteenth century and its revival by John Marshall at the end of the fifteenth. It is now clear that the trend in fact continued into the fourteenth century with John of Monmouth in the 1320s and John Pascall in the 1360s. Llandaff's bishops were not unusual in this. Between 1271 and 1350, 108 English and Welsh bishops died, and only fifteen years passed in this period when an episcopal monument was not commissioned.⁶⁶ The low number of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century episcopal monuments at Llandaff compared to those of the thirteenth century is easily explained as a number of bishops were translated elsewhere and did not die in office.⁶⁷ Furthermore, after the middle of the fourteenth century there was a collapse in the market for monumental commemoration, especially of an effigial form, throughout south Wales, the result of pressures to which the bishops must also have been exposed.⁶⁸

CONCLUSION

The thirteenth century was a dynamic time in the history of Llandaff cathedral. It witnessed extensive rebuilding in the hands of active and ambitious clerics keen to enhance the prestige of the diocese, and who took advantage of the flourishing cultural links within Severnside in order to do so. The evidence of the bishops' effigies suggests that the diocese of Llandaff was thoroughly integrated into mainstream fashions in contemporary commemorative culture. The superb quality of the Dundry monuments, although difficult to appreciate in their current state, cannot be doubted, and indicates the presence of the best craftsmen the region had to offer, while the Blue Lias effigies suggest that financial constraints may have necessitated opting for a local substitute to fashionable and prestigious materials such as Purbeck marble. Unless further evidence comes to light it may never be possible to resolve satisfactorily the conundrum of Llandaff's medieval episcopal memorials, and the arguments presented above show that the traditions surrounding them, although of some antiquity, should not be taken too literally. On balance it is probably best to assume that the thirteenth-century Dundry effigies commemorate some of the diocese's contemporary or earlier bishops, but were unlikely to have been originally intended as memorials to the founding saints, with whom there seems to have been no attempt to link them iconographically.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The photographs in this article, which are by the author, are reproduced by permission of the Dean and Chapter of Llandaff Cathedral.

NOTES

1. M. H. Bloxham, 'On the sepulchral effigies and sculptured monuments in Llandaff Cathedral', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 4th ser., 10 (1879), 33–43; R. W. Griffith, 'The episcopal effigies in Llandaff Cathedral', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 5th ser., 7 (1890), 196–204; M. Gray, 'The medieval bishops' effigies at Llandaff Cathedral', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 153 (2004), 37–51.

2. Charles Edward Long (ed.), *Diary of Richard Symonds* (London, 1859).
3. Browne Willis, *A Survey of the Cathedral Church of Llandaff* (London, 1718).
4. Malcolm Thurlby, 'The early Gothic fabric of Llandaff Cathedral and its place in the West Country School of masons', in J. R. Kenyon and D. M. Williams (eds), *Cardiff: Architecture and Archaeology in the Medieval Diocese of Llandaff* (Leeds, 2006), 62.
5. J. North, *Stones of Llandaff Cathedral* (Cardiff, 1957), 102.
6. W. R. Compton-Davies, *Historical and Pictorial Glimpses of Llandaff Cathedral* (Cardiff, 1900), 32.
7. E. T. Davies, 'John Wood's Italianate temple', *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales* 6 (1956), 70.
8. Browne Willis op. cit. (note 3), 29.
9. J. H. James, *A History and Survey of the Cathedral Church of Llandaff* (Cardiff, 1929), 16.
10. *Ibid.*, 16–17. See also, Davies op. cit. (note 7).'
11. National Library of Wales (NLW), MS LLCh/42, fo. 13: Extract from a paper given by T. H. Wyatt at the meeting of the Royal Institute of Architects, 1848.
12. Cardiff Central Library (CCL), MS 3.127, vol. 6, fo. 86: Richard Colt Hoare's Tour Journals.
13. CCL, MS 3.127, vol. 2, fo. 60.
14. NLW, MS 678b, fo. 147: Richard Vaughan Yates' Tour through Wales.
15. CCL, MS 2.325, fos 41–2: Diary of Judith Beecroft's Excursion to Wales.
16. Alfred Ollivant, *Some Account of the Condition of the Fabric of Llandaff Cathedral*, (London, 1860), 25–7.
17. North op. cit. (note 5), 46.
18. Gray op. cit. (note 1).
19. John Newman, *The Buildings of Wales: Glamorgan* (London, 1995), 251.
20. The soul held by an angel is also seen on the Tournai marble slab of Bishop Nigel (c. 1169) at Ely cathedral (Cambridgeshire).
21. G. H. Doble, *St Dubricius*, (Guildford, 1943), 30.
22. Gray op. cit. (note 1); Chrystal Davies, *Around and About Llandaff Cathedral* (Much Wenlock, 2006), 25; Pat Aithie, 'The art of Llandaff Cathedral', in Nick Lambert, ed., *Llandaff Cathedral* (Bridgend, 2010), 160, where it is thought more likely to be that of Bishop Edmund Bromfield (d. 1393), for which, see below.
23. Madeleine Gray has suggested that the fifteenth-century cadaver effigy, which lies just to the east and is also carved from Painswick stone, may have originally lain in this recess: Gray op. cit. (note 1), 40–1, and pers. comm. This is a plausible suggestion not just for petrological reasons, but also because the iconography of the horrors of Christ's Passion chimes particularly well with the feelings of humility, repentance and pity which cadaver memorials were designed to elicit in spectators. On the other hand, the cadaver effigy fits its present alcove well stylistically, and there is no evidence that it has ever lain anywhere else.
24. Aithie op. cit (note 22), 160–1. This attribution is discussed further, below.
25. The three Dundry stone monuments described here have been linked convincingly to the early-to-mid-thirteenth-century work at Wells cathedral. It is possible to see similarities between 'Teilo' and the retrospective episcopal effigies at Wells, produced at the beginning of the century. Although 'Teilo's' face is more worn than those of the Wells bishops their proportions are similar, with rounded chins (on some of the Wells examples), short stubby noses and prominent, bulging eyes, and the feet share the same sturdy quality. The treatment of the drapery on a small headless figure next to the canopy of Bishop Sicarus at Wells, as well as its proportions and attitude, are

- very close to those found on either side of 'Teilo's' canopy. While it may not be possible to claim that the Wells bishops and 'Teilo' are products of the same hand or workshop, there are enough similarities to propose that the 'Teilo' craftsman had at least seen what had been done at Wells. The closest stylistic references to the effigy of 'Dyfrig' are to be made with some of the figures on the west front of Wells cathedral, executed from the 1220s to c. 1240. Particular similarities with the treatment of 'Dyfrig's' head, beard and vestments can be seen in the figures of a noble, two bishops and a king on the buttresses and centre panel. See also discussions in: Paul Williamson, *Gothic Sculpture 1140–1300* (New Haven, 1995), 107, 111, 210; Thurlby op. cit. (note 4), 74–81.
26. The National Archives, PROB 11/10, image reference 363.
 27. North op. cit. (note 5), 80, 86, 101.
 28. The Lady Chapel remained intact and functional when the rest of the building fell into ruin and so there appears to have been no need to remove this effigy.
 29. Browne Willis op. cit. (note 3), 17. In Willis' time this effigy was described as being in a niche behind two seats beyond the door that goes into the chapter house.
 30. Bloxham op. cit. (note 1), 37, calls it Bishop Staunton (d. c. 1294), but his is an extremely flawed account. The following have all settled on Teilo: E. C. Walcott, 'Llandaff: the Cathedral', reprinted from the *Cambrian Journal* (1864), Glamorgan Record Office, DL/DC/D/17; Ollivant op. cit. (note 16), 25; Griffith 1890 op. cit. (note 1), 203; James op. cit. (note 9), x; Gray op. cit. (note 1), 43; Aithie op. cit. (note 22), 160.
 31. Or more usually in this period, the Latinised form 'Dubritius' or 'Dubricius'.
 32. Bodleian Library (BL), MS Willis 104.
 33. BL, MS Willis 104, fo. 8. The accuracy of this account is confirmed by a floor plan of Llandaff Cathedral from the corrected proofs of the *Survey*: NLW, MS 19046B.
 34. BL, Add. MS 29, 940, fo. 31. Carter (1748–1817) moved in the same circles as Richard Gough and other antiquaries and was the draughtsman of the Society of Antiquaries from 1780. Carter's sketches of Llandaff cathedral preserved in the British Library include particular and general views of most of the monuments and he plotted their positions on a floor plan of the church: fo. 11.
 35. Griffith 1890 op. cit. (note 1), 198–200, 202; James op. cit. (note 9), x, 31.
 36. Walcott op. cit. (note 30); followed by Compton-Davies op. cit. (note 6), 57.
 37. Compton-Davies op. cit. (note 6), 57; North op. cit. (note 5), 74.
 38. Browne Willis op. cit. (note 3), 18–19; Griffith 1890 op. cit. (note 1), 202; James op. cit. (note 9), 34; Ollivant op. cit. (note 16), 26; Peter Lord, *The Visual Culture of Wales: Medieval Vision* (Cardiff, 2003), 188 and fig. 294, 189; Aithie op. cit. (note 22), 160.
 39. See, for example, the effigies of Archbishop Courtenay (c. 1395) at Canterbury and Bishop William of Wykeham (d. 1404) at Winchester. M. H. Bloxham, writing in *Archaeologia Cambrensis* in 1879, suggested Bishop Barret (d. 1396) as the person commemorated by this effigy, but his account has several idiosyncratic conclusions regarding identities and should be treated with caution: Bloxham op. cit. (note 1), 34–5. Barret is as equally unlikely as Bromfield in stylistic terms, of course. John Newman gives no suggestions for effigy 3: Newman op. cit. (note 19), 252)
 40. For south-east Wales' extensive cultural, economic, political and social links with the west country see, for example: R. A. Griffiths, 'Medieval Severnside: the Welsh connection', in R. R. Davies, R. A. Griffiths, I. G. Jones and K. O. Morgan (eds), *Welsh Society and Nationhood: Historical essays Presented to Glanmor Williams* (Cardiff, 1984), 70–89; idem, *Conquerors and Conquered in Medieval Wales* (Stroud, 1994); Thurlby op. cit. (note 4), 60–85.

41. William of Goldcliff (1219–29), Elias of Radnor (1230–40), William de Burgh (1245–53) and John de la Ware (1254–56). William of Radnor’s lost monument is discussed below. Care must be taken around these issues: although the commemoration of the dead and intercession for the soul was a central theme in late-medieval Christianity this could be addressed in a variety of ways and an elaborate sculpted effigy was not necessarily de rigeur, even for a bishop. Nor did high-status monuments always have to be effigial in nature. Furthermore, we have only a sketchy idea of what has been lost from Welsh churches and it may have been the case that some bishops chose to be buried elsewhere, as did John de Eglesclif, a Dominican, who was buried with his order in Cardiff in 1347.
42. Newman op. cit. (note 19), 254; Aithie op. cit. (note 22), 160–1.
43. The Blue Lias slab, with its semi-circular canopy, can be fairly compared with the effigy of Bishop Jocelin de Bohun (d. 1184) at Salisbury cathedral, however the Llandaff example is very worn and the stone may have been chosen as a convenient alternative to the fashionable Purbeck marble: North op. cit. (note 5), 101.
44. See note 25.
45. Howard Colvin, *Architecture and the Afterlife* (New Haven, 1991), 138.
46. Williamson op. cit. (note 25), 105.
47. Cowley, ‘The Church in medieval Glamorgan 1: the Church in Glamorgan from the Norman Conquest to the beginning of the fourteenth century’, in Glanmor Williams (ed.), *Glamorgan County History, Vol. 3: The Middle Ages* (Cardiff, 1971), 87–93.
48. Doble 1943 op. cit. (note 21), 6–7, 14, 29–31.
49. *Ibid.*, 30.
50. Doble, *St Teilo* (Lampeter, 1942), 8, 17.
51. G. H. Doble, ‘St Oudoceus’, *Journal of Theological Studies* 43 (1942), 209.
52. Cowley op. cit. (note 47), 93.
53. *Ibid.*
54. Thurlby op. cit. (note 4), 62, 82.
55. See Matthew J. Sillence, ‘The two effigies of Archbishop Walter de Gray (d. 1255) at York Minster’, *Church Monuments* 20 (2005), 5–30, for the significance of the cross-staff and pallium and their appearance on images of archbishops. Both are seen on the effigies of archbishops Stratford (d. 1348), Courtenay (d. 1396) and Chichele (d. 1434) at Canterbury.
56. Peter Lord is unsure whether the decoration around the shoulders and down the front of the chasuble in the Warwick Roll illumination was an archiepiscopal pallium or orphreys, but judging by the way in which this feature follows the folds of the chasuble it is more likely to be the latter, which would be embroidered, rather than the former, which was a separate strip of material: Lord op. cit. (note 38), 110 and fig. 164. The pallium was pinned to the chasuble and both pallium and pins are prominent on the effigy of Archbishop Stratford at Canterbury.
57. Lord op. cit. (note 38), 216–7, figs 340, 341.
58. Gray op. cit. (note 1), 40, 43, 48, 49.
59. An early nineteenth-century observer remarked how she saw ‘many figures and whole effigies which had been removed out of the ruins.’: Diary of Judith Beecroft’s excursion to Wales, 1827, CCL, MS 2.325, fos 41–42.
60. Some bishops are represented with their feet resting on a corbel, rather than an animal, which can give the impression of a standing statue, especially when combined with architectural surrounds such as side-shafts: N. J. Rogers, ‘English episcopal monuments, 1270–1350, II. The episcopal

- monument', in John Coales (ed.), *The Earliest English Brasses: Patronage, Style and Workshops 1270–1350* (London, 1987), 19.
61. Long op. cit. (note 2), 213.
 62. See Rhianydd Biebrach, 'Conspicuous by their absence: rethinking the reasons for the lack of monumental brasses in medieval Wales', *Transactions of the Monumental Brass Society* 18, i (2009), 36–42.
 63. BL, MS. Willis 104, fo. 8.
 64. BL, MS. Willis 104, fo. 3.
 65. BL, MS. Willis 104, fo. 3.
 66. Rogers op. cit (note 60), 16, fig. 5.
 67. Thomas Rushook (1383–85) to Chichester, William Bottlesham (1385–89) to Rochester, Tideman de Winchcombe (1394–5) to Worcester, John Burghill (1396–98) to Lichfield, Thomas Peverell (1398–1407) to Worcester.
 68. Plague and other disruptions, such as Owain Glyn Dŵr's rebellion, seem to have caused a contraction in the client base and contributed to the failure of the native monument industry. See Rhianydd Biebrach, 'Monuments and Commemoration in the Diocese of Llandaff c. 1200–c. 1540', Swansea Ph.D (2010), 113–25.

