

The Works Chantry Screen in the Great South Transept of Lincoln Cathedral

David Stocker

The stone screen enclosing the works chantry in the main south transept of Lincoln Cathedral is described. It is shown that the screen contains many original panels and sections, but that it has been comprehensively rebuilt following demolition. During the process of that rebuilding, it is suggested, items of architectural salvage from fittings elsewhere in the Cathedral were incorporated. It is further suggested that the original screen was first erected in the early 1360s as part of the establishment of the chantry of Henry of Grosmont (1310–1361), duke of Lancaster and earl of Lincoln, and that it was demolished in 1644. It is proposed that the screen's reconstruction dates from the twenty years or so following the Restoration and was one of a series of projects within the cathedral undertaken at that time by bishops with antiquarian interests.

Introduction

The paper that follows was written during the preparation of the *Conservation Plan* for Lincoln Cathedral (Gibbs 2001a & b). During the compilation of the *Plan* a series of seminars and discussions were held, focussing particularly on those areas and artefacts within the Cathedral that had not already benefitted from substantial comment in the past. These debates led to basic understandings, which could then be captured and documented in the *Plan*. At an early stage the works chantry screen was identified as a structure about which very little had been written previously, and about which there was some uncertainty regarding its conservation value. Essentially previous commentators had been unable to agree whether it represented an intact 14th-century screen, or whether it was, rather, a much later confection put together out of bits. Potentially, therefore, in terms of the simple 'scoring' used to identify 'importance' in the *Plan*, the works chantry screen could have fallen into any of the three categories between 'A' – of exceptional significance

– and 'C' – of some significance'. Thus in 1999, the author was asked by Dr Gibbs to undertake some research into the history and archaeology of the screen and to offer a paper to the working group. The final version of the *Conservation Plan* summarised the author's findings (Gibbs 2001b, 281–3) and allocated it to 'category B', 'considerable significance (would warrant inclusion on a national list)'. It was intended at that stage that the *Plan* would be published, but currently it is only available for public consultation in the cathedral library. Subsequent to the appearance of the *Conservation Plan*, the author has been asked on several occasions for copies of his analysis, and it is now offered here (more-or-less as originally tabled) so that its conclusions may contribute to further work on the cathedral. References to works published since 2001 have not been systematically included.

The screen across the west end of the northernmost chapel in the south transept of Lincoln Cathedral evidently enclosed an altar dedicated successively to St Guthlac, St Anne and St Edward the Martyr (Curtois 1912–13, 52–3; Binnall 1962, 77; Fig 1).¹ It is still a

Fig 1

The location of the works chantry and its screen. (Extract from the plan of Lincoln Cathedral by Edward Willson in Lincoln Cathedral Library. A copy of an original plan held in the Society of Antiquaries London – MS 786 – probably made in the first or second decade of the 19th century)

magnificent structure (Fig 2), and is usually indicated briefly in most guide-books to the cathedral. Yet often, one suspects, its oddities encourage writers to pass-on quickly! The screen is shown in something like its present form in the view of the transept from the north-west published by Charles Wild in 1816 (Fig 3). No statues are visible in this view, although the screen itself looks much as it does today. The screen was the subject of a series of drawings by Edward Willson in the first and second decades of the 19th century (Lincoln Cathedral Library, Willson Collection Portfolios; Society of Antiquaries of London, Willson Collection, MS 786, portfolios A & C), some of which were worked up into the engravings first published in 1821 (Pugin and Willson 1895, 27; Fig 4). The sketch by Herbert Railton (Venables 1898, 19) shows the screen still without its figure-sculpture (Fig 5).

It was first commented on in detail by Aymer Vallance, who pointed out, fundamentally, that the

present stone screen in this location was preceded by a wooden one along a similar line (1947, 74). His short discussion of the surviving screen concludes that the structure visible today is essentially a 14th-century monument, though ‘heavily restored’ (Vallance 1974, plate 69), and this is not an unreasonable assessment. To understand the complexity and archaeological and historical interest of the screen, however, we need to describe it in greater detail.

Description

Plinth

Although it is clearly an insertion into the eastern transept arcade, the plinth stones have been quite carefully shaped to fit the concavities of the pier bases. The stones forming the plinth are tightly and evenly jointed and look undisturbed; the plinth course seems

Fig 2

The works chantry screen in 2012 (Photo: Chris Wilson and Susan Leadbetter)

to belong to the original stone screen in this location. Its plan shows that the screen always had a blind wall north and south of a centrally placed doorway, whilst the plinth's complex moulding suggests a date in the central or later 14th century.

Dado

The dado is decorated with three bays of blind arcading to either side of the central opening, which are defined by projecting miniature panelled buttresses, rotated through 45 degrees to the plane of the wall. It appears that these buttresses were intended to rise through the dado level and form major divisions in the screen above, but they now terminate at dado level; what was originally a joint with the mullion above has been given a scalloped decoration (Fig 6). This latter detail

is certainly a re-cutting, and its form is not dissimilar to the 'gadrooning' found on later 17th-century monuments. In each bay defined by the buttresses are three panels imitating contemporary cusped window forms in blind tracery, ie of mid- to late 14th-century character. As the apparently original and *in situ* plinth contains seatings for the miniature buttresses, we can presume that both the buttresses and the dado panels with which they are associated were original components of the screen. They belong here and are not architectural salvage imported from elsewhere. However, the stones forming the dado show clear signs of disturbance; they were evidently cut to be very tight jointed, yet the joints here are broad and irregular, such that certain elements of the tracery designs no longer fit well together. This marked contrast in assembly technique between the plinth and the dado indicates

Fig 3
The works chantry screen. View of the screen in a detail of the south transept from the north-west drawn by Charles Wild and engraved by John Lee (Wild 1816, plate 8)

that that the latter has been reassembled somewhat carelessly. The dado sits beneath a moulded rail or sill, in the upper surface of which are a small number of sinkings for iron uprights set in lead.

Openwork screen

Above the dado, the central section of the screen comprises simple square-headed tracery on each side of the doorway. The tracery heads are cut from four pieces of stone to each side of the doorway, which have been selected to fit the space. Although reset, these are also unlikely to represent architectural salvage from elsewhere. The castellated cornice, which the lintels support, however, does not fit the space and there is a nasty bodge in plaster at the south end. The openings in the screen are divided into three groups of three lights by slightly broader mullions but none of them are deeper than the dado rail on which they sit. As has been suggested, the major mullions, incorporating a miniature pinnacle buttress, were clearly intended, originally, to rise through from the dado below, but they are now terminated short of the openwork screen and not picked up in the open lights above (Fig 6). Willson reconstructs such a buttress in this location,

Fig 4
The works chantry screen. Engravings by Pugin and Turrell of screen's details, from drawings by Edward Willson, first published in 1821 (Pugin and Willson 1895, 27)

but mistakenly shows it sitting on the dado rail. Against the central doorway, however, the half-profile of a 'major' mullion does survive, which would have been broad enough to engage with mullions rising through from the dado level below. This half-mullion is the only one retaining evidence for iron fittings sunk in lead. Furthermore, on the screen's east face, the mullions dividing the bays are marked with a broader and more complex profile; these too would have engaged with mullions rising through the dado level.

These details in the mullions and tracery of this part of the screen suggest, first, that there was originally an openwork screen in this location, which was divided into three bays on each side of the doorway by three major mullions rising from the dado below. No doubt minor mullions divided each subdivision into three lights, giving a total of nine lights on each side of the door as now. These eighteen openings were filled with metalwork grilles, probably also with traceried heads. Secondly, this pattern of three groups of three lights

Fig 5
The works chantry screen. Sketch of c1895 by Herbert Railton published by Isbister & Co. (Venable 1898, 19)

per side was retained during the course of a major reconstruction, when new mullions were cut to a single template and new (more simple?) traceried heads were created, separated at the top by blank shields. No grille was ever provided in the reconstructed screen, and the minimal decoration on the east face of the new work, not to mention the unfinished quality of the masonry, probably suggests that this face was intended to be obscured with a hanging. The reconstruction and the new mullions might be dated by the 'gadrooning' on the re-cut original mullions (Fig 6), although this is so minimal that little weight of interpretation should be placed on it alone. Finally, it is worth noting that few of the openings at this level are of precisely the same width, and some of them are markedly narrower than their fellows. This too is likely to be a sign that the screen has been reconstructed, as it is unlikely that such discrepancies would have existed in the original monument.



Fig 6
The works chantry screen. Detail of junction between original major mullion and miniature buttress pinnacle rising through dado; dado rail; and later replacement mullion dating from the reconstruction (Photo: author)

Canopy Tier

Above the openwork screen the second level of openwork masonry provides an unusual, not to say ungainly, canopy tier, yet it is clear from the responds against the arcade piers that, even if the whole of the present upper screen is a replacement, such an upper tier of openwork screening was a part of the original design. At this level today, however, the masonry simply does not fit the space allotted; it does not correspond to the bay divisions established in the dado and openwork screen below, and neither does it match the fragments of the original screen termination still adhering to the arcade piers to north and south. Each bay within the canopy tier is decorated with two simply cusped ogee canopy heads separated by blank shields supported on the stubs of panelled buttresses, which no longer rise above the shoulders of the arches. Above, the canopies support a heavy, simply moulded cornice decorated with another row of blank shields. In addition each bay within the canopy tier is supported by a pair of

uprights, which sit directly beneath, on the east side. The uprights themselves have a completely different tooling from the tracery in the openwork screen and dado below, and their simple squared section with 'flared' moulded capitals appear neo-classical rather than Gothic (Fig 7). Such deep openings, with straight heads below paired ogee arches look highly unconventional in this context; they are too small-scale for their elevated position and look more like the canopies surrounding niches from a tomb base or another item of furniture. These canopy blocks are probably architectural salvage from elsewhere, although they too are mid- or later 14th-century in date. The run of blank shields supporting the upper cornice is simply moulded compared with the embattled rail above the openwork screen below, and this too might suggest that this whole zone is not original. Similarly, the brattishing is set back from the front face of the cornice in an unusual way: the stalks appear too squat and much of the leaf sculpture itself seems to be of plaster. The simplicity and poor design quality of these cornice components may suggest that they were



Fig 7
The works chantry screen. Single bay in canopy tier from western side. Note the inserted pillars towards the rear with their 'flared' capitals (Photo: author)

manufactured at the time the screen was reconstructed, rather than being architectural salvage from elsewhere.

Doorway

The presence of a doorway in the original screen in this location is demonstrated by the survival of the original threshold stones in the plinth. Above them the door jambs look original, including the lower parts of the small kneeling figures of bedesmen to either side of the impost. These are fine mid-14th-century sculptures and only their heads are restorations. They are shown headless by Pugin and Willson (1895, plate 27; Fig 4 here), and the heads were added as part of the restorations of 1913 (Nicholson 1913, 2). The two stones which form the arch-head with its elaborate cusping and sub-cusping, and which carry the inscription '*Oremus p[ro] b[e]n[e]factorib[us] istius Ecclesie*' are not original; they seem to be of a slightly different stone type, have a different tooling technique and they have been 'let into' the original masonry on either side. The form of decoration, however, looks quite genuine and they may be close copies of the original stones.

The monolithic decorative gablet above the arch head looks original, however, but the blessing bishop's face and mitre, at least, appear replaced (Fig 8). By contrast with the bedesmen in the imposts below, the bishop's head and mitre is present in Willson's studies and here, once again, the features and the shape of the mitre look later 17th-century in date. The bishop sits beneath a blank scroll on the gablet, which may have originally been decorated with a painted prayer. The pierced panels to either side and the cornice with square-flowers above, appear convincing medieval work, and they are decorated towards the east as well as towards the west. They have clearly been reset in their current location as packing is visible on the east face, and their flanking buttresses are missing finials. The stone carrying the principal, central, statue niche, and carved with the arms of England 'ancient', is also apparently of medieval workmanship, although it too has been relocated. It no longer sits comfortably on the finial below and is supported by two lateral fillets of stone, clearly later insertions. These insertions are seen in Willson's studies, however, and so may have been made during the initial reconstruction. The uppermost tabernacle along with its spire also seems to be of medieval workmanship. Like the smaller openwork tabernacles to either side, it is also decorated on its east face as well as towards the west. The two subsidiary tabernacles also appear to be largely original medieval



Fig 8
The works chantry screen. The 'blessing bishop' over the central doorway, suggested here to be a sculpture of the later 17th century (Photo: author)

work, although the south tabernacle incorporates a reused mullion section in the statue base (east side). Both the main central tabernacle and the subsidiary tabernacles to either side, are strapped from behind with iron supports. These iron straps are very crude-looking and appear hand-made. This very crudity, however, might also suggest a date of manufacture prior to the 19th century.

Statuary

Three stone figures or figure groups have been placed in the three tabernacles; they are all of a similar 'realistic' style and presumably represent a single enhancement. The central tabernacle is occupied by a standing crowned figure holding what seems to be a cushion in one hand and a sword in the other. This is intended as a representation of St Edward King and Martyr. To the north is a blessing bishop carrying a metal crosier, intended as a representation of St Thomas Beckett, whilst to the south a group represents St Anne teaching St Mary to read. The sculpture was intended to be

installed as part of the chapel's restoration under the direction of Sir Charles Nicholson in 1913, but the sculptures were not in place when the chapel was reopened in September of that year (Nicholson 1913; Anon 1913) and it may well be that their installation was delayed by the outbreak of war. The three statues had been installed by the early 1930s, however (Lambert and Sprague 1933, 97). The name of the sculptor does not seem to be known, though the style of the figure sculpture (as well as the stone-type) resembles that of the Madonna in the Judgement Porch trumeau, which was a war memorial made in 1926 (Gibbs 2001b, 235).

Door leaf

The bipartite door leaf, of oak, is pierced in its upper parts with simple traceried openings and the solid parts below have applied tracery panels to the west above a plinth decorated with quatrefoils. The doors are difficult to date, and have been comprehensively reconstructed in several phases, but it is possible that some of the tracery elements preserve medieval components reassembled into doors of the present form during the later 17th century. The doors are hung on crude hand-made strap-hinges (on original pintles?). These strap hinges might also be of 17th-century date.

Discussion

Henry of Grosmont

There seems no doubt that there was a fine stone screen built in this location in the later 14th century. This screen is represented by many of the stones in the present screen and it can be broadly dated by the shield of *England ancient* to between 1338 and 1405, when these arms were current within the family of Edward III. Although the connection does not seem to have been made previously, it seems likely that the arms refer to the re-foundation of the chapel beyond in honour of St Anne and St Edward the Martyr by Henry of Grosmont, great-grandson of Henry III and political mainstay of Edward III (Binnall 1962, 77). At this time the chapel was probably already the location for performances of masses '*pro benefactoribus*' by members of the community of priests who lived in the fine house west of the Deanery and who had been known since 1320 as the 'works chantry' (Wordsworth 1898, 232-5; Binnall, 1962,77; Jones, Major and Varley 1990, 12-19). Henry of Grosmont died in

1361 and was closely associated not just with Lincoln city, but also with St Edward the Martyr (Fowler 1969 *passim*; Everson and Stocker 2011, 133–5, 153, 269–73, 328). A date in the early 1360s would also be appropriate for the institution of a major new chapel in the cathedral by Henry, as John Gynewell remained bishop of Lincoln until 1363 and Gynewell was Henry's protégé, having been his treasurer in the 1330s and 1340s, before being promoted to the bishopric in 1347 (Fowler 1969, 177). Henry of Grosmont's own arms, however, were based on the three leopards and were not combined with the lilies of France (Anon 1848), so the shield over the entrance would be a reference to Henry's cousin, Edward III, who had rehabilitated him as earl of Lincoln in 1349, and who would have been, as usual, at the head of the list of recipients of prayers within the new chantry.

Architectural design and parallels

A date in the early 1360s would also match the screen's architectural design well. A brass to an unknown priest at North Mimms (Hertfordshire), for example, shows the deceased standing beneath a large archway, with a trio of tabernacles above him, set beneath what was probably originally a 'spire'. This brass is usually dated to c1360–80 (Stephenson 1964, 190; Pevsner and Cherry 1977, 262). The blind tracery of the dado in the Lincoln screen is also comfortably placed around this date. Not only does it incorporate the mullions rising from the apexes of the main lights, characteristic of Perpendicular at this date, but alternate panels have distinctive encircled quatrefoils in the spandrels to either side. This latter detail is reminiscent of some of the tracery designs attributed by John Harvey to the master mason Robert Wodehirst, whom he believed was trained at Westminster in the 1350s before moving to Norwich (Harvey 1978, 105–7; see also Woodman 1996, 182). Whether or not the designer is correctly named, tracery in the rebuilt parts of the choir at Norwich cathedral (begun 1362) also displays the distinctive encircled quatrefoil seen in the works chantry screen, and similar details can also be seen at a group of contemporary churches in Norfolk, Suffolk and Lincolnshire, most notable amongst which is the tracery of the south aisle windows at Swanton Morley church (Norfolk), which is dated to the later 1370s (Fawcett 1996, 217–8).

Medieval stone screens of any sort are not that common, however, and although other stone screens survive at Lincoln Cathedral – notably the great pulpitum (choir screen) made a generation or so earlier

– the great majority of the church's screens seem to have been in wood. This is typically true; such stone screens as do survive are usually pulpitums. Where stone 'parclose' screens, used to enclose a chapel or tomb, have survived, they are often an integral part of the structure (the various free-standing chantry screens in Winchester Cathedral being an example), and not an additional feature, as in the Lincoln case. Another category of screen intended specifically for statuary, like the works chantry screen, is the reredos, which is sometimes also equipped with free-standing tabernacles. The 'Neville Screen' in Durham Cathedral, dating from the decade or so prior to 1376, is an example of this type and it too has encircled quatrefoils in the spandrels of cusped and sub-cusped arches. In the most recent detailed study of this screen, Professor Wilson explores the genesis of openwork tabernacles in such micro-architecture and identifies their origin around 1300, at least amongst reredoses (Wilson 1980). He believes that there was an influential screen of this general type at Peterborough Abbey, built in the second quarter of the 14th century; of which some impression can be gained from the surviving reredos fragments at Northborough, in the Soke of Peterborough. He also links their development with that of openwork tabernacles containing statuary adorning major tomb superstructures, like that of Archbishop Stratford at Canterbury Cathedral presumed to have been made shortly after his death in 1348. More recently Jackie Hall has written about the architectural context of such openwork tabernacles in the course of her consideration of the fragments of a monument from Binham Priory (Norfolk – Hall and Atherton 2011). She draws attention to the broad similarities between structures of this type and the elaborate pinnacles at several Lincolnshire churches of the mid-14th century (St Botolph's Boston, St Denys' Sleaford and St Andrew's Heckington).

Although some similarities might be drawn between the works chantry screen and contemporary architectural details, however, no other church in Lincoln diocese has a rood or parclose screen that is in any way comparable; indeed it is hard to find directly comparable screens elsewhere in the country either. At Stebbing (Essex) a stone rood screen of mid 14th-century date has a central archway with an arrangement of tracery above, incorporating settings for a group of rood sculptures but, although it represents a broadly similar artefact, it is hardly a close parallel. A similar screen at Great Bardfield (Essex) is somewhat later in date. There is also a generic

similarity between the Lincoln screen and a number of late medieval screens enclosing chantry chapels, such as that of Bishop Alcock's chapel at Ely Cathedral (c1500; see other examples listed in Vallance 1947 and Roffey 2007, esp 56–9). The Lincoln and the Ely examples are both highly decorated stone parclose screens intended to receive free-standing statuary, but the stylistic parallels are not at all close. Furthermore, a century and a half earlier than the Ely example, the works chantry screen seems to come quite early in this screen-building tradition.

Demolition and reconstruction

It is likely, of course, that many more such screens were erected only to be demolished during the 16th and 17th centuries. Indeed 'inhabited' parclose screens were particularly suitable for screening chantry chapels and, as the saints in whose honour the chantry had been founded could be prominently displayed within them, they may have been specially sought out for destruction following the dissolution of the chantries in 1547.

We have seen that, of the original stone works chantry screen at Lincoln, it appears that only the plinth survives *in situ* and undisturbed. Sections that were probably from upper parts of this screen originally, and which have been dislodged and subsequently reset, include the dado panels to either side of the doorway and most of the components from the central doorway itself. Many of these reset original components are chipped and broken, suggesting that the screen was carelessly demolished at some stage, with no intention that it should be re-erected. In addition we have also noted the suspicion that a number of components have been specially made for the reconstruction of the screen subsequent to its demolition. Amongst these are the mullions and monolithic heads in the openwork screen, the 'neo-classical' supports for the arch heads in the canopy tier, the upper cornice, and the two stones forming the arch head for the central doorway.

The date of this demolition – which is so apparent from close inspection – is undocumented, and so is the date of its reconstruction. A few slight details such as the 'gadrooning' and the face of the blessing bishop, however, might suggest that the reconstruction dates from the later 17th century. If so, the reconstruction would presumably date from the episcopates of bishops Sanderson (1660–3), Lany (1663–7) or Fuller (1667–75). Both Sanderson and Fuller were known to have taken an active interest in the cathedral's medieval monuments. Fuller certainly involved himself

in reconstructing the liturgical fittings after the damage caused during the Civil War (Cocke 1986, 149) and Sanderson and Lany probably did as well (Bowker 1994, 196–7).² Although direct proof is lacking, therefore, we might suggest that the screen was demolished in the summer of 1644³ and reconstructed using many original components in the years between c1660 and c1675. Some new masonry components were cut for the reconstruction, and a group of fragments from another 14th-century feature from elsewhere in the church were also imported to form the new screen.

The imported arch heads and other elements in the canopy tier are presumably items of architectural salvage from elsewhere in the cathedral. They seem to represent a highly detailed openwork screen or base, decorated with paired niches under ogee canopies, which might have been an item of ritual furniture, a tomb or even a shrine base. It has been suggested that one possible origin for this material might have been the 'unofficial' shrine of Bishop Dalderby (*in litt* Warwick Rodwell in correspondence with Dr L Gibbs August 2000), which was located on the western side of the transept, following the bishop's burial in 1320. The form taken by this shrine is largely unknown; the three surviving pillars against the west wall of the south-west transept probably represent the responds for a metal grille which stood around the bishop's tomb, rather than the shrine-base itself. Within the railed area would have been a base like a tomb chest for the silver feretory made during the 1320s (Cole 1915–6, 271). The eight canopy sections in the works chantry screen might have come from a very large and elaborate tomb chest, with three paired niches for 'weepers' along each long side and one each at either end, but the explanation fails to convince, partly because of their size. Furthermore, had these stones been cut for the sides of a tomb-chest one would expect them to be engaged with the tomb's structure to the rear, and they are not.

Several other persuasive arguments speak against the proposal that these fragments came from Dalderby's shrine base. Most crucially, unlike those built to carry the shrines to St Hugh and Little St Hugh and the tomb of Robert Grosseteste, which were all standing until the 1640s (Stocker 1985; 1986; 1987), Dalderby's shrine base was apparently destroyed, not during the Civil War, but in the period immediately following the Reformation (Cole 1915–16, 272): Leland reported c1543 that Dalderby's '*tumbe was taken away nomine superstitionis*' (Toulmin Smith 1964, V, 122). Had it survived into the 1630s it is highly likely that it would

have been mentioned by one of the antiquaries who recorded the cathedral's antiquities at that time – Holles, Sanderson or Dugdale – and the fact that it was not, seems to confirm that it was demolished during the earlier iconoclasm. Consequently, had the stones been recycled from Dalderby's shrine base, they would have been kept in storage for a century and a half, before being brought out at the Restoration for incorporation into the reconstructed works chantry screen, and this does not sound likely. Considerable damage was also done to the choir fittings in 1644, however, and it seems more logical to search for an origin for the canopy fragments now in the works chantry screen amongst the furnishings demolished at this time.

Conclusion

The original screen was probably built in the early 1360s as part of the establishment of the chantry founded by Henry of Grosmont, earl of Lincoln and duke of Lancaster, endowed after his death in 1361, at the newly re-dedicated chapel of St Edward and St Anne. It is of an advanced type for that date, having two levels of openwork screens above the elaborately decorated dado. The openwork canopies and niche-work over the doorway through the screen is also unusual. Similar architectural designs are seen on contemporary brasses and manuscripts, as well as in elaborate blind arcading around doorways and other architectural features, but this screen takes such two-dimensional designs and audaciously converts them into a three dimensional structure. Like most such furnishings in the cathedral, the Lincoln screen was demolished in the early modern period, probably in September 1644, and was then reconstructed, probably in the 1660s or 1670s. It can be seen, therefore, as another of the 'antiquarian' gestures undertaken by the Restoration bishops of Lincoln, of which the reconstruction of the Swynford tomb in the cathedral choir is probably the most famous (Harvey 1972). The screen's reconstruction is of interest in its own right, and it seems likely that it involved the production of new components and the importation of stone fragments from other demolished furnishings from elsewhere in the cathedral, as well as the re-assembly of surviving elements from its original fabric. To this author, however, it seems unlikely that any of the architectural salvage represents the shrine of Bishop Dalderby, which had very probably been demolished

a century and a half prior to the reconstruction of the works chantry screen.

The works chantry screen at Lincoln Cathedral, then, seems to be a rare survivor of an unusual and ambitious design of parclose screen. The interest of the structure is enhanced – rather than reduced – by the fact that it has been demolished and rebuilt, as this says as much about the concerns of the Restoration clergy as it does about their mid-14th-century predecessors.

David Stocker is Hon Visiting Professor of Medieval Studies at the University of Leeds and current chair of the Society for Church Archaeology.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Dr Liv Gibbs, Dr Jackie Hall and Prof David Lepine for discussing the screen with me at various times, and I'm very grateful for the help offered by Dr Nicholas Bennett, Vice-Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral with the Fabric Accounts. I would also like to acknowledge the help given by Chris Wilson and Susan Leadbetter, who have generously given permission for the reproduction of Fig 2.

Notes

- 1 The validity of the evidence associating this chapel with Edward the Martyr was queried by Curtois, but the case for its having held this dedication, amongst others, was accepted by Binnall.
- 2 The Cathedral's Fabric Accounts survive for the period 1660–1690 (Cathedral Library Bj/1/8 & Bj/1/9). The accounts for the first three years of this period are quite full and occasional details of the work being paid for are entered. None of these refer to any reconstruction of screenwork, or even anything like it. Such work would have been concealed behind the large payments in 'The Mason's Bill' for unspecified work. The Dean and Chapter contested the 1663 accounts prepared by the Clerk of Works, and thereafter the accounts are summary and formulaic.
- 3 '*Lincoln has been prophaned by Cromwell's barbarous crew of Brownists who have pulled down all the brave carved works there; torn to pieces all the monuments and tombes; laid them even with the earth.*' (extract from *Mecurius Aulicus* for 16th September 1644). See also Bennett 2012, 12–3.

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

Lincoln Cathedral Library, Willson Collection Portfolios.

Lincoln Cathedral Library, Fabric Accounts 1661–1690, Ms. Bj/1/8 & Bj/1/9

Society of Antiquaries of London, Ms. 786, ('The Willson Collection') portfolios A & C.

Secondary Sources

Anon, 1848, 'A short dissertation upon the monuments at the upper end of the north-eastern part of the presbytery (or choir of angels) in the cathedral of Lincoln', *Memoirs illustrative of the History and Antiquities of the County and the City of Lincoln communicated to the annual meeting of the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland held at Lincoln, July 1848*, London 1850, 241–7

Anon, 1913, 'Re-Opening of St Edward's Chapel', *The Minster Gazette* 9, September 1913, 2–3

Binnall, P B G, 1962, 'Notes on the Medieval Altars and Chapels in Lincoln Cathedral', *Antiquaries Journal* 42, 68–80

Bowker, M, 1994, 'Historical Survey, 1450–1750', in D Owen (ed), *A History of Lincoln Minster*, Cambridge, 164–209

Cocke, T, 1986, 'The Architectural History of Lincoln Cathedral from the Dissolution to the Twentieth Century', in T Heslop and V Sekules (eds), *Medieval Art Architecture and Archaeology at Lincoln Cathedral*, Transactions of the British Archaeological Association Conference 1982, London, 148–57

Cole, R E G, 1915–16, 'Proceedings relative to the Canonisation of John de Dalderby, Bishop of Lincoln', *Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers* 33, 243–276

Curtois, A, 1912–13, 'The Titles of the Altars and Chapels in the Minster', *Lincoln Diocesan Magazine*, 187–8; 4–6; 37–9; 52–3; 71–2

Everson, P and Stocker D, 2011, *Custodians of Continuity? The Premonstratensian Abbey at Barlings and the Landscape of Ritual*, Lincolnshire Archaeology and Heritage Reports Series 11, Heckington

Fawcett, R, 1996, 'The influence of the Gothic parts of the cathedral on church building in Norfolk', in I Atherton, E Fernie, C Harper-Bill and H Smith (eds) *Norwich Cathedral. Church, City and Diocese, 1096–1996*, London and Rio Grande 210–227

Fowler, K, 1969, *The King's Lieutenant. Henry of Grosmont, First Duke of Lancaster 1310–1361*, London

Gibbs, L, 2001a, 'Lincoln Cathedral and Close. Conservation Plan, Volume 1: Understanding the site', Privately Distributed, Copy available for consultation in the Lincoln Cathedral Library

Gibbs, L, 2001b, 'Lincoln Cathedral and Close, Conservation Plan, Volume 2: Cathedral Gazetteer', Privately Distributed, Copy available for consultation in the Lincoln Cathedral Library

Hall, J, and Atherton, J, 2011, 'Devotion and Image at Binham Priory: A 14th-century hexagonal stone pedestal', *Norfolk Archaeology* 46, 153–70

Harvey, J, 1972, *Catherine Swynford's Chantry*, Lincoln Minster Pamphlets 2nd series No.6, Lincoln

Harvey, J, 1978, *The Perpendicular Style 1330–1485*, London

Jones, S, Major K and Varley, J, 1990, *The Survey of Ancient Houses in Lincoln III: Houses in Eastgate, Priorygate and James Street*, Lincoln

Lambert, M R and Sprague, M S, 1933, *Lincoln*, Oxford

Nicholson, Sir C, 1913, 'The Chapel of St Edward', *The Minster Gazette*, No.8, August 1913, 4

Pevsner, Sir N and Cherry, B, 1977, *The Buildings of England. Hertfordshire*, Harmondsworth

Pugin, A C and Willson, E J, 1895, *Specimens of Gothic Architecture ...*, 2 vols. Edinburgh

Roffey, S, 2007, *The Medieval Chantry Chapel. An Archaeology*, Woodbridge

Stephenson, M, 1964, *A List of Monumental Brasses in the British Isles*, London

Stocker, D, 1985, 'The Tomb and Shrine of Bishop Grosseteste in Lincoln Cathedral', in W Ormrod (ed), *England in the Thirteenth Century. Proceedings of the 1984 Harlaxton Symposium*, Nottingham, 143–8

Stocker, D, 1986, 'The Shrine of Little St Hugh', in T Heslop and V Sekules (eds), *Medieval Art Architecture and Archaeology at Lincoln Cathedral*. Transactions of the British Archaeological Association Conference 1982, London, 109–117

Stocker, D, 1987, 'The Mystery of the Shrines of St Hugh', in H Mayr-Harting (ed), *St Hugh of Lincoln. Lectures delivered in Oxford and Lincoln to celebrate the eighth centenary of St Hugh's consecration as bishop of Lincoln*, Oxford 89–124

Toulmin-Smith, L (ed), 1964, *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535–1543*, Carbondale

Vallance, A, 1947, *Greater English Church Screens*, London

Venables, E, 1898, *Lincoln Cathedral*, London

Wild, C, 1816, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln*, London

Wilson C, 1980, 'The Neville Screen', *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the year 1977, 90–104

Woodman, F, 1996, 'The Gothic Campaigns', in I Atherton, E Fernie, C Harper-Bill and H Smith (eds), *Norwich Cathedral. Church, City and Diocese, 1096–1996*, London and Rio Grande, 158–196

Wordsworth, C, 1898, *Notes on Medieval Services in England, with an index of Lincoln Ceremonies*, London